

**ENTREPRENEURIALISM'S INFLUENCE ON THE INTERNATIONAL STRATEGIES
AND ACTIVITIES OF PUBLIC U.S. UNIVERSITIES**

by

Eric Deschamps

Copyright © Eric Deschamps 2013

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL POLICY STUDIES AND PRACTICE
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
WITH A MAJOR IN HIGHER EDUCATION
In the Graduate College
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

2013

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

As members of the Dissertation Committee, we certify that we have read the dissertation prepared by Eric Deschamps entitled Entrepreneurialism's Influence on the International Strategies and Activities of Public U.S. Universities and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Regina Deil-Amen Date: February 8, 2013

Jenny J. Lee Date: February 8, 2013

Francisco Marmolejo Date: February 8, 2013

Gary Rhoades Date: February 8, 2013

Final approval and acceptance of this dissertation is contingent upon the candidate's submission of the final copies of the dissertation to the Graduate College.

I hereby certify that I have read this dissertation prepared under my direction and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement.

Dissertation Director: Jenny J. Lee Date: February 8, 2013

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at the University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under the rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgement of source is made. Request for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the copyright holder.

SIGNED: Eric Deschamps

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	6
ABSTRACT.....	7
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	8
Statement of the Problem.....	11
Purpose and Audience.....	12
Statement of Purpose.....	13
Methodology.....	13
Organization of the Study.....	14
Significance of the Study.....	15
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	17
Globalization and Higher Education.....	18
Internationalization and higher education.....	20
Internationalization strategies and activities.....	22
International offices.....	26
Entrepreneurialism in Higher Education.....	28
Environmental pressures driving entrepreneurialism.....	28
Growing expectations.....	28
Competition between higher education institutions.....	29
Decreasing state support.....	31
Institutional engagement in entrepreneurial behaviors.....	33
Internationalization and Entrepreneurialism.....	35
International student recruitment.....	38
Changes in the international student market.....	43
The use of agents in international student recruitment.....	44
International students' impact on national economies.....	44
Other entrepreneurial activities in internationalization.....	45
Concerns.....	46
Summary.....	48
Analytical Frameworks.....	50
Academic capitalism.....	50
Neo-institutional theory.....	51
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY.....	53
Research Questions.....	53
Research Design.....	54
Site and Sample.....	55
Data Collection.....	58
Data Analysis.....	59
Codes.....	60
Analytical Frameworks.....	61
Utilizing the framework of academic capitalism.....	61
Utilizing the framework of neo-institutional theory.....	62
Limitations.....	63

TABLE OF CONTENTS - *Continued*

Validity.....	65
Ethical considerations.....	65
Positionality.....	65
Pilot Study.....	67
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS.....	70
Forces Encouraging Entrepreneurialism.....	70
Expectations of upper administrators.....	70
Growing student demand for international services.....	73
Funding.....	74
Past changes in funding.....	77
Expected future changes in funding.....	79
Funding and expectations.....	81
Allocation of international office revenue.....	82
Funding and seniority.....	83
Summary.....	84
Activities.....	87
Changing activities of international offices.....	87
Dual-degree agreements.....	88
International student recruitment.....	89
Delivery of credit abroad to foreign students.....	92
Nurturing international alumni.....	93
High-priority activities for international offices.....	95
Priorities based on philosophical support for international education.....	95
Priorities based on budgetary considerations.....	98
Summary.....	100
Strategies.....	101
Strategic partnerships in support of international student recruitment.....	101
Growing enrollment in international activities.....	103
Balancing Entrepreneurial Needs and Educational Priorities.....	107
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS.....	115
Summary of the Findings.....	115
Contribution to the Literature.....	120
Implications for Practice.....	124
Implications for Research.....	128
APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL.....	131
APPENDIX B: CODES.....	133
REFERENCES.....	134

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 – <i>A comparison of globalization and internationalization</i>	20
Table 2 – <i>Measurements of state support for higher education</i>	32
Table 3 – <i>Overview of institutions and corresponding identifier</i>	57
Table 4 - <i>Sources of Revenue for Interviewees' International Offices</i>	74

ABSTRACT

This study explored how international offices engage in entrepreneurial internationalization. Thirty Senior International Officers (SIOs) at public U.S. universities were interviewed to understand why and how their offices seek to generate revenue through their international strategies and activities. This study found that SIOs are engaging in entrepreneurialism for the following reasons: funding cuts, expectations of their institutions, and growing student demand for international services. These drivers have resulted in targeted international activities, such as the delivery of U.S. credit to foreign students in their home country (without a branch campus) and the growth of dual degree programs. International offices are also developing strategic partnerships with enrollment management in trying to attract more international students to campus. This study found entrepreneurialism to largely align with the educational priorities of international offices, though a misalignment of incentives and priorities seems to exist within many international offices.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

U.S. higher education has become increasingly international over the past decades. Between the 1979/80 and 2010/11 academic years, international student enrollments grew by 253% (Bhandari & Chow, 2011). U.S. study abroad enrollments almost quadrupled between the 1989/90 and 2009/10 academic years (Bhandari & Chow, 2011). Robust growth in U.S. study abroad is expected to continue. The Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation Act supports the goal of one million Americans studying abroad by the 2016/17 academic year (Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program, 2005). This would again quadruple study abroad enrollments, considering that 270,604 students studied abroad in the 2009/10 academic year (Bhandari & Chow, 2011). As the internationalization of U.S. higher education continues to grow, so do the responsibilities of higher education institutions' (HEIs') international offices.

International offices serve as the centralized unit in which universities' international projects are housed. Although the traditional responsibilities of different international offices vary, there are many commonalities. Michigan State University's Office of International Studies and Programs, a leader in international education, is responsible for international contracts, study abroad, international students, international scholars, and the international engagement of domestic faculty (Hudzik, 2009). These roles and responsibilities are typical of international offices across the United States.

The economic downturn of 2008 has forced some universities to reevaluate the roles of their international offices (Fischer, 2010). While international education has been a priority for many institutions during the past decade, recent budget cuts have forced HEIs to scale back

ambitious international projects. North Carolina State and Michigan State have pulled back from prominent outposts abroad (Fischer, 2010). Other HEIs, such as Boise State and Emmanuel College, are eliminating their international offices and dispersing their responsibilities in order to reduce costs (Fischer, 2010). Boise State reassigned international functions to a variety of divisions across campus. Campus administrators decided that it would be less costly to have international functions managed by existing divisions, rather than funding an independent international office. Emmanuel College chose to run its international programs through a local international consortium. The consortium is responsible for managing the international programs of many local institutions, thus allowing those institutions to share the costs associated with running an international office.

Despite the recent recession, support for the expansion of internationalization exists on some campuses. In the fall of 2010, the University of Richmond opened a \$20 million international education center (Fischer, 2010). In 2008 Yale announced that it would spend \$30 million to expand its presence in India (Fischer, 2008). The University of South Florida has recently committed to investing \$2.5 million towards international student recruitment (Fischer, 2010). South Florida expects that it will take five years to recuperate this investment. South Florida's cost/benefit analysis of their investment is becoming increasingly common in international education. Budget cuts resulting from the 2008/09 recession have encouraged HEIs to view internationalization as an investment in which they should expect a healthy return. Although universities have identified international activities as potential sources of revenue for the past decade, a healthy return on investment has been made even more important by recent budget cuts.

While education-based missions have historically guided international offices and the field of international higher education, revenue generation is becoming increasingly important (Knight, 2004). Diminishing state support for higher education, intensifying competition between institutions, and society's growing expectations of HEIs are pressuring universities to find alternative sources of revenue (Clark, 1998; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997) such as their international engagement. Research has found that educational (Knight, 2004) and entrepreneurial (Davies, 1992; Williams & Kitaev, 2005) rationales now coexist for international education. HEIs are internationalizing in part to realize revenue opportunities present in international student fees, overseas research projects, branch campuses and international consultancies (Davies, 1992; Williams & Kitaev, 2005). Some scholars believe that international higher education is at a crossroad between its traditional education-based missions and a desire to generate profits (Altbach & Knight, 2006).

This shift in desired outcomes guiding international higher education has had important ramifications. For example, as international offices are becoming increasingly entrepreneurial some of their relationships with third-party study abroad providers are becoming, to some, questionable. Wheaton College is facing litigation for charging students full tuition when they enroll in third-party study abroad programs that cost significantly less than tuition. Recent graduate Jennifer Bombasaro-Brady and her family has brought suit against Wheaton for charging her full tuition (over \$21,000) when she attended a third-party study abroad program with a sticker price of \$16,561 (Lewin, 2008). The difference of \$4439 was kept by the university. This scrutiny on the practices of international offices goes beyond individual lawsuits. In January 2008 the New York attorney general's office subpoenaed 15 universities to obtain data on their international offices' relationships with third-party study abroad providers

(Lewin, 2008). The attorney general's office is investigating billing practices and kickbacks from study abroad providers to the international offices that send them students.

Considering the consequences of shifting priorities in international education on students, their families, and universities, it is important to better understand the impact of these changing priorities. Studies have explained how the priorities of international offices are changing, but many questions regarding the relationship between entrepreneurialism and internationalization remain unanswered (Knight, 2004). One unanswered but important question is how entrepreneurialism is shaping the strategies and activities of international offices at public U.S. universities.

Statement of the Problem

This gap in existing scholarship is problematic in that there is limited empirical research on how international offices' behaviors are changing as they increasingly engage in entrepreneurial behaviors. Research has not clarified how the behaviors of international offices reflect their changing priorities. As the international engagement of universities becomes increasingly centralized (Van de Water, 2000; Taylor, 2004), the strategies and activities of international offices are having a greater impact on the international opportunities available to the students, faculty, and communities that they serve. The concentration of responsibility, autonomy, and authority in centralized international offices allows them to play an important role in how international opportunities are distributed to the rest of campus (Brockington, 2002). In light of international offices' effect on their communities, it is important to have a clear understanding of entrepreneurialism's role in how international education is pursued in universities.

Purpose and Audience

Extensive research has been conducted on the separate topics of internationalization and entrepreneurialism in higher education, though the overlap between these two topics has not been sufficiently examined. As U.S. HEIs become increasingly international and entrepreneurial it becomes more important to understand the relationship that exists between internationalization and entrepreneurialism. This study examined the impact that entrepreneurialism has had on campus internationalization. This research looked at the changing activities and strategies of international offices and how those changes might be connected to entrepreneurialism. The motivations behind the actions of Senior International Officers were examined. This study also explored the expectations held by HEIs' upper administrations in regards to internationalization. In doing so, this study bridges the gap between research on entrepreneurialism and research on internationalization.

This study allows SIOs and campus leaders to better understand how entrepreneurialism is affecting international engagement. Better awareness of this relationship encourages administrators to more deliberately decide the role that entrepreneurialism will play in internationalization. Administrators also benefit from an understanding of the nature of this relationship at other institutions. Organizations such as NAFSA and the Forum for Education Abroad are responsible for developing best practices in international education. The findings of this research allow NAFSA and the Forum to better understand how internationalization is developing at U.S. universities and to develop recommendations to guide these developments in a manner in which they can best serve students and higher education institutions.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this research is to understand how entrepreneurialism is influencing the behaviors of the international offices of public U.S. universities. This study explored if and how changes in funding are connected to entrepreneurial ambitions. This study clarifies entrepreneurialism's role in the priorities of international offices. It will seek to understand how strategies and activities are changing due to entrepreneurialism.

Methodology

Thirty international offices at public U.S. universities were examined in order to answer the research questions of this study. Senior International Officers were interviewed to understand the activities and strategies of their offices, how their offices are funded, the external forces that influence their behaviors, and how SIOs balance their budgetary and educational priorities. Their offices' webpages were searched for mission statements, vision statements, values, and strategic plans that address these topics. Interviews were conducted at international education conferences and on the phone. Some interviewees were selected based on their office's entrepreneurial reputations among SIOs. These interviewees were recommended to me by the SIOs I had already interviewed. Other interviewees were selected due to their office's prominent reputations in international education.

Every interview was recorded and transcribed. Transcriptions were organized and analyzed based on the categories of activities, strategies, funding, forces guiding the behaviors of international offices, and balancing entrepreneurialism and educational goals. Sub-themes emerged that many institutions had in common, such as pressure from campus leadership as a

sub-theme of forces. Information obtained from international offices' webpages was also categorized into these themes.

This study used two theoretical frameworks in analyzing the data collected. Academic capitalism explores the marketization of higher education in the late 20th century and early 21st century. The second framework, neo-institutional theory examines the relationship between the internal operations of organizations and their external environment. These two frameworks give this study the foundation necessary to explain how entrepreneurialism is influencing the internationalization of public U.S. universities.

Organization of the Study

This study is divided in to five chapters. The first, **Introduction**, presents the goal of this study: understanding how entrepreneurialism is shaping the strategies and activities of international offices at public U.S. universities. The second chapter, **Literature Review**, summarized research already conducted on internationalization and entrepreneurialism. Because the intersection of internationalization and entrepreneurialism has not been examined before, chapter two reviews these two subjects separately. Research on the internationalization of higher education is examined first. The literature review then explains how U.S. universities are increasingly engaging in revenue-generating activities. Chapter two ends with a description of the theories used to frame this study, academic capitalism and neo-institutional theory.

Chapter three, **Methodology**, explains why a qualitative approach is best suited to bridge the research gap between entrepreneurialism and internationalization. In chapter three I identify the research questions that have guided this study and the methods that will be used to answer those questions. The methods chapter describes how institutions were selected for this study and

provides a summary of each institution. Chapter three also explains how interviews were coded, addresses positionality, and describes potential limitations to this study.

In the fourth chapter, **Findings**, I present the data obtained through my research. Themes found to be common to many institutions are identified and explored in depth. The fifth and final chapter, **Conclusions & Implications**, summarizes the goals and design of this study. The fifth chapter also identifies how this study has filled a gap between research on entrepreneurialism and research on internationalization in higher education.

Significance of the Study

The U.S. higher education landscape is changing as universities increasingly engage in entrepreneurial behaviors (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Entrepreneurial behaviors are manifested through stronger connections between universities and the private marketplace, corporations playing a greater role in higher education, and the commercialization of the goods and services produced by universities (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). The increasing entrepreneurial ambitions of higher education institutions are changing the way in which they educate their students, produce knowledge, and serve their communities.

This research will advance our theoretical understanding of entrepreneurialism in international higher education. Altbach and Knight (2004; 2006) have identified entrepreneurialism's new role as a driver of international education but studies have not explained how that role is manifested in international offices. The research conducted in this study will move theory one step further by explaining *how* entrepreneurialism is emerging in international offices. It will explore how the activities and strategic choices of international offices are changing. This study will contribute to existing scholarship by clarifying what is

happening as entrepreneurialism intersects with internationalization. In addition, university administrators will be able to better understand the extent to which internationalization strategies and activities are changing due to entrepreneurial ambitions.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review begins by discussing the evolution of internationalization in higher education. Globalization has encouraged HEIs to internationalize. HEIs can internationalize by reaching abroad, for example through branch campuses abroad and recruiting students from overseas, or through changes made to their domestic campuses, for example internationalizing domestic curriculum or supporting domestic research on international topics.

Internationalization in higher education happens through a variety of activities such as study abroad programs, exchange programs, and English as a second language programs.

This literature review then explains how a confluence of environmental forces has pressured U.S. universities to engage in revenue generating activities. This literature review examines the evolution of entrepreneurial forces in higher education. Entrepreneurialism in higher education is being driven by society's growing expectations of HEIs and intensifying competition between institutions. In addition, decreasing state subsidies have caused HEIs to look elsewhere for revenue. Decreasing state support, growing expectations, and intensifying competition are resulting in HEIs' engagement in entrepreneurial behaviors such as the selling of the goods and services produced by HEIs, as well as charging corporations for access to their campuses.

Following the summary of literature on revenue generation in higher education is a review of existing research on entrepreneurialism in internationalization. Although few studies have looked at how internationalization and entrepreneurialism overlap, this subject is getting more attention from researchers. Existing literature almost exclusively focuses on international

students generating revenue for HEIs through tuition and stimulating national economies through their expenditures beyond tuition fees.

An understanding of internationalization and entrepreneurialism in higher education will bring context to the study of the effect of entrepreneurialism on internationalization.

Internationalization and entrepreneurialism have developed over time. The historical development of these forces has affected the behaviors and characteristics of today's HEIs. Thus, to understand the direction in which a confluence of these forces is moving, we must understand their trajectories.

This literature review concludes by explaining that entrepreneurialism is playing a role in internationalization, but how this is happening is unclear. Scholarship does not specifically explain how entrepreneurial ambitions have affected the internationalization of higher education. This gap in research is discussed and the literature review ends with a summary of the theoretical framework grounding this study.

Globalization and Higher Education

Malcolm Waters defines globalization as “A social process in which the constraints of geography on economic, political, social, and cultural arrangements recede, in which people become increasingly aware that they are receding and in which people act accordingly” (2001, p. 5). An important component of Waters' definition is that globalization is a social process. Politicians, business leaders, and voters in democratic societies have created the fertile economic and political structures that have allowed globalization to take root and grow. When applied to higher education, Waters' definition suggests that HEIs are increasingly connected to each other and the global higher education system, despite the “constraints of geography” (2001, p. 5).

Globalization has impacted higher education by encroaching upon the autonomous space that traditionally defined higher education's role in society (Scott, 2000). The historic design of higher education is being challenged in HEI's increasingly globalized environment. How knowledge is produced, how teaching is delivered, and the structures of universities are changing (Scott, 2000). While HEIs traditionally operated on a local level (Jencks & Riesman, 1977), we have seen their influence and scope grow to the regional, national, and global levels. For example, some universities now actively recruit international students. Other universities contribute to the development of national identities (Ordorika & Pusser, 2006). These roles go far beyond the traditional local focus of HEIs.

In acknowledgement of the changes facilitated by globalization, Marginson and Rhoades (2002) have suggested a new heuristic, called a Glonacal Agency Heuristic, to be used in the study of higher education. The term Glonacal accounts for the global, national, and local contexts in which HEIs operate. The term agency refers to both organized agencies that impact higher education and the agency of human action. Marginson and Rhoades argue that the global, national, and local forces affecting higher education overlap and interact. They do not exist in isolation and, thus, do not impact higher education in isolation. Rather, global, national, and local forces interact with and affect each other.

Although many universities consider themselves to be objects of globalization, it is important to understand that universities contribute to the quickening pace of globalization (OECD, 2009). The research and education produced by universities contribute to the development of a global environment (OECD, 2009). For example, the business leaders that expand the reach of multi-national corporations are trained in our higher education institutions. Nations and regions with higher university enrollments tend to show high global competitive

performance (Bloom, 2005, pp. 23-24). Higher education helps these nations and regions align with a global business environment. The relationship between higher education and globalization is therefore not unidirectional. Higher education affects globalization while globalization affects higher education.

Internationalization and higher education. The relationship between globalization and internationalization in higher education must be clarified to understand why internationalization takes place in many universities. While globalization is a social process in which the constraints of geography recede (as defined earlier), the internationalization of higher education is “the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension in to the purpose, functions, or delivery of post-secondary education” (Knight, 2003, p.2). Knight’s definition explains that internationalization does not simply happen to a campus. Rather, administrators and faculty actively internationalize through activities such as study abroad programs and international faculty exchange (Olcott, Jr., 2009). Mitchell and Nielsen (2012) provide a succinct summary of the difference between globalization and internationalization by explaining that “internationalization is seen as something higher education institutions do while globalization is something that is happening to them.” The internationalization of HEIs is driven by their increasingly globalized environments.

The following chart summarizes Waters’ (2001) distinguishing characteristics of globalization and internationalization.

<i>Table 1 – A comparison of globalization and internationalization</i>	
Globalization	Internationalization
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ignores existence of nations • Rooted in capitalism • Restless force ignoring past structures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assumes existence of nations • Rooted in diplomacy & culture • Tied to past hierarchies and structured

	relationships
--	---------------

Waters emphasizes that globalization ignores existing socio-political structures. Globalization creates its own structures based in capitalistic forces. Globalization does not develop according to the plans of social actors, but rather is shaped and driven by capitalism. Internationalization occurs through existing socio-political structures. Social actors consciously decide how internationalization happens. The term *internationalization* is based on the existence of nations while globalization ignores the existence of nations (Waters, 2001).

Altbach and Knight (2006) identify seven motivations and sources of higher education internationalization. The desire to realize *profits* serves as a motivation for HEIs to internationalize. Internationalization *provides access and absorbs demand* from students whose home countries cannot properly expand higher education capacity. *Traditional internationalization* strategies are evident in study abroad programs and the internationalization of curriculum. Traditional internationalization strategies are rarely profitable because they are designed to internationalize a campus, rather than to generate revenue. *European internationalism* is pursued to integrate the economic and political systems that exist within Europe. *Internationalization in developing countries* serves to generate income, improve the quality of students in HEIs, and to gain prestige. Altbach and Knight describe *individual internationalization* as the impact of students who decide to study in a foreign country. Tuition payments from students participating in individual internationalization are the largest source of financial impact in international education. Finally, *growth areas* motivate internationalization by creating opportunities for universities to expand their scope and influence. An example of a growth area resulting in internationalization is a branch campus in a country where higher

education supply cannot meet growing demand. Altbach and Knight explain that internationalization is driven by a variety of motivations.

Altbach and Knight identify the ability to generate profits as a source of motivation for higher education internationalization. Other researchers (Burgess and Berquist, 2012; Rumbley, Altbach, & Reisberg, 2012) have also found revenue generation to be an important driver of internationalization. Although Altbach and Knight describe six other sources of motivation, this study will focus on profits as an international education motivator. This research will examine how this motivation is creating change in the international strategies and activities of HEIs.

Internationalization strategies and activities. The internationalization of HEIs can happen through a variety of strategies and activities. International activities have not only grown over time (Olcott, 2009), but have also changed with time (Mazzarol, Soutar, & Seng, 2003). The rationales guiding strategic decisions to internationalize have changed with time too (Knight, 2004). This section will summarize HEIs' international activities, describe how international activities have evolved, and explore the rationales that guide the strategic development of internationalization.

Don Olcott, Jr. (2009) categorizes international activities in universities as either internal or external. The internal dimension of internationalization is based out of an institution's home campus. Examples of internal activities are study abroad programs, internationalizing the curriculum, internationalizing the focus of domestic research, international faculty exchange, and English as a second language programs. The external dimension represents engaging in international research, strategic partnerships, technology transfer, and the international extension of academic programs. External activities include the recruitment of international students,

international branding, branch campuses, overseas consultancies, student exchange, and international distance education.

The international activities described by Olcott have changed in scale over time. HEIs are participating in increasingly more international activities (Olcott, 2009) as they intensify their international engagement. U.S. higher education shows strong longitudinal growth in international student enrollments, study abroad participation, and international faculty recruitment (Bhandari & Chow, 2011). International student enrollments have increased 37% in the past ten years and the number of international scholars in the U.S. has increased by 61%. Study abroad participation has approximately doubled in ten years and is expected to continue to grow at a healthy pace due to initiatives such as the Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation Act. The Simon Act is now waiting to be passed by the U.S. Senate and is designed to encourage one million U.S. students to study abroad every year. 80 million dollars of federal money per year would be allocated to help achieve this goal (NAFSA, 2010). This data indicates that higher education in the United States is increasingly internationalizing through inbound and outbound mobility.

Internationalization activities have not only changed in scale, but have also changed in design. Following the Second World War, the first wave of wide-spread internationalization involved cross-border student mobility (Mazzarol, Soutar, & Seng, 2003). Students around the world left their home countries to go abroad and pursue higher education. Student mobility is still an important internationalization activity today, but has become just one form of internationalization. The second wave of internationalization emerged during the end of the 20th century. It involved institutions establishing a presence in foreign higher education markets (Mazzarol et al., 2003). For example, twinning programs, or formal partnerships between

institutions, allowed domestic HEIs to step into a foreign market through their partners, giving them a stable, long-term presence abroad. Previously, short-term activities allowed only a temporary presence in a foreign market, after which an HEI would leave the country. What the future will bring is unclear. A third wave of internationalization may be occurring through the growth of branch campuses and the international delivery of distance education (Mazzarol et al., 2003). The viability of branch campuses is unclear and many quality concerns surround the concept of international distance education (Hira, 2003; Olcott, 2009).

Knight (2004) explains that a recent shift in our understanding of internationalization has involved looking not beyond borders, but at our own campuses. Internationalization has evolved to include international activities in a domestic setting through, for example, adding a global dimension to campus curricula (Knight, 2004). Engagement with ethnic groups in the campus community is also part of what some campuses consider to be internationalization. Knight suggests that campuses can now internationalize without reaching beyond their national borders.

In addition to changing international activities, internationalization strategies are changing as well. George Keller (1983, p. 75) explains that strategy in higher education is based on a focus upon the aims, or goals, of behaviors of the institution. When applied to international higher education, Keller's explanation indicates that strategic internationalization is based on clarifying the goals driving international activities. In the past, rationales for internationalization traditionally emphasized what activities were going to be pursued (Knight, 2004). Rationales are now increasingly emphasizing why campuses are internationalizing (Knight, 2004), or the goals of internationalization. According to Keller, an emphasis on why campuses internationalize indicates a more strategic approach to the process.

Rationales for internationalization have traditionally been categorized into four groups: social/cultural, academic, political, and economic (de Wit, 1995; Knight & de Wit, 1997, 1999). Knight (2004) suggests that the fifth rationale of *branding* be added to de Wit's classification. HEIs are internationalizing in order to establish an international identity. A distinct international identity can help HEIs compete in an increasingly competitive international higher education market. Successful branding can attract high quality international faculty, high numbers of students from abroad, and can help HEIs succeed in the variety of projects that they pursue in other countries. An example of branding is the National University of Singapore's (NUS) aggressive marketing campaign in East Asia. Through this program, NUS has positioned itself as one of the premier higher education destinations for international students in Asia. Branding is part of what Knight suggests is a modern interpretation of de Wit's classifications. Knight argues that additional modern rationales for internationalization are HEIs' international profiles and reputations, student and staff development, income generation, strategic alliances, and research and knowledge production. Knight's new rationales for internationalization suggest that strategies are changing.

Changing strategies will fundamentally change the internationalization of higher education. This study seeks to understand how entrepreneurialism in higher education, discussed later in this literature review, is changing the strategies and activities discussed here. Knight has identified *income generation* as a modern rationale for internationalization. This study will examine how this rationale is affecting the internationalization behaviors discussed here.

International offices¹. International offices play important roles in developing international education in HEIs. International offices act as catalysts for campus internationalization (Knight & de Wit, 1995). They are also responsible for monitoring a campus' international activities in order to ensure quality and integrity (Knight & de Wit, 1995). While these roles are common among international offices on different campuses, many differences exist between institutions. Where international units exist within HEIs and how they fulfill their responsibilities vary according to the internal and external environments of higher education institutions (Knight & de Wit, 1995).

The history of international offices in U.S. higher education can be traced back to the early 20th century in the form of international student advisors. While international student advisors were originally faculty, administrators assigned exclusively to that role began to emerge, such as in Oberlin College in 1910 (Cornell Cosmopolitan Club, 1913). On-campus organizations tasked with advising international students grew throughout the 1910s and 1920s, but international student mobility to the U.S. slowed dramatically in the 1930s and 1940s due to the Great Depression and World War II (Glazier & Kenschaft, 2002).

A global market in international higher education began to develop following World War II (Mazzarol, Soutar, & Seng, 2003). The strong growth of international student mobility during the decades following the war represented the beginning of large-scale higher education internationalization (Mazzarol, Soutar, & Seng, 2003), with considerable growth in mobility happening during the 1960s and 1970s (Wit, 2002). This period saw the professionalization of

¹ This study uses the term "international office" to refer to the centralized office, department, or division on U.S. campuses responsible for an institution's international engagement. These offices have different names on different campuses such as International Affairs, International Education, Global Initiatives, and International Programs.

international education with the creation of the National Association of Foreign Student Advisors, or NAFSA, in 1948 (Glazier & Kenschaft, 2002). The postwar period also witnessed the growth of campus-based study abroad programs (Hoffa, 2000). On campus international offices began to administer study abroad programs and were responsible for facilitating students' study abroad experiences in addition to allowing these programs to be part of students' formal academic curricula (Hoffa, 2000).

The last quarter of the 20th century and the early 21st century continued the strong growth of U.S. higher education internationalization that began during the post-World War II period. Between the 1975/76 and the 2008/09 academic years, the U.S. international student population grew from 179,344 to 671,616 students (Bhandari & Chow, 2011). U.S. study abroad enrollments quadrupled between the 1987/88 academic year and the 2007/2008 academic year, with 262,416 students studying abroad in 2007/08 (Bhandari & Chow, 2011). U.S. higher education's increasing international engagement resulted in the growth of international offices. Some of the international activities of higher education institutions (HEIs) were centralized in these offices. International offices' responsibilities grew as their institutions' international activities continued to develop.

During the 1990s and 2000s, international offices began operating in a changing academic environment. The massification and diversification of higher education challenged HEIs to play greater roles in society (Clark, 1998). Public support for higher education was diminishing on a per student bases (Carbone & Winston, 2004). In addition, the U.S. higher education industry became more competitive (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). Universities reacted to these changes by aggressively pursuing alternative sources of revenue. International offices guide many of the international strategies and activities of HEIs. They are therefore an

appropriate source of information for this research. This study will collect its data from the international offices of public U.S. universities.

Entrepreneurialism in Higher Education

Universities are engaging in an unprecedented level of entrepreneurial activities. This portion of the literature review explains how universities are being pressured to maximize revenues. As revenue generating opportunities are found beyond public dollars, universities are engaging in market behaviors that have traditionally existed in the for-profit private sector (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). This section of the literature review describes the environmental forces pressuring HEIs to be entrepreneurial as well as how universities have reacted to this pressure.

Environmental pressures driving entrepreneurialism. Three environmental forces are pressuring HEIs to engage in entrepreneurial behaviors: increasing expectations of HEIs (Clark, 1998), competition in higher education (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997) and decreasing state support (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). Growing expectations of what universities should accomplish is pressuring universities to find ways to pay for meeting those expectations. Competition for funding and students is pressuring HEIs to develop the services that they offer, and thus the revenues available to pay for those services. Decreasing state support is pressuring HEIs to look for alternative sources of revenue.

Growing expectations. HEIs are increasingly expected to do more by society (Clark, 1998). The emergence of new disciplines² and the growth of knowledge in existing disciplines have challenged HEIs' teaching and research capacities (Clark, 1998). HEIs must find the

² For example, women's studies and comparative higher education.

resources necessary to teach new and emerging disciplines as well as to address the new knowledge developing within existing disciplines. HEIs are also challenged to serve a rapidly growing student population (Clark, 1998). The massification of higher education has created capacity problems for HEIs as more and more students enroll in higher education institutions.

HEIs are expected to meet these expectations. State governing boards have accountability structures in place to pressure them to do so (McLendon, Hearn, & Deaton, 2006). These boards set expectations for HEIs, such as graduation rates and faculty productivity. State boards hold HEIs accountable for meeting these expectations by tying state funding to their ability to meet stated goals. For example, the Arizona Board of Regents is expecting the University of Arizona to serve 10,000 additional students by the year 2020 (University Communications, 2009). Not meeting this expectation may result in a weakening of state funding for the University of Arizona. State governing boards pressure HEIs to meet expectations by tying inputs, state funding, to their ability to produce particular outputs, or results (McLendon, Hearn, & Deaton, 2006).

Society's growing expectations of the modern university, such as increasing capacity and disciplines taught, outpace the resources available to HEIs to meet those expectations. These expectations are too large and complex for HEIs to address through small, incremental changes (Clark, 1998). Many HEIs have chosen to fundamentally alter their behaviors by engaging in entrepreneurialism in order to find the resources necessary to meet society's expectations (Clark, 1998).

Competition between higher education institutions. Competition between HEIs is encouraged by the U.S. higher education system. The federal financial aid system and federal

patent/copyright policies are designed to create a competitive environment (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). The federal financial aid system does so by giving money directly to students rather than to institutions who would then distribute the aid as they choose. This federal policy gives students control over their funding rather than having institutions control the funding. Students have the funding necessary to pick the institution that they want to attend thus students are positioned as consumers for which institutions must compete (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Institutions compete by trying to provide what they think that students want, from state-of-the-art recreation centers to highly ranked academic departments.

National patent and copyright laws also encourage competition between institutions (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). For example, the Bayh-Dole Act of 1980 made it easier for knowledge generated by faculty research to become the intellectual property of a university (Slaughter & Rhoades, 1996). The Bayh-Dole Act allowed HEIs to patent the intellectual property developed by on-campus research, even if federal funds were used to pay for that research. HEIs were given the right to own and profit from the knowledge that they created, thus allowing intellectual property to generate revenue for an institution. This potential for revenue pressures institutions to compete for the talented faculty that will create profitable knowledge.

The development of national and international rankings has also intensified competition between universities (Ehrenberg, 2003). Rankings pressure universities to be “better” than their peers, as defined by the evaluating organization. Universities are positioned in direct competition with each other by rankings. For example, U.S. News & World Report’s rankings are based on faculty resources, financial resources, alumni giving, academic reputation, student selectivity, retention rates, and graduation rates (Ehrenberg, 2003). Moving up in the U.S. News & World Report evaluation can be done by tightening student selectivity or increasing faculty

resources, as compared to other institutions. These kinds of improvements only matter if they allow an institution to outrank their competitors, thus creating a competitive environment in higher education. Intensifying competition has pressured universities to find alternative sources of revenue in order to better compete with their peers (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997).

Decreasing state support. There are four ways to measure state support for higher education: state dollars allocated to higher education, state dollars allocated per student, the portion of state budgets going to higher education, and the portion of HEIs' expenditures that are paid for by state dollars. The measurement of state dollars spent on higher education per year indicates, with a few exceptions, that state support for higher education is increasing as total state dollars spent on higher education increase on a yearly basis (Carbone & Winston, 2004).

A second measurement of state support for higher education is state dollars allocated to HEIs per student. The state dollars per student measurement indicates that support is increasing if one uses the Consumer Price Index (CPI) (Carbone & Winston, 2004). The Consumer Price Index accounts for the increasing costs of goods and services over time due to inflation. Thus, state dollars per student are increasing at a faster rate than the increasing costs of goods and services in society. The state dollars per student measurement indicates decreasing state support if using the Higher Education Price Index (HEPI), an inflation adjuster specific to the unique costs of higher education (Carbone & Winston, 2004). State dollars are not keeping up with higher education costs, which are increasing at a faster rate than other goods and services in society.

The third measurement of state support for higher education is the portion of state budgets going to HEIs. This measurement indicates that state support for higher education is

decreasing (Roherty, 1997). Higher education funding is being squeezed out by the increasing financial burden of programs such as Medicaid. Medicaid surpassed higher education funding in 1990 and grew very quickly in the early 1990s as a portion of state budgets (Roherty, 1997).

The fourth measurement of state support calculates the portion of universities' expenditures that are paid for by state appropriations. State appropriations are paying for a continually smaller share of universities' total expenditures (Rizzo, 2004). The four measurements discussed here are summarized in the following table:

Measurement	Method	Results
1	Total state dollars spent	State support is increasing
2	State dollars spent per student	State support is increasing if using CPI, decreasing if using HEPI
3	Portion of state budget going to higher education	State support is decreasing
4	Portion of institutional expenditures paid for by state appropriations	State support is decreasing

Measurement 1 is incomplete because it does not account for inflation and growing enrollments in higher education. Measurement 2 indicates decreasing state support when accounting for the increasing costs of higher education. Measurements 3 and 4 indicate decreasing state support. Considering these measurements we can conclude that state support for higher education is decreasing. Decreasing state support pressures HEIs to find other sources of revenue (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997).

Growing expectations, increased competition, and decreasing state support have pressured HEIs to pursue alternative sources of revenue. Lately, international education has been identified as a potential source of revenue for HEIs (Williams & Kitaev, 2005; Altbach &

Knight, 2006). Revenue has traditionally been pursued through a variety of avenues outside of international education, as described in the following section.

Institutional engagement in entrepreneurial behaviors. A desire for alternative revenues has resulted in HEIs that increasingly engage in entrepreneurial behaviors. Entrepreneurial opportunities can be found in research produced for the private-sector (Ylijoki, 2003), competition for grant funding (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004), and in a variety of relationships with organizations outside of the institution (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). The following paragraphs describe how HEIs can one, sell the goods and services that they produce to those entities and two, give those entities access to campus.

Universities are engaging in entrepreneurialism by increasingly selling the goods and services that they produce (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Universities have traditionally produced goods and services of value to society, beyond their value to students of the institution. Universities are now recognizing and pursuing the revenue generating potential of selling these goods and services to society. For example, technologies developed in biosciences departments may be sold to private biosciences companies. This linkage results in HEIs increasingly producing knowledge that is of value to the private sector, because of their ability to realize that value through selling their products.

Businesses are now paying institutions for access to their campuses (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). There is value in the fact that universities control businesses' access to the thousands of students, or consumers, on their campuses. This value is realized in universities charging organizations for the right to market their products to students. For example, private study abroad providers may pay university study abroad offices for access to students. Private

study abroad providers may pay for the right to attend study abroad fairs, have study abroad offices advise on their programs, and participate in the development of new study abroad programs.

Entrepreneurial behaviors such as providing businesses with access to students and the sale of goods and services is being encouraged and rewarded in higher education. A department's ability to generate revenue directly impacts its perceived value to the university (Hackman, 1985). Departments that attract revenue through grants and contracts are allocated a greater portion of institutional resources (Volk, Slaughter, & Thomas, 2001). Thus, departments do not have total autonomy in deciding whether or not to engage in entrepreneurial behaviors. Rewards are in place to pressure them to do so. This is becoming more common in Student Affairs divisions in which budgetary pressures are increasingly leading staff to spend time on entrepreneurial activities (Ryan, 2003) rather than their traditional responsibilities of supporting students (Lee & Helm, in press). Student Affairs professionals are spending more effort on generating revenue through programming for their units and funding is increasingly tied to student enrollments in those programs. This is changing the nature of Student Affairs work and many young professionals feel that their Student Affairs degrees did not adequately prepare them for this part of their work (Lee & Helm, in press). The fact that this change is fairly recent may mean that Student Affairs curriculum has not yet caught up with entrepreneurial changes in the field. Selling goods and services and providing businesses with access to their campuses are only a few examples of the many ways that institutions can generate revenues. Developing research that meets private-sector needs and intensifying competition for grants are other ways in which HEIs engage in entrepreneurialism (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004; Ylijoki, 2003). A department's

revenue generating capacity effects how it is valued by its university's upper administrators (Hackman, 1985).

The 2008 economic crisis has pressured HEIs to become increasingly entrepreneurial. HEIs are now looking for sources of revenue beyond the traditional sources described here. International education has been identified as an additional source of revenue that could help HEIs weather the recession and its aftermath (Fischer, 2010). Prioritizing international education as a source of revenue will ultimately change the behaviors of international offices.

Internationalization and Entrepreneurialism

Entrepreneurialism is being encouraged in higher education by decreasing state support, competition between HEIs, and growing expectations of HEIs. At the same time, globalization is encouraging HEIs to internationalize. Although much research exists on the separate subjects of internationalization and entrepreneurialism, limited research has been done on how these subjects overlap. This dearth of research is concerning considering that the influence of entrepreneurialism on internationalization is growing as more projects abroad are motivated by profits (Scott, 1998; Knight, 2012). While internationalization has historically been driven by academic motivations, commercial motivations are becoming increasingly important (Knight, 2005). A shift in drivers of internationalization occurred during the 1990s as internationalization's ability to generate revenue for HEIs became increasingly important. In addition to revenue generation, internationalization's ability to impact economic factors such as brain gain and capacity building³ became increasingly important (Vincent-Lancrin, 2009). Internationalization's focus on revenue generation is manifested in international students paying

³ Capacity building in internationalization describes countries that send students to HEIs abroad due to an insufficient supply of domestic higher education.

full tuition fees abroad as well as the development of for-profit international education programs (Vincent-Lancrin, 2009). These two manifestations help us conceptualize international education, including its entrepreneurial side, by the activities of global mobility of students and the global mobility of programs⁴, with student mobility generating more revenue in internationalization than the mobility of academic programs (Vincent-Lancrin, 2009). The United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, New Zealand, Australia, Denmark, The Netherlands, Singapore, Malaysia, and Hong Kong have been the most active in pursuing revenue-generating internationalization (Vincent-Lancrin, 2009). The HEIs of these countries engage in international entrepreneurialism by setting tuition based on market rates, franchising their programs abroad, hosting international programs on their home campuses, and opening campuses abroad (Vincent-Lancrin, 2009). Although the English-speaking countries from this list have historically been successful at attracting international students to their campuses, they have recently lost student market-share compared to other OECD countries (Vincent-Lancrin, 2009).

The World Trade Organization's (WTO) regulation of international trade in higher education points towards the commercialization of internationalization. The WTO regulates higher education internationalization through GATS (the General Agreement on Trades in Services), an agreement created to eliminate trade barriers for services. All 145 of the WTO's member countries are regulated by the agreement. GATS aims to establish a level and fair playing field for the international higher education market by allowing countries to lodge complaints when they see foreign nations implementing barriers to the free trade of education services (Knight, 2003a). Those complaints are reviewed by the WTO and a decision is made

⁴ For example, study abroad or branch campuses.

regarding whether or not the offending country must change its practices. Examples of international education complaints lodged by the United States through GATS include eliminating requirements that (Knight, 2003a):

- Only non-citizens may be taught by foreign educational providers (lodged against Turkey and Italy).
- Only citizens may lead educational institutions (Taiwan).
- Foreign educational providers must partner with domestic universities (China).

Not all international education activities are covered by GATS. For example, the internationalization of domestic curriculum would not apply because it does not directly impact international trade. GATS does cover international delivery of education such as (Duke, 2002):

- Higher education services supplied internationally through, for example, distance education programs.
- Student mobility in which students study abroad for part or all of a degree.
- A foreign provider's commercial presence abroad, such as a branch campus.
- Higher education employees travelling abroad to do business, such as temporary teaching or research appointments overseas.

These activities provide some understanding of how commercial internationalization can be carried out. The fact that international education has attracted the attention of the World Trade Organization suggests that the field has substantial commercial implications.

This study's review of literature on entrepreneurialism and internationalization begins by examining existing research on international student recruitment; the most commonly cited entrepreneurial activity. Recruitment practices and impacts in different countries are discussed. This review then summarizes changes in the international student market, followed by a look at

the use of agents in this market, and then an examination of how international students impact national economies. This section concludes with a look at entrepreneurialism in international education beyond student recruitment and a summary of concerns surrounding the role of revenue-generation in internationalization.

International student recruitment. Research on internationalization and entrepreneurialism has focused on the idea that international student recruitment is driven in large part by a desire for revenue. This is the case in places such as the United States (Burn, 2002), the United Kingdom (Burn, 2002; Hawthorne, 2012), Canada (Burnett & Huisman, 2010), Australia (Burn, 2002; Welch, 2012; Walters & Adams, 2001), Finland (Cai & Kivisto, 2011), and the European Union (Hawthorne, 2012). Recruitment of high tuition paying students has been encouraged by cuts in public appropriations, especially since the 2008 financial crisis (Hawthorne, 2012).

The United States dominates the international student market and recruits over half of the students going to English-speaking countries (Asteris, 2006). In the 10 years between academic years 2001/02 and 2011/12, international student enrollments in the U.S. grew from 582,996 to 764,495 students (Chow & Bhandari, 2011). Many international students are drawn to the U.S. by the outstanding reputation of its higher education system. International rankings regularly fill their top-20 lists with U.S. universities. The Shanghai ranking, a well-known ranking of universities around the world, lists 17 U.S. universities in its top 20 (Shanghai Ranking Consultancy, 2011) Although the U.S. does not have a well-coordinated national strategy to attract international students, individual institutions and some states are driving forces in recruitment. The positive benefits of international enrollments has resulted in many U.S. states lifting their caps on the number of international students their universities can enroll (Hawthorne,

2012). While most countries charge higher tuition fees that apply specifically to international students, public U.S. universities charge fees that apply to all out-of-state students which include international students (Burn, 2002).

Britain accounts for approximately a quarter of the English-speaking market for international students and ranks behind the United States in attracting the 2nd largest number of international students (Asteris, 2006). The British government recently launched two successful recruitment drives; one in 1999 and the other in 2006 (Hawthorne, 2012). These initiatives made it easier for international students to study in the U.K. by allowing them to work part-time and allowing them to work in the U.K. on a temporary or permanent basis following graduation. International students reacted to these changes and enrollments in British HEIs increased quickly. Between 1995 and 2000, tuition collected from international students increased by 27.9% while total revenues to HEIs increased by only 8.6% (Marginson & van der Wende, 2009). Gross income in 2001-2002 from non-British and non-European higher education students exceeded 3.1 billion pounds (Johns, 2004). In 2003, one tenth of full-time undergraduates were international students and 38% of full-time postgraduates were international students (Bohm et al. 2004). The British Council believes that international student enrollments will continue to increase at a healthy pace through 2020 (Asteris, 2006). This forecast is challenged by factors that are challenging the traditional big players in international recruitment; discussed in detail later in this section.

A study of four undergraduate HEIs in Ontario, Canada found revenue generation to be one of the top two reasons for recruiting international students at three of the four institutions (Burnett & Huisman, 2010). Success in pursuing revenue through international student recruitment depended on the degree to which each HEI had already established an

entrepreneurial culture. Institutions with a strong entrepreneurial culture more quickly and comfortably jumped into international student recruitment and were better able to successfully recruit international students to their campuses. In addition, out of the four HEIs, those with more mature international programs were more successful in recruiting. This suggests the importance of establishing a framework of entrepreneurial culture and expertise in internationalization before recruiting abroad.

Entrepreneurialism has had an important impact on the internationalization of Australia higher education (Welch, 2012). As HEIs have become increasingly entrepreneurial, international student recruitment been identified as a source of revenue, thus changing the nature of internationalization in Australia (Welch, 2012). The Australian higher education system's active recruitment of international students led to impressive increases in international enrollments. Between 1980 and 2009, international enrollments in Australia grew by 2,216%. Enrollments in the United States, home to the largest population of international students, grew by only 122% during the same time period (Welch, 2012). In 2009 international student tuition accounted for 17.5% of revenues at Australian universities (Banks & Bhandari, 2012) while international students represent 25% of enrollments at many HEIs (Adams, 2007). In order to ensure that international students benefit from the fees that they are paying, the Australian government requires that some revenue from their tuition be used to provide services to international students. Once those requirements are met, surplus revenue can be used at the discretion of the institution (Adams, Leventhal, & Connelly, 2012). Freedom to use some revenue as desired is the incentive that encourages Australian HEIs to recruit abroad. HEIs are not the only entities contributing to successful recruitment. Rapidly growing enrollments can be attributed to the actions of HEIs, private companies, and the Australian government (Adams,

2007). HEIs have employed a large network of recruiting agents to attract both degree-seeking and short-term non-degree students to Australian institutions. English as a second language programs designed for international students spread quickly in Australia as private, for-profit, organizations recognized the profitability of the international student market. The Australian government has supported international recruitment through trade organizations that provide market advice and through Australian Education International, part of the Department of Education, which markets Australian higher education abroad. Substantial government involvement in branding and recruiting for Australian higher education has played a critical role in the rapid rise of international enrollments. Very few countries have experienced the degree of government involvement in international education found in Australia.

Despite these successes, Australian HEIs must remain vigilant if they are to continue to successfully recruit international students. Walters and Adams (2001) argued that continued success requires Australian universities to incorporate strategic operations management techniques to their international recruitment. Strategic operations management is characterized by quick responses to changing market conditions. In the context of international student recruitment that means providing to students, as cost-efficiently as possible, the best possible quality education. As the international student market changes, Australian HEIs will need to rapidly adapt their services to align themselves with student demands. Australian HEIs must deepen their adaptation of strategic operations management techniques if they are to continue to benefit from a dominant position in the international student market (Walters and Adams, 2001).

The phenomenal growth in Australian enrollments has led to some problems. Many HEIs closed due to issues related to quality control and admitting poorly qualified international students (Welch, 2012). Many of the “students” at these institutions were using their student

status as a way to enter Australia, with no plan to seriously pursue their degrees. These closures left stranded the international students that had been recruited to those HEIs and were in the process of pursuing degrees. In addition to these closures, the quality of Australian branch campuses abroad came under scrutiny as doubts were raised regarding whether or not the branch campus student experience was comparable to the student experience on the Australian campus (Welch, 2012). Students that enroll in a branch campus should be provided with the same quality education found at the home campus, which ultimately provides a branch campus with their reputation and name-recognition. Ultimately, Welch expressed concern that entrepreneurial internationalization may damage the quality and reputation of Australian higher education.

The Finnish government has implemented policies that introduce commercial characteristics to the internationalization of their universities. This was driven by the Finnish Ministry of Education's 2009 recommendation of exporting Finnish higher education (Cai & Kivisto, 2011). Although Finnish higher education has traditionally been free for students, new government policies allow HEIs to charge tuition to non-EU students (Cai & Kivisto, 2011). This is consistent with a 2011 European Union Association decision authorizing EU universities to charge non-EU students significantly more for tuition. The European Union Association had recognized the financial challenges facing European HEIs as subsidies decreased due to the contraction of national economies (Hawthorne, 2012). In contrast with Australia, a lack of experience in exporting higher education by the Finnish government and Finnish HEIs has made this a challenging process (Aarrevaara, Dobson, & Elander, 2009). The government must address this lack of experience by developing a framework for the export of higher education and supporting HEIs in marketing their services internationally (Cai & Kivisto, 2011). Future Learning Finland, a government body that manages the exportation of Finnish higher education,

was recently established by the Finnish government to do provide such coordination and guidance.

Changes in the international student market. Three developments threaten the dominance of traditional hosting nations such as the United Kingdom, the United States, and Australia. First, sending countries such as Hong Kong (China), Singapore, and Malaysia are expanding their higher education capacity (Asteris, 2006). Many of their students who have traditionally gone abroad to pursue higher education will soon have access to a greater number of high quality, domestic, HEIs. These students will have lost an important incentive to pursue their education abroad: a lack of suitable options at home. HEIs in many non-English speaking counties are emulating foreign universities by offering instruction in English and by utilizing curricular design and quality assurance procedures based on western models (Asteris, 2006). As the higher education systems of Hong Kong, Singapore, and Malaysia become more like those found in the U.K., U.S., and Australia, students will be more likely to stay in their home country to pursue degrees.

Secondly, non-western countries are beginning to actively recruit international students. These countries are enticed by the financial benefits, to both HEIs and national economies, that international student enrollments provide. The same countries that are increasing domestic capacity, Hong Kong (China), Singapore, and Malaysia, are attracting international students to their new institutions (Asteris, 2006). Singapore hopes to increase international student enrollments by 250% in 10 years (Harmon, 2006). As new competition enters the international student market, traditional western destinations will have more difficulty attracting students.

Finally, new technologies are threatening the dominance of traditional hosting nations. Private companies such as Person and Thompson and the Apollo Group are increasingly attracting students to their web-based programs (Asteris, 2006). These companies have the ability to reshape the international student market as students are able to access foreign education without leaving home. While these companies will undoubtedly impact the international student market, the degree of their impact is yet to be seen and will be affected by the fact that many students travel abroad not only for classes at a foreign university, but also to develop cultural competencies and language abilities. The United Kingdom is already acting to suppress this competition by strengthening the British higher education brand and by making traditional in-person higher education in Britain more attractive to foreign students by, for example, loosening rules regulating students' right to work (Asteris, 2006).

The use of agents in international student recruitment. Private agents are often used to recruit international students to campuses around the world. Agents represent HEIs by marketing and recruiting for them. 50% to 60% of international students worldwide are recruited by agents (Adams, Leventhal, & Connelly, 2012), who are typically paid by HEIs on a per-student commission basis. HEIs usually pay agents 10 to 15% of a student's first year tuition which ultimately accounts for approximately 4.1% of the tuition paid by international students (Adams, Leventhal, & Connelly, 2012). Agents offer HEIs an efficient and effective way to recruit international student in that agents have expertise and access to markets that individual universities may not have.

International students' impact on national economies. In addition to generating revenue for HEIs through tuition fees, international students have been show to impact local and national economies. This impact has been calculated in countries such as Australia (Welch, 2012) and

the United States (Chow & Bhandari, 2011), but acknowledged by other countries as well (Asteris, 2006). Not only do international students pay their host country for tuition and living expenses, visits from their families further contribute to host economies. International education is Australia's largest services export and third largest overall export. International higher education contributed \$10.8 billion to the Australian economy in 2010 (Adams, Leventhal, & Connelly, 2012). Tuition fees represented 48% of international students' total expenditures in Australia in 2008 (Vincent-Lancrin, 2009), with the remaining 52% going towards living expenses. The financial and economic impact of international students is even greater in the United States. In academic year 2010/11, international students contributed \$21 billion to the U.S. economy by paying education and living expenses (Chow & Bhandari, 2011). Of that total, Chinese students contributed \$4 billion, Indian students \$3.3 billion, and South Korean students \$2.2 billion (Bureau of Economic Analysis, 2012). International students not only have a positive financial impact on their HEIs, but on the economies of their host countries. International education organizations such as the U.S. Institute for International Education highlight this impact to promote state and national policies that encourage international students to enroll in U.S. HEIs.

Other entrepreneurial activities in internationalization. International student recruitment is the focus of existing literature on entrepreneurialism and internationalization. Other entrepreneurial activities are rarely mentioned. Hudzik and Stohl (2012, p. 73) briefly mention "contracts abroad on a cost plus or high overhead return basis" as an example of an international activity motivated by revenue. Hudzik and Stohl did not specify the nature of these contracts. Heyl and Tullbane (2012, p. 117) do not discuss specific activities but explain that new international activities, beyond student recruitment, must be shown by Senior International

Officers to be “at worst, revenue neutral”. Study abroad, traditionally not a revenue-generating activity, is expected to be increasingly entrepreneurial as, for example, HEIs charge students home tuition for programs abroad that cost significantly less (Burn, 2002). This practice has been controversial and prompted an alumnus to file a lawsuit against Wheaton College for charging approximately \$21,000 in Wheaton tuition, room, and board for a program that cost \$4,439 less. The emergence of pathways programs is briefly discussed by Adams, Leventhal, & Connelly (2012). Pathway programs allow students to begin their university education in their home country and then transfer to a host institution abroad, thus serving as an international student recruitment tool. Limited research has looked at branch campuses and their profitability. The growth in branch campuses abroad has been driven in part by opportunity for income and access to foreign markets (Becker, 2009; Garrett, 2004). The focus on the profitability of branch campuses has created tension with traditional academic values and standards (Shams & Huisman, 2012). Internationalization also allows for unique forms of fund raising. International alumni may want to endow funds to be used to support international students, international faculty, or to strengthen an international component of curricula (Taylor, 2004). Nurturing such alumni requires frequent travel overseas. HEIs may also be able to raise funds from corporations in foreign countries or from domestic companies that target foreign markets (Taylor, 2004). Having a physical presence abroad opens doors to funding opportunities that would be difficult to access from a home country. The literature cited here does explore entrepreneurial activities beyond student recruitment but on a very limited basis. Most of this literature addresses entrepreneurialism as one small part of a larger study.

Concerns. Concerns have been expressed regarding entrepreneurialism gaining influence in internationalization. A 2005 survey of HEIs in 95 countries conducted by the

International Association of Universities found that the commercialization and commodification of educational services is one of the major perceived risks associated with internationalization (Knight, 2007). The increasingly important role of generating profits may threaten the traditional academic values that used to drive internationalization (Green, Marmolejo, & Egron-Polak, 2012). Although certain courses of action may sometimes serve academic values and entrepreneurial desires, other actions may generate revenue at the expense of academic values. This concern parallels those surround the increasingly entrepreneurial behaviors of HEIs, beyond internationalization - that as HEIs prioritize revenue generation, traditional academic priorities lose influence in the decision making process (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004).

Opportunities for revenue through internationalization may also shift the missions of HEIs. While many HEIs were founded to serve their local or regional communities, financial incentives are encouraging them to look beyond their borders for students. This has happened, for example, at Oxford University where in 2005 Oxford reported that it would reduce admittance of British and EU students while increasing seats for international students (Marginson & van der Wende, 2009). International students pay more at Oxford than students from the EU. Oxford explained that this change was based on both financial incentives and creating a more multi-cultural campus environment. One must question if one of these explanations was the driving force behind changes in admittance practices, and if the other one was meant to make the change more palatable to the public. At Oxford and other HEIs in countries that attract many international students, domestic students, who often pay discounted tuition rates, may find themselves squeezed out by international students.

The shift towards entrepreneurialism in international education requires Senior International Officers with command of a different skill set. SIOs must be entrepreneurs and

able to effectively market their institutions abroad (Taylor, 2004). In addition, successful financial management is critical as generating profits becomes increasingly important in campus internationalization (Taylor, 2004). SIOs have historically moved from academia to university administration. Academics have very different skill sets than those needed to successfully generate revenue for an institution considering that for-profit projects abroad require a sound understanding of business principles such as financial management, strategic planning, and marketing. Although international education is experiencing a shift towards professional administrators with a student affairs background, business skills and degrees will become more valuable as HEIs look for SIOs that can successfully manage revenue-generating projects.

Finally, concerns have been raised regarding the quality of education services delivered internationally. National laws exist regulating the delivery of education in a domestic setting but few laws thoroughly address domestic providers delivering higher education abroad. At the same time, many foreign countries regulate the behaviors of their domestic HEIs but do not address the actions of a foreign higher education provider (Marginson & van der Wende, 2009). This raises concerns of quality. HEIs' foreign operations, such as branch campuses, are less accountable in delivering their services to students of the host country. Considering that an institution's reputation is usually based on its main campus, students may unknowingly enroll in a branch campus based on the reputation of the HEI's main campus, while the branch campus offers lower-quality services.

Summary

Globalization has challenged universities' traditional roles and operations. U.S. universities are no longer the local institutions that they were at their inception (Jencks &

Riesman, 1977). They now operate in the glonacal context identified by Marginson and Rhoades (2002). The global component of the glonacal context has pressured universities to internationalize. Internationalization can be achieved through many activities such as study abroad, international student recruitment, internationalization of curriculum, branch campuses, and international distance education. Strategic internationalization has evolved as HEIs clarify their rationales for engaging in entrepreneurial activities.

Internationalization is occurring while HEIs are under increasing pressure to engage in entrepreneurial behaviors. Society's growing expectations of HEIs is pressuring them to find revenues that will help meet those expectations. Intensifying competition in higher education is pressuring HEIs to maximize the resources available to them in order to successfully compete. Decreasing state support for higher education is motivating HEIs to find alternative sources of funding. Entrepreneurialism is found in HEIs' research activity, competition for grant funding, and in relationships with organizations outside of the university.

Internationalization and entrepreneurialism are intersecting in the international offices of higher education institutions. Studies have shown that internationalization is in part motivated by entrepreneurialism (Williams & Kitaev, 2005; Altbach & Knight, 2006), but have left many questions unanswered (Knight, 2004). While studies indicate that this intersection exists, they have not explained what happens at this intersection. There is no clear understanding of how entrepreneurialism is affecting the strategies and activities of international offices. Studies have not explained how international offices are changing in light of entrepreneurialism's increasingly important role in higher education.

Analytical Frameworks

This study is rooted in established scholarship in the discipline of higher education. Two theories ground how this theory will seek to understand the intersection of entrepreneurialism and internationalization. The theories of academic capitalism and neo-institutionalism frame this study and are the lenses through which this research is conducted.

Academic capitalism. Academic capitalism has primarily been developed by Larry Leslie, Gary Rhoades, and Sheila Slaughter. It explores the marketization of higher education in the late 20th century and early 21st century. This marketization is manifested in higher education institutions through increased connections to external resources, the commoditization of goods and services, and private-sector influences on campus (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). As public funding for higher education decreases, institutional behaviors are being guided by economic rationales (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). Institutional research is also being affected as research increasingly responds to private-sector needs (Ylijoki, 2003). Slaughter and Rhoades explain that these changes do not point to the privatization of higher education. Rather, the public space in which universities operate is being redefined, in addition to what is appropriate behavior within that space. This study will view the increased entrepreneurial ambitions of international offices through the lens of academic capitalism. Academic capitalism explains that campus entities, such as international offices, are under pressure to find alternative revenues to that of state subsidies. International offices are not independent of the entrepreneurial forces shaping their institutions. Entrepreneurial actions in international education are driven by an environment of academic capitalism. Academic capitalism contextualizes the entrepreneurial behaviors that this study seeks to understand.

Neo-institutional theory. Neo-institutional theory explains the relationship between the internal operations of organizations and their external environment (Tolbert, 1985). Neo-institutionalism developed out of DiMaggio and Powell's (1983) work on institutional isomorphism. According to DiMaggio and Powell three types of isomorphic pressures in organizations' external environments pressure institutions to become similar. Coercive isomorphism is change resulting from political influence. Mimetic isomorphism is change resulting from organizations' similar responses to uncertainty. Finally, normative isomorphism is commonalities between organizations resulting from the professionalization of a field, such as higher education management. Neo-institutional theory is further described by the concepts of normative institutionalism and rational choice institutionalism. Normative institutionalism explains that the choices of organizational actors are guided by the norms present in an institution's environment (Tolbert, 1985). Those norms exist due to the pressures present in an organization's external environment, as described by DiMaggio and Powell. Rational choice institutionalism explains that individuals attempt to realize their goals in the context of the limited rational choices available in an organization (Trondal, 2002). Neo-institutional theory is the second lens through which this study will examine international offices' entrepreneurial behaviors. Neo-institutionalism explains that universities internationalize in the context of isomorphism, normative environments, and rational choice environments. The choices made by international offices are not independent of their external environment. Rather, neo-institutional theory explains that choices are strongly dependent upon an organization's environment. Neo-institutionalism grounds this study in the belief that international offices' decisions to engage in particular activities are framed by complex interactions with their environments, both within the university and beyond the university. Neo-institutionalism brings to this study the idea that

international offices do not operate in a vacuum. Rather, international offices exist in a complex and dynamic relationship with their environment. This study acknowledges the effects of this environment by exploring the context in which international offices operate.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this research was to examine how entrepreneurialism is influencing the strategies and activities of international offices at public U.S. universities. This research explored how funding changes are impacting these offices. The changing behaviors of international offices are considered in the context of pressures to engage in entrepreneurial behaviors. This study advances the field of higher education's theoretical understanding of entrepreneurialism in higher education and gives practitioners in international offices a clearer picture of how the internationalization of HEIs is changing due to entrepreneurial ambitions.

In this Methodology chapter, I present my research questions, review my research design including why a qualitative approach was chosen, explain my site and sample, and show how my data was collected, coded, and analyzed. This chapter ends with my positionality in relation to this research, the limitations constraining this study, and a brief summary of a pilot study conducted while planning my research.

Research Questions

The guiding research question of this study is “How is entrepreneurialism influencing the strategies and activities of international offices in public U.S. universities?” Strategic activities in higher education internationalization are the “planned, integrated, and strategic” (Knight, 2004, p. 13) use of international activities. Examples of international activities are study abroad, institutional relationships, and branch campuses (Knight, 2004, p. 20). Four additional sub-questions explore the guiding research question:

- What forces are encouraging international offices to be entrepreneurial?
- How are the activities managed by international offices changing?

- How are the strategies of international offices changing?
- How are international offices balancing their educational and entrepreneurial goals?

The question of “What forces are encouraging international offices to be entrepreneurial?” investigates drivers of entrepreneurialism. The question of “How are the activities managed by international offices changing?” provides an understanding of how international offices are engaging in entrepreneurial activities. The third question; “How are the strategies of international offices changing?” explores how international offices are choosing to participate in particular activities.

The final sub-question of “How are international offices balancing their educational and entrepreneurial goals?” addresses the tension that may exist between entrepreneurialism and education-based missions. This question is based on research on entrepreneurialism that has found academic capitalism to be displacing the traditional academic values that guided institutional decision making (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). For example, by being entrepreneurial and increasing user fees, lower income students lose access to some educational services and are therefore disadvantaged. While tension between entrepreneurialism and educational values has been shown to exist at the institutional level, my fourth question will explore whether or not this is happening at the unit level within HEIs.

Research Design

This was an exploratory study of social processes. The pressures that shape international offices are applied through social networks. The behaviors of international offices are determined by their SIOs and are influenced by SIOs’ interactions with their supervisors and other members of a campus community. Qualitative methods are appropriate when examining

social processes (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 2). This study's exploration of these social processes and their influence on international strategies and activities was therefore rooted in the qualitative tradition.

Site and Sample. Thirty senior international officers were interviewed between March 30, 2011 and December 16, 2011. The term "Senior International Officer" represents the administrator that is ultimately responsible for the internationalization of a university. Different institutions assign different titles to the role of SIO. SIOs may be vice-provosts, vice-presidents, executive directors, directors, or deans. Senior international officers were interviewed because they are responsible for managing international offices as well as for the overall strategic development of internationalization on a college campus. They have the greatest influence on the behaviors of international offices. SIOs are therefore the administrators that are best able to provide information that will answer this study's research questions. Initial contact with SIOs was made through my professional network. Interviewees were also asked to recommend HEIs that are especially entrepreneurial abroad. SIOs for those institutions were emailed and asked if they were willing to be interviewed.

A sample was obtained through a combination of typical case sampling and intensity sampling. Typical case sampling is designed to create a sample that represents average members of the population being studied (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 71). Typical case sampling was used to understand how entrepreneurialism is emerging in the average public U.S. university. The reputation of international offices in the international education field determined if the institution is a typical case or not.

Intensity sampling is designed to create a sample that represents the phenomenon being studied (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). This method was used to find international offices that are actively engaging in entrepreneurial activities. These international offices were identified through conference presentations and through their reputation among international education administrators. Through a typical and intense sample, this study explored entrepreneurialism at an average international office while also ensuring that some data collected represented international offices that are actively engaging in entrepreneurialism. The use of typical and intense sampling is important because it is unclear how much the average international office pursues entrepreneurial activities. Intensity sampling ensured that this study's sample included international offices with strong entrepreneurial ambitions.

From March 30 to April 1 four interviews were conducted in person at the Universities Study Abroad Consortium Board Meeting, in the lobby of the Doubletree Hotel in Washington D.C. Three in-person interviews were conducted at the National NAFSA Conference in Vancouver, Canada from May 29 to June 3. The following 23 interviews were conducted over the phone. Although in-person interviews were arranged when possible, the fact that interviewees were located all over the United States made phone interviews necessary in the interview process.

The region of the United States in which each interviewee's institution is located is identified in the chart below. The west region includes WA, OR, CA, ID, MT, WY, NV, UT, and CO. Southwest represents AZ and NM. Midwest is composed of ND, SD, NE, KS, MN, IA, MO, IL, WI, IN, MI, and OH. South includes TX, OK, AR, and LA. Northeast represents ME, VT, NH, MA, RI, CT, NY, PA, and NJ. Finally, Southeast includes DE, MD, DC, WV, VA,

KY, TN, NC, SC, MS, AL, GA, SC, and FL. These regional identifiers are based on the geographic divisions used by the U.S. Census Bureau.

In addition to region, the size of each institution is noted. Large HEIs enroll 35,000 students or more. HEIs with between 27,000 and 34,999 students are medium/large. Medium institutions host 14,000 to 26,999 students. Institutions with between 7,000 and 13,999 students are considered to be medium/small. Small HEIs enroll fewer than 7,000 students.

In order to keep the identity of interviewees and their institutions private, a coding system is used in which each HEI and interviewee is identified by a number. Interviewees are addressed as SIO (Senior International Officer) followed by the number assigned to their institution. International offices are addressed as IO and their corresponding number. The term “office” is used in this study to represent the division, department, center, or office on campus that is responsible for campus internationalization. Similarly, institutions will be addressed as HEI followed by a number.

HEI	Region	Size	International Students	Education Abroad Students
1	Southwest	Large	13,300	1,387
2	West	Medium	196	145
3	Southeast	Medium	954	1,009
4	Northeast	Small	36	331
5	Southeast	Medium/Small	80	172
6	Southeast	Small	130	239
7	Southeast	Medium	184	1,030
8	Midwest	Large	4,509	2,589
9	Midwest	Medium/Small	630	75
10	Southeast	Medium	238	415
11	Southeast	Medium/Small	591	330
12	Southeast	Small	55	165
13	Southwest	Medium	926	409

14	South	Medium	1,821	576
15	Northeast	Medium/Small	53	537
16	Northeast	Medium/Large	4,911	550
17	Northeast	Small	158	489
18	Southwest	Large	2,664	2,064
19	Southeast	Large	3,088	2,025
20	Midwest	Large	4,714	1,939
21	Southeast	Medium	1,304	637
22	Northeast	Medium	564	144
23	West	Medium/Large	1,145	447
24	South	Medium/Small	800	480
25	Southeast	Medium	844	65
26	West	Medium/Large	1,411	684
27	Southeast	Medium/Small	115	172
28	Northeast	Medium/Small	136	200
29	Southeast	Medium/Small	112	187
30	Southeast	Small	120	175

This study's sample included webpages and documents of the international offices in which these SIOs work. Webpages and documents provided information that allowed this study to triangulate some of the data provided in interviews and generated additional data.

Triangulation strengthened this study's ability to generalize its findings to HEIs beyond those in the sample (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 202). Examples of documents that were examined are annual reports, strategic plans, publically reported data, organizational charts and marketing materials.

Data Collection. In-depth semi-structured interviews were conducted to collect data⁵. Semi-structured interviews allowed the interviewees to express and frame their answers through an emic perspective, or as the interviewee chooses (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 101). This methodology was used to avoid the etic perspective in which the interviewer's point of view

⁵ See appendix for interview questions.

frames the subject of study (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). Interviews were recorded and transcribed and lasted, on average, about 30 minutes. Interviewees were asked to provide annual reports, strategic plans, organizational charts and marketing materials for their organizations if those documents are not available on their websites. The Institute for International Education's *Open Doors Report* was used to collect publically reported data on universities' international engagement. The annual Open Doors Report provides a summary of international activities at U.S. colleges and universities, as well as national trends and statistics.

Data Analysis. Editing analysis was applied to the transcribed interviews. Editing analysis allows categories of meaning to emerge from the data collected during interviews, rather than applying pre-determined categories to data (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). Interview data was categorized and coded according to the themes identified in interviewees' responses.

The webpages and documents of the international offices directed by those interviewed were analyzed through content analysis and rhetorical analysis. Content analysis is a tool designed to understand and interpret the population being studied (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). An understanding is gained by studying the artifacts of a society, such as webpages and documents. In this study, content analysis was used to clarify how entrepreneurialism is influencing the behaviors of international offices. Content analysis of webpages and marketing materials shed light on the activities that international offices engage in. Open Doors data helps explain the degree to which some activities are pursued. An analysis of strategic plans clarified international offices' strategies.

This study used rhetorical analysis to examine the word choice and images in those documents. Rhetorical analysis allows research to understand how and why an author is

delivering their message in a particular style (Krippendorff, 2004). This study considered what the writer's motivation may have been in using particular phrasing and images. The rhetoric used in publically available documents, including webpages, was analyzed to understand how international offices want the public to perceive them. This analysis explored if messages in international offices' documents are expressed in a particular way. Considering that some international offices must balance entrepreneurial and education based missions (Altbach & Knight, 2006), rhetorical analysis is important. This type of analysis is important in that it helped this study distinguish between international offices' private goals and the public images that they may be trying to project.

Data obtained through interviews, webpage analysis, and document analysis was compared and contrasted. Common themes were identified and explored. Data was triangulated, further clarifying how entrepreneurialism is emerging in international offices.

Codes. The primary codes of activities, strategies, guiding forces, funding, and entrepreneurialism were used to organize the information obtained in interviews. Additional sub-codes were used to further organize primary codes and to better address this study's research questions. All codes used emerged during repeated reviews of transcriptions and were not pre-determined. Transcriptions were carefully read until categories of meaning were found in the interviews, at which time codes were created and applied. Categories of meaning were sought out that addressed the research questions of this study. A full list of codes and sub-codes can be found in the appendix. The primary research question of "How is entrepreneurialism influencing the strategies and activities of international offices in public U.S. universities?" was addressed through the codes of *Activities, Strategies, Guiding Forces, Funding, and Education vs. Entrepreneurialism*. The sub-question "How is the funding of international offices changing?"

was addressed through the *Funding* and *Guiding Forces* codes. The *activities* code addressed the sub-question of “How are the activities managed by international offices changing?” The code of *strategies* addressed “How are the strategies of international offices changing?” Finally, “How are international offices prioritizing the activities that they engage in?” was addressed by the *Guiding Forces* and *Funding* codes.

Analytical Frameworks

The two analytical frameworks of academic capitalism and neo-institutional theory were used to contextualize my findings. The impact of each on the analysis of my results is described in the following sections.

Utilizing the framework of academic capitalism. Academic capitalism explores the marketization of higher education. This framework suggests that HEIs are becoming increasingly entrepreneurial and that this shift is weakening the traditional academic priorities of institutions. I utilize the theoretical framework of academic capitalism to contextualize my research. Entrepreneurialism in international education is happening in the broader context of a search for revenue across a university’s activities. Senior international officers have not by themselves decided that their units need to engage in revenue-generating activities. Rather, SIOs are operating in the broad entrepreneurial environment described by academic capitalism. Academic capitalism suggests that HEIs will exert pressure on their international offices to find opportunities for revenue. Academic capitalism also suggests that as international offices become more entrepreneurial, their educational motivations may be replaced with entrepreneurial motivations. The findings put forth by academic capitalism encouraged this study to explore how SIOs balance entrepreneurial and educational priorities. SIOs were asked

if they consider these two influences to be compatible, and if not, how they balance the two.

This study also considered the forces that encourage universities to maximize revenues. Factors beyond international offices that result in entrepreneurialism were explored. These components of this study utilize academic capitalism to bring context to the entrepreneurial behaviors of international offices

Utilizing the framework of neo-institutional theory. Neo-institutional theory frames the relationship between the internal operations of organizations and their external environment. The theory suggests that organizations operating in the same space, over time, become similar to each other. This happens for three reasons: one, a shared political environment guiding these organizations; two, organizations respond in similar ways to uncertainty; three, the professionalization of a field develops similarities in the organizations in that field. All three facets of this theory apply to this study.

The common political environment in which HEIs operate has reduced financial support for higher education. State governments have decreased funding for HEIs, especially following the 2009 recession. As HEIs across the United States receive less state support, they have reacted in the same way – by relying on alternative sources of revenue. Internationalization is one potential source of revenue.

Public subsidies have historically been a stable and predictable funding mechanism for universities. As subsidies decrease on a per student basis, HEIs increasingly rely on less stable alternative sources of revenue, thus increasing elements of uncertainty in their funding. For example, tuition-based funding is reliant on enrollments, an often volatile variable that is difficult to forecast.

The field of international education has become increasingly professionalized over the past two decades. Professional organizations such as NAFSA and the Forum for Education Abroad have seen their memberships increase quickly. Ethical and practical guidelines now exist to support the development of international offices. Part of this professionalization involves dialogue on revenue-generating activities. Professional organizations discuss these activities through webinars, publications, and conference sessions. International offices tune in to the same presentations and are therefore encouraged to adapt similar practices. This results in a more crowded market as HEIs pursue the same opportunities and reduces the potential benefits of a particular activity to individual institutions. Growing similarities between HEIs stifles innovation in revenue-generating international programming.

Neo-institutional theory guided this research by suggesting that commonalities would exist in data collected based on a shared political environment, similar reactions to uncertainty, and the professionalization of international education. Acknowledging an operating environment's ability to shape behaviors increases the likelihood that commonalities are based on a shared operating environment rather than chance. This study therefore paid close attention to the environmental influences that impact the strategies and activities of international offices.

Limitations

Limitations to this study include perceptions of entrepreneurialism in education, an examination of internationalization only from the point of view of the international office, questions of validity, ethical considerations, and my positionality.

This study was limited by the perceived incompatibility of education and entrepreneurialism. Some educators believe that market forces do not belong in higher

education, or that their impact should be strongly limited. Thus, the data gathered by this study may have been influenced by personal opinions. Senior International Officers may not have been comfortable explaining that their actions are motivated in part by entrepreneurialism. Therefore, interviews and document analysis may have yielded data that under-emphasizes international offices' entrepreneurial ambitions. I addressed this limitation by assuring all interviewees that their answers would not be used beyond the scope of this study without their permission. An informed consent form was presented to all interviewees in which measures taken to ensure confidentiality are explained. The coding system described earlier will keep the public from identifying particular institutions. This limitation was also addressed by the use of rhetorical analysis. Rhetorical analysis considers why a message is being framed in a particular way.

A second limitation to this study involves the scope of data collected. Data on internationalization was only collected from international offices even though campus internationalization also happens elsewhere in universities. Research collaboration across borders often occurs without the involvement of international offices. The recruitment of graduate students sometimes happens through the international connections of faculty. Even projects that do involve an international office may be instigated and driven by academic departments.

In addition to not being involved in all internationalization activities, international offices bring a unique perspective to internationalization that is sometimes not shared by other campus units. For example, being ultimately responsible, and held accountable, for a campus' internationalization activities could cause some international offices to be more conservative than other units. International offices may therefore approach internationalization differently,

and thus data collected in this study represents most, but not all, campus internationalization strategies and activities.

Validity

In addition to answering the research questions of this study, triangulation helped ensure validity. Multiple data sources strengthen the validity of a study's results (Creswell, 2003, p. 196; Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 202). Similarities and differences between interview responses, webpages, and documents were identified and explored. In addition to triangulation, validity is strengthened by having a researcher communicate their personal biases to their audience (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 202). Personal biases that may have affected this study are identified and discussed in the upcoming positionality section.

Ethical considerations

Because I conducted interviews, federal law required that I submit my interview protocol and research design to the Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB granted me approval to conduct my research. An IRB review helped assure that my interview protocols and recruitment methods posed minimum risk to the interviewees that chose to participate in this study.

Positionality

I bring an uncommon perspective to the study of higher education. My bachelor's degree is in business management. My undergraduate studies taught me the benefits of capitalism and that market forces are the most efficient way to provide goods and services to societies. Business theory explains that most of the time, society is better served by having governments stay out of the production and consumption of goods and services. Though, economics courses

do acknowledge that some external factors beyond market forces should influence markets for goods and services. A government should regulate some markets when external factors result in unfettered capitalism creating a suboptimal balance of supply and demand. For example, unregulated markets may result in the consumption of large quantities of gasoline by vehicles. The environmental effect of gasoline use is not in society's best interest and therefore the impact of carbon dioxide emissions is an externality, or something that should, but is not, taken into account in the unregulated pricing of a good or service. The government may choose to address this externality by raising the price of gasoline through taxes in order to increase prices and lower demand. The consumption of gasoline would then be reduced to a level that is better for society, despite higher prices at the pump. The concept of externalities is import to apply to the study of higher education.

My graduate studies at the University of Arizona's Center for the Study of Higher Education have, in part, explained the negative impact of market forces in education. Market forces can cause the cost of higher education to skyrocket; putting higher education out of reach of low-income students. Considering higher education's important role in social equity and economic development, the government should play a role in keeping the cost of education low. Higher education's influence on the externalities of social equity and economic development must be considered when HEIs engage in entrepreneurial behaviors that may increase the cost of education to students.

I do not see my undergraduate and graduate educations as contradictory. Rather, they have led me to a middle-ground. I bring to my research the belief that well-regulated capitalism allows for rapid economic development and social equity. Market forces can benefit higher education systems, individual institutions, and students. I also believe that, due to social equity

concerns and public good arguments, market forces must be tailored to the unique context of education. My positionality will be mitigated by the use of semi-structured interviews, an emic data collection method. An emic perspective will allow interview answers to be framed by the interviewee rather than by myself (Marshall & Rossman, 2006).

Pilot Study

A pilot study using this study's interview protocol was conducted on April 26 and 27, 2010. I interviewed three employees in the international affairs division of a public U.S. research university: the Assistant Director in the Office of Study Abroad and Student Exchange, the Director of the Office of Study Abroad and Student Exchange, and the Assistant Director for the Office of the Executive Director, International Affairs. These interviews provided feedback that resulted in several changes to the interview protocol. One change necessary was the clarification of the term "activities" in an international office. Some interviewees interpreted the term "activities" as the day-to-day responsibilities of staff while others understood "activities" to be the general programs administered by the office. This study is more interested in the latter. The pilot study also showed that an exclusive focus on entrepreneurialism did not present a clear picture of entrepreneurialism's role in international offices. A question was added to the interview protocol to identify entrepreneurialism's role in relation to education-based missions. By understanding SIOs educational goals, I am able to establish a context in which to study entrepreneurial behaviors.

The pilot study found that entrepreneurialism is influencing the strategies and activities of the public U.S. university. Despite already low levels of public funding for this Division of International Affairs, it may be reduced in the near future. International Affairs has been

engaging in entrepreneurial activities and is strategically expanding those activities in preparation for potential funding cuts.

Three priorities guide the behaviors of International Affairs. One, International Affairs prioritizes its strategies and activities according to the needs of the greater campus community. Two, International Affairs is committed to providing high quality education-based services. Three, it is important for International Affairs to find ways to pay for those services. These priorities have impacted past activities and are playing an important role in the development of new internationalization models for the university. Innovative models being developed are cohort study abroad programs, short-term visiting student programs, and international distance education. Cohort programs are study abroad programs designed to strategically build capacity in a department. A department may only be able to admit a certain number of students per term due to funding and staffing constraints. These constraints are alleviated by sending a cohort of students abroad. While abroad, students earn credits that count towards that department's degrees but the department does not have to pay for the delivery of those credits. Departments can essentially expand their capacity by having students earn credits abroad. Visiting student programs are non-exchange short-term inbound programs for international students. Visiting students or their sending institution pay a fee for their students to take a couple of courses which count towards the students' home degrees. This can be conceptualized as reverse study abroad. Visiting student programs have been implemented for U.S. students abroad for a long time but are rarely offered by U.S. institutions to international students. International distance education allows online classes to be delivered abroad. These three developing models may change how internationalization occurs at the university examined in the pilot study.

By studying a variety of public U.S. universities, this research will clarify how entrepreneurialism is changing internationalization on a larger scale. The changing strategies and activities of international offices will have long-term implications on the internationalization of higher education.

CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

This study seeks to answer the primary research question, “How is entrepreneurialism influencing the strategies and activities of international student offices in U.S. public universities?” This research also addresses four secondary questions:

- What forces are encouraging international offices to be entrepreneurial?
- How are the activities managed by international offices changing?
- How are the strategies of international offices changing?
- How are international offices balancing their educational and entrepreneurial goals?

To answer these questions, I first describe the underlying forces that are motivating international offices to engage in entrepreneurialism, then explore how entrepreneurial pressures are changing the activities that international offices oversee. With this foundation in place, I identify and discuss two major new strategies that international student programs are adopting as a result of these changes. I close with an examination of interviewees’ views on balancing entrepreneurial and educational priorities in their offices.

Forces Encouraging Entrepreneurialism

An understanding of the forces that guide the behaviors of international offices can clarify what motivates them to engage in entrepreneurialism. Three primary forces are driving this transition: expectations of upper administrators, growing student demand for international services, and changing funding models.

Expectations of upper administrators. The administrators who oversee international student programs mandate that they emphasize particular activities. Administrators' predominant interest is recruitment of international students who pay higher out-of-state tuition rates and

bring revenue to the university. The interviews I conducted reveal that administrators at higher education institutions (HEIs) 1, 4, 5, 7, 9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 27, and 29 all encourage their senior international officers (SIOs) to recruit students abroad. For example, whereas SIO 1 values the presence of international students on campus for educational reasons, she explains that for her central administration “the primary incentive appears to be financial.” The leadership of both HEIs 5 and 15 likewise support the presence of international student on campus for educational reasons, but their primary interest is financial. The president of HEI 9 regularly asks SIO 9 about his international student recruitment numbers. SIO 9 stated “there is this recognition that international students are an important component to our ... I don’t want to say financial survival ... but in a way they are.” According to SIO 13 “the need to attract more international students who are fee paying constitutes an expectation that has been articulated quite clearly by the senior administration here.”

The degree to which expectations of upper administrators encourage international entrepreneurialism is affected by the budgetary health of their universities. Universities facing severe cuts in public funding since the 2009 recession, such as HEIs 1, 13, and 18, may feel a greater need to generate revenue through international activities. Upper administrators at each of HEIs 1, 13, and 18 have articulated a need for more international students. If public funding for universities were to return to pre-recession levels, international offices may feel less pressure to recruit abroad; though it is more likely that universities will continue to feel a fiscal squeeze as higher education is increasingly viewed as a private good and state higher education funding gets squeezed out by other budgetary commitments. HEIs will therefore continue to look for alternative sources of revenue, such as out-of-state tuition paid by international students.

SIOs, on the other hand, tend to focus on the educational benefits of having international students on campus. SIO 1 explained that “we are never going to get a really high percentage of students to study abroad.” Those students that do not study abroad can, according to SIO 1, still be exposed to an international experience through HEI 1’s international student population. SIO 16 noted “diversity in our enrollments” as a reason for recruiting abroad. The importance of a diverse student body was also cited by SIO 19 as a reason to enroll more international students. SIO 21 noted out-of-state tuition as the second reason to bring international students to campus. Her primary reason for recruiting internationally was “to create more global conversations in our classrooms.”

Hence top university administrators and SIOs share a goal of attracting more international students to campus, albeit for different reasons. Administrators’ primary interest is the revenue generation potential of international students, whereas international student offices focus their attention on creating a more diverse and richer academic environment. This coincidence of objectives is advantageous to SIOs, who can pursue their office’s goals while simultaneously meeting the expectations of campus leadership.

University leaders also increasingly understand that international offices are capable of generating their own revenue. With this realization comes changing expectations. Upper administrators are expecting international offices to engage in the behaviors necessary to cover a portion of their operating expenses. This suggests that university leaders see international education as a value-added service, and not a fundamental educational service provided by the institution. International education does not fall under the basic education covered by tuition. This view differs from, for example, tutoring services which could be offered on a fee-for-

service basis but is typically free to students. SIOs may therefore have limited choice in deciding whether or not to charge user fees as pressure is applied from their supervisors.

Growing student demand for international services. Growing student demand for services encourages international offices to be entrepreneurial because they typically cannot expand their services without generating additional revenue to support these services. This challenge has been exacerbated by the rapid growth in internationalization over the past ten years and the aforementioned stagnation of university general funds, which requires international student offices to identify and pursue other revenue sources in order to provide the services that students are asking for. SIOs 1, 2, 4, 9, 12, and 17 described ways they have sought to meet increasing demand for their offices' services⁶; other SIOs likely have done the same but did not explicitly say so in the interviews. SIO 4 explained that his international office must provide adequate education abroad opportunities if HEI 4 is to compete effectively in attracting prospective students. SIO 9 realized that her exchange programs were losing money because they were not enrolling enough outbound students. In response, she realigned the exchange programs to better match where students want to go. SIO 17 noted that when he asked a room of incoming freshmen who was interested in studying abroad, nearly every hand was raised. He therefore feels a need to provide enough education abroad opportunities to meet student demand which bring to light the question of how expanded opportunities will be paid for. Given many institutions' current unwillingness to meet heightened student demand for international programs using general funds, international offices are being pressured to engage in entrepreneurial behaviors as one way to pay for the additional services that students are requesting.

⁶ How SIOs have met increasing demand for services is addressed later in Chapter 4, in the Funding section.

Funding. The funding models of international offices also encourage entrepreneurialism. Funding mechanisms serve as incentives for international offices to align their activities to reap the greatest possible financial reward. The 30 SIOs I interviewed identified a variety of revenue streams for their offices (summarized in Table 4).

International Office	Sources of Revenue				
	General Funds	Education Abroad	International Students	Passport Office	Other
1	X	X	X	X	
2	X	X			
3	X	X			
4	X	X			
5	X	X			X
6	X	X			X
7	X	X			
8	X	X			X
9	X	X			
10	X	X			X
11	X				X
12	X				
13	X	X	X	X	
14	X				X
15	X	X			
16	X		X		X
17	X	X			
18	X	X	X	X	
19	X	X			X
20	X	X	X		
21	X	X			
22	X				
23	X	X			X
24	X	X	X		X
25	X	X			
26	X		X		
27	X				X
28	X				
29	X	X	X		X
30	X	X			

All international offices in this study receive some amount of general funds. Along with education abroad funding, general funds are one of the two largest sources of funding for international offices. Because general funds are not tied directly to any particular activities, this is the funding source that allows SIOs the most flexibility in choosing what pursuits their offices engage in. SIO 29 explained that due to his office's success in attracting out-of-state-tuition-paying international students, he has been able to persuade his institution to allocate progressively more funding to the international office. No other SIOs mentioned their institutions investing in the international student office for its revenue generation potential, but this may indeed have occurred elsewhere.

The education abroad funding category most commonly takes the form of a user fee that students who choose to study abroad pay to the international office. Sometimes the user fee is transparent to students and is added on to the program fee; in other cases (IOs 5 and 6) the fees are embedded in program budgets and not visible to students. Education abroad funding less commonly occurs through tuition capture in which an international office retains a portion of the tuition that students pay to their home university while studying abroad.

Funding from international students is likewise a user fee that international students pay to receive services from the international office such as immigration advising, orientation, and other programming. International student fees are sometimes labeled as “administrative fees” which include funding for international offices to administer the SEVIS immigration database. Some institutions charge a “SEVIS fee” that only pays for the extra staff time necessary to

administer SEVIS. Those institutions that do not charge an international student fee must pay for SEVIS fees from general funds or funds generated by other international education activities.

The international offices that serve as U.S. passport processing facilities can also charge fees for processing new passports and passport renewal requests. As table 4.1 shows, three offices are currently passport offices, and SIO 2 is considering the idea. Passport processing is a natural source of revenue for international offices that serve as launching points for students studying abroad. Not only is it convenient for students to obtain their passport on campus, they can do so from an office that is already coordinating a significant part of their international travel. Neither funding from international students nor passport processing are significant parts of most international offices' budgets.

The “other” category in Table 4.1 represents a variety of funding sources. International offices 5, 6, 8, 11, 16, 19, 23, 27, and 29 receive funding from their universities' foundations, through either “no-strings-attached” donations or donations directed to the study abroad program (typically funds for scholarships). HEIs 5 and 10 charge every student on campus a \$10 and a \$14 fee per semester (respectively) in order to support the international office. IOs 8 and 16 facilitate professional training programs in partnership with academic departments, and charge a fee to participants. HEIs 11, 14, 24, and 27 generate revenue from their English as a Second Language (ESL) programs: HEI 11's ESL program generates \$1.2 million of revenue per year for the international office. IO 14 manages a correspondence education program. HEI 16 administers a branch campus that generates a profit, and IO 16 receives a portion of those profits. IOs 19 and 24 receive revenue from various grants awarded by entities such as USAID and the U.S. Department of Education. “Other” activities contribute vastly different amounts to the

budgets of international offices, depending on the activity and the degree to which it is pursued by an international office.

Past changes in funding. SIOs identified a number of ways in which their funding models have changed over the past ten years. One common theme was the shift toward “user-pays” funding, whereby education abroad students, international students, ESL students, or passport applicants pay for whatever international office services they use. A commonly cited reason for moving to this model was a growth in enrollments and demand for international services without parallel growth in general funds to support the increased workload. As SIO 1 explained, “The number of staff did not keep pace with the growth in international students. So in, you know, a budget crisis time there was no way to argue for more state funding.” SIO 20 similarly reported that his international student population has increased but state allocations have not. User fees make up the funding differential. SIO 22 is in the process of implementing education abroad user fees to replace a reduction of general funds. Whereas IO 24 used to receive \$200,000 to \$300,000 per year from their central administration for education abroad, that funding was drastically cut in 2009 and replaced by user fees. IO 6 generates revenue from an education abroad user fee. Because study abroad enrollments have tripled in the past ten years while funding allocations have increased by only 10 to 15%, user fees have become a much more significant part of IO 6’s budget. SIO 8 also commented that “state support has represented an ever-declining share of the total.” SIO 3 stated that when her office implemented an education abroad user fee, the central administration noted the increase in revenues and, feeling less need to provide general funding, reduced the allocation to the international office. IO 15 used to receive a healthy budgetary allocation from the central administration, but five or six years ago

switched to funding from education abroad user fees as general funds were cut almost completely.

These changes show that the increased entrepreneurialism of international offices over the past decade has been driven by enrollment growth that has not been supported by a growth in budget allocations from their institutions. This may be an opportunistic strategy by university leaders who have recognized that international offices are capable of generating their own revenue and can survive without being completely underwritten by general funding. International offices are thus faced with the “choice” of trying to serve a rapidly growing population of students without additional resources, or moving toward user-pays funding mechanisms.

IO 13 also relies more heavily on user fees with every passing year, and SIO 13 has strategically aligned his office's activities with the funding mechanism. Because IO 13 retains all tuition paid by outbound exchange students, the education abroad portion of SIO 13's office works almost exclusively with exchange programs rather than third-party providers. Because IO 13 retains a portion of the tuition paid by dual-degree students from China, SIO 13 has focused on the development of dual-degrees with Chinese universities. This strategy provides ample funding to IO 13 and has allowed IO 13 to develop innovative international activities that otherwise would be prohibitively expensive, such as large-scale curriculum internationalization. Although SIO 13 appreciates his office's ability to be almost entirely self-supporting, he acknowledges that doing so carries a certain degree of risk:

If there is a major catastrophe in China tomorrow that effectively cuts off the flow of Chinese students, we would be indeed troubled. If there is a global crisis that affects transportation or the flow of all the students to other countries around the world, that

effectively cuts off revenues from study abroad. So, there is a very frightening downside to this model, especially if it is the only model that exists for our survival. But on the upside, it indeed allows us to be masters of our own destiny, meaning the more students we send abroad and [on] bilateral exchanges, the more tuition revenue we capture. The more Chinese international students we admit, the more tuition revenue we capture.

SIO 13 was the only interviewee to acknowledge that his funding mechanism creates incentives for particular behaviors, although he can hardly be the only SIO in such a situation. This is an important point in that senior administrators who establish new funding mechanisms for their international offices are to a degree determining the priorities their office will set. The concept of incentivizing internationalization through funding models is important and will be discussed in depth in Chapter 5.

Increases in user fees often result in higher-quality services for students, although the downside is that they increase the cost of education for students, which most educators want to avoid. According to SIO 1, “There was a staff of two for 3,200 [students]. It was just impossible to do it. So now we have almost 4,000 students and we have a staff of, I think we are up to nine or ten right now, and it’s just, I mean, it’s a whole different operation.” SIO 10 asserted, “We’re sending 500 to 600 people overseas a year. And we have an education abroad office of two people, and that is just unacceptable.” User-pays funding models are more palatable when funds remain with international offices in order to provide students with better service.

Expected future changes in funding. Interviewees were asked how they expected their funding to change over the coming five years. SIOs 1, 13, 15, 17, and 20, whose funding is tied to enrollment in study abroad programs, identified the impact that enrollments will have on their

budgets. SIO 17 summed up this idea: “if our numbers increase, our funding will increase proportionally.” SIO 20 likes the model: “I actually like this arrangement because if we are successful in recruiting more students to study abroad and develop more programs, we do not have to worry about asking for resources to actually back this up and create the capacity to do it. Resources will emerge automatically.” SIO 15 hopes that increased enrollments will spread the burden of fixed costs among more students, thus reducing the per-student cost of programs.

SIOs 1, 2, 5, 11, 13, 17, 19, and 23 expressed doubts about whether they would receive additional revenue from their central administrations. In fact, SIO 13 not only expects not to receive larger allocations, “I fully expect that within two years, we will receive zero dollars from central administration.” SIO 23 would be happy to have her office’s funding stay steady over the next five years: “if everything stays the same, I’ll be thrilled.” SIOs 4, 5, 28, and 30 are trying to instate or expand user fees to generate revenue. IO 12 is opposed to user fees but may have to implement them due to inadequate support from university leadership. IO 28 has traditionally been fully state-supported but is just beginning to implement user fees to bring its budget back into balance, as many programs are currently running a deficit. Although the initially small user fees will not immediately solve IO 28’s budget problems, SIO 28 wants to “grease the wheels” and start the office moving in that direction.

These expected changes in funding are consistent with the ongoing shift toward user-pays funding models that I have already identified. SIOs plan to expand the use of user fees and doubt that they will receive increases in general funds. This indicates that international offices are becoming more entrepreneurial as they become increasingly responsible for their own funding, a shift that has been happening over the past ten years and that SIOs expect will continue in the next decade.

Funding and expectations. A number of SIOs identified a misalignment between funding and expectations. They have been expected to increase their institutions' international engagement but have not received any additional funding to achieve this goal. SIO 1 explained that the president of the university where she worked a few years ago "wanted 40% of [name of HEI 1] students to study abroad. And it was a very clear goal that for ten years was articulated and a lot of progress was made. But with that goal not one new penny of central money came." A lot of support for internationalization seems to be verbal rather than budgetary. SIO 1 went on to explain, "There has been a lot of central, you know, top leadership verbal support for internationalization. But in none of the three places [where she worked has that] translated into a role change or any budget models or funding for new initiatives or anything like that." SIO 10 applies the same criterion to determine if support for internationalization is real or just "lip service": "the truth comes down to when you ask for the funding and the support to do it. And that's where I think you can really measure an institution's sincerity and commitment to these types of things."

SIOs are thus facing higher expectations with shrinking budgetary support. Their offices must find additional funding through entrepreneurial behaviors if they are to meet the expectations of their upper administrations. We can surmise that SIOs do not always freely make the choice to engage in entrepreneurial behaviors, but rather sometimes it is the only option available to them if they are to meet their professional expectations. Additional research is necessary to determine if central administrators are deliberately encouraging entrepreneurialism in international offices (through high expectations and shrinking general funds), or if they simply expect international offices to figure out how to provide more services with less money.

Interviewees made it clear that they are disappointed by the lack of support provided by university leadership. Although verbal support for international education is present on many campuses, shrinking general funds cause many SIOs to question how sincere this support is. One would expect expressed institutional commitment to internationalization to be supported financially but that is not the case. The frustration expressed by SIOs is understandable considering that they must now do more with less central funding. Though, it must be acknowledged that international offices are in a position to generate the revenue necessary to grow internationalization. It would be a mistake for SIOs to not ask for additional funding to support growth, but since the 2009 recession, international offices across the country have been able to grow internationalization despite decreases in general funding.

Allocation of international office revenue. Although international offices have the ability to generate their own revenue, they are generally expected to raise only enough funds to support themselves. The exceptions to this rule are IOs 13 and 24. SIO 13 recently gave a substantial amount of excess money to the Provost's Office. SIO 24 explained, "We keep bringing back money to the university every year to the tune of, I don't know, \$75,000." HEI 24 captures this revenue from IO 24's education abroad activity. On the international student side, HEI 24 requires the international office to charge a fee to international students, but that revenue is captured by the central administration rather than by the international office. The international office in fact has no control over the amount of that fee. This arrangement is not consistent with the concept of user fees resulting in better services. Because IO 24 does not have access to the international student fee revenue stream, they cannot provide foreign students with the visa procurement and orientation services that most offices have been paying for with user fees. Although it is rare for international offices to raise funds for their institutions, it is common for

one activity of an international office to subsidize other components of the office. For example, at IO 18 revenue from the education abroad program supports the international student and scholar services. Ideally, revenue generated from a particular international activity would go directly to providing those specific services. Students then "get what they pay for." In reality this match is difficult to achieve because it is much easier to generate revenue in some areas—such as education abroad and ESL programs—than others—such as international students and scholars services.

IO 12's internationalization plan describes a unique arrangement that temporarily incentivizes entrepreneurial behaviors and later results in funding for the university. IO 12 captures tuition revenue generated by new international activities during the first three years of the program. The university then has the option to capture some or all of the revenue resulting from that activity. IO 12 is thus incentivized to create new programs that bring in tuition revenue, with the university also able to benefit from the activity in the long-run.

Funding and seniority. It is important to understand that not all Senior International Officers play the same role on campus. The seniority, resources, and political capital of SIOs determine their ability to influence their campuses. Senior International Officers hold a variety of titles at the 30 institutions examined in this study. 16 SIOs are directors or executive directors, 2 are deans, and 4 are either associate or assistant vice presidents. 8 SIOs hold the title of vice provost, associate provost, or assistant provost. Interestingly, the interviewees in this study are almost evenly divided between the director level (16) and the more senior dean, vice president, and vice provost levels (14).

A look at revenue generating activities by SIOs with director titles versus SIOs with more senior titles indicates a greater engagement in entrepreneurialism by SIOs with more senior titles. Of the 8 international offices that generate internal revenue from international students, 5 are led by SIOs with senior titles. Senior SIOs manage 2 of the 3 international offices that run passport offices. 7 of 12 international offices receiving funding from “other” sources are led by SIOs with senior titles. Revenue-generating education abroad activity was evenly divided between director SIOs and those with more senior titles. Despite slightly more directors having been interviewed for this study, in no activity did directors generate revenue from particular activities more than dean, vice president, and vice provost level SIOs. This may be due to the greater autonomy enjoyed by more senior level SIOs. Those SIOs are better able to determine how they will generate revenue for their international offices while director level SIOs may feel that they do not have the authority necessary to develop international entrepreneurialism. Senior level SIOs are also closer to the strategic core of their institutions and may also better understand the importance of international entrepreneurialism to upper administrators.

Although SIOs have traditionally been employed as directors, universities are increasingly hiring SIOs as vice provosts and vice presidents. This change may be connected to this study’s finding that international offices are playing increasingly entrepreneurial roles for their institutions. As upper administrators see the revenue potential of internationalization, they will be more willing to invest in a leader capable of generating those revenues. This idea is supported by the fact that a greater number of this study’s senior-level interviewees engaged in revenue generating activities than director-level SIOs.

Summary. SIOs’ discussions of their funding models bring to light the question of who influences how internationalization happens on a college campus. One would naturally assume

that SIOs have the greatest influence over how internationalization is carried out. Yet this assumption was challenged by the interview data. As Table 4.1 shows, international offices are funded through particular activities such as education abroad programs, international student enrollments, ESL programs, and others. Though SIOs identify and pursue some of these funding streams independently, others are imposed on them by upper administrators. For example, a provost could decide to provide an international office with a certain amount of revenue for either every new international student recruited or every international student enrolled per semester. This decision would have consequences for the way the international office operates. If funding is derived only from new international students recruited, the international office has an incentive to focus its recruitment efforts on attracting new students, rather than retaining current students. In contrast, funding based on enrollments per semester may encourage the international office to expend more energy on retaining international students.

Given that funding mechanisms serve as incentive structures for international offices, upper administrators who impose funding models strongly influence the activities their university's international office will prioritize. SIOs will pursue activities that will generate the revenue necessary to run their offices, so essentially upper administrators have the power to set the agenda for their international offices. This subject deserves further research considering its potential impact on campus internationalization. Anecdotally, it seems that some funding models are assigned to international offices for reasons of opportunity and convenience rather than in pursuit of the strategic goals of the university. If further research confirms this to be the case, it would represent a significant misalignment of action and strategic priorities.

A force encouraging entrepreneurialism that was not discussed by SIOs but should be considered is SIOs' professional responsibilities. SIOs are tasked with internationalizing

university campuses. The degree to which they do so reflects whether or not they are being successful. Being entrepreneurial provides SIOs with the resources that they need to grow internationalization on campus and thus be more successful in their professional responsibilities. For example, by generating revenue through education abroad fees, SIOs can encourage curricular internationalization by paying stipends to faculty willing to introduce a global component to their department's curriculum. Internationalizing curriculum can be pointed to as an indicator of SIOs being successful in their responsibility of campus internationalization. Entrepreneurialism allows SIOs to use new programming and growth in existing programs as indicators of their success in internationalizing a campus. SIOs' understanding that entrepreneurialism is an important component of fulfilling their responsibilities may explain why interviewees did not vocalize opposition to entrepreneurialism. Interviewees did express frustration towards budget cuts but not at their need to find revenue elsewhere. It may be understood that in light of declining general funds, entrepreneurialism is necessary if SIOs are to successfully internationalize campus.

The expectations of upper administrators, growing student demand for international services, funding mechanisms, and possibly SIOs' professional responsibilities all are forces that pressure international offices to be entrepreneurial. Upper administrators expect international offices to engage in behaviors that will at least make the office wholly or partially self-supporting, or in a few cases even generate revenue for the university. Increasing student demand for international services has led SIOs to search for ways to pay for additional services such as social programming and orientation services. Funding mechanisms encourage international offices to align their behaviors with revenue sources. Overall, the forces acting on international

offices encourage them to engage in entrepreneurialism in terms of the activities that they engage in and how they generate revenue from those activities.

Activities

The activities that international offices engage in have evolved over just the past decade, and the SIOs interviewed expect that the changes will continue. In this section I explore how international activities are developing by looking at how they have changed in the past, how SIOs expect them to change in the future, and how SIOs prioritize the activities that their offices engage in.

Changing activities of international offices. International offices engage in a range of traditional international activities. These include oversight of education abroad programs such as the management of partnerships abroad, faculty-led program coordination, and student advising. International student and scholar services typically include advising students and scholars on immigration matters, holding orientations, providing programming, and bringing international scholars to campus. The management of international agreements involves evaluating new international partners, vetting the content of the agreements, routing agreements for signature, and record keeping for agreements. Traditional activities such as education abroad programming and international student and scholar services are becoming increasingly entrepreneurial as international offices shift towards user-pays funding mechanisms. Both education abroad students and international students are expected to pay for a greater portion of the services they utilize⁷.

⁷ See the Funding section for a complete discussion of the shift towards user-fees funding models.

Over the past ten years, international offices have evolved beyond these traditional activities. Dual-degree agreements in which students earn degrees from two separate institutions for one coordinated course of study are becoming ever more common, as is international student recruitment. Two interesting new activities that have emerged recently are the delivery of credit overseas to foreign students and the establishment of international alumni networks. Although not all interviewees mentioned such changes, these themes appeared repeatedly in different interviews.

Dual-degree agreements. Dual-degree agreements are a hot topic in international education. They involve students taking courses at two different institutions in two different countries and earning a degree from each institution. The curricula at both schools are coordinated to complement each other. These arrangements allow students to benefit from the unique strengths of the two participating institutions. They are also beneficial to HEIs in that they serve as a recruiting mechanism for international students. For example, a dual-degree agreement between U.S. and Chinese HEIs turns the Chinese institution into a recruiter for its U.S. partner when it promotes the dual-degree program to Chinese students. The U.S. HEI benefits from receiving out-of-state tuition from Chinese visiting students and diversifying its student body, while the Chinese HEI offers a desirable program that attracts students.

HEI 2 is in the process of developing more dual-degree programs. HEI 7 already has some agreements in place. SIO 18 reported that the increase in demand for higher education in developing countries, “particularly China and India,” has fueled the growth of dual-degree programs at that institution. An emphasis on China exists at HEI 13, which focuses almost all its dual-degree efforts on that country in order to tap into the Chinese higher education market. China has experienced tremendous growth in demand for higher education in the past decade as

its rapidly developing middle class can now afford the costs associated with going to college and seeks to afford their children the benefits of a college education. The supply of high quality higher education in China has not kept pace with this demand, thus creating excess demand. At the same time, U.S. higher education enjoys an excellent reputation in China. These factors have aligned to make China an important supplier of students to U.S. universities.

Some institutions use dual degree offerings strategically to attract international students. HEI 27 has successfully implemented dual-degree programs in order to increase the number of international students on campus. Dual-degree programs focusing mostly on Korea, and more recently Vietnam, have played an important role in the recent tripling of HEI 27's international student enrollment. HEI 29 has also developed agreements in both Vietnam and China. Before HEI 29 centralized the responsibility for dual-degree programs in the international office, the university had trouble creating agreements that provided high-quality services to international students in an efficient manner. SIO 29 believes that the current centralized system for dual degrees has streamlined and ultimately made more efficient use institutional resources while providing better services to students. Ultimately, dual degrees encourage foreign universities to send their students to U.S. institutions. U.S. institutions are able to attract international students without direct recruitment (in which a recruiter travels abroad and speaks to students directly), but rather by having their foreign partner institutions recruit students into dual-degree programs. Recruitment by this means may be more efficient as it saves U.S. institutions the travel costs associated with direct recruitment of international students while enhancing their revenue from out-of-state tuition paying international students.

International student recruitment. The competitive market for international students is motivating more and more universities to actively recruit abroad. As recent budget cuts have

squeezed institutional resources, HEIs have been forced to look elsewhere for resources, including among international students. The increase in international recruitment is relatively recent. Many HEIs have just started recruiting abroad or plan on doing so soon. HEI 6 currently recruits international students but is, according to SIO 6, “struggling to get some funding for overseas recruitment.” HEI 6 is trying to expand recruitment through relationships with recruiters. HEI 5 is in the process of developing its recruitment capability, as SIO 5 described:

We’ve been looking more recently, in the last year or two, at international student recruitment. Even though that’s not formally under this office, we’ve taken a sort of leadership role, in that when the university looked at doing it for the first time, and we’re going through a first institutional campus internationalization planning process, we did that in a sort of preliminary way, just through the international education committee. But this particular year something’s been requested by the provost, so because it’s being requested by the top leadership, it’s more intensive, and more likely to be successful so we’re very optimistic about that right now.

SIO 5 did not state which entity would ultimately be responsible for international recruitment, but his office is providing leadership in moving the initiative forward. International student recruitment is one of six initiatives highlighted in IO 5’s 2012 strategic plan. The plan asks for funding to hire a new International Student Recruitment Coordinator in spring 2013.

SIO 5’s decision to take a leadership role in the development of international student recruitment may be driven in part by a desire to increase the role and responsibilities of the international office. International student enrollments can contribute significantly to a university’s bottom line, therefore making the unit that brings those students to campus more

valuable to the institution. Strategically, one would expect all SIOs to want to manage international student recruitment as long as they have the resources necessary to do so. Logistically, there are also advantages to having a close relationship between those that recruit international students and those that manage immigration, orientation, and programming for international students (ISSS offices), by having both units located in the international office.

SIO 15 just had international recruitment added to his responsibilities; he stated that it “never used to be part of this office, never used to be systematically approached on campus in any way, so we’ve become much more systematic and much more intentional about our international recruiting efforts.” HEIs 24 and 26 are in similar situations, in that international recruitment may become a responsibility of the international office. Until now, their international offices have done only limited recruitment. SIO 28 is interested in recruitment but noted “right now, no one is really claiming responsibility for recruitment, and I’ve also found out that I don’t really have any tools to help in recruiting the students. I mean, I do have some tools, but in general I don’t have scholarships, I don’t have tuition waivers, things like that.”

HEIs 7, 11, 16, 21, 26, 27, and 30 are already engaging in international student recruitment. SIO 16 acknowledges that his office has greater interest in education abroad but recognizes that they will continue to recruit international students, “maybe more so than in the past because of cutbacks and state budgets.” The out-of-state tuition paid by international students can soften the impact of cuts in public money. HEI 21 has approached international student recruitment by making it a responsibility of both the international office and the Enrollment Management Office. At HEI 30, a professional international education administrator was hired to develop international recruitment.

Delivery of credit abroad to foreign students. Universities have traditionally only delivered credit abroad to students on their education abroad programs and at their branch campuses. That is changing. A groundbreaking new trend in the international activities of HEIs is the delivery of credit abroad to foreign nationals. A hot topic in international education, such arrangements been discussed at some conferences, such as the 2009 NAFSA Region II conference. Broadly, these programs allow foreign students to earn credit at U.S. HEIs while studying in universities or study centers in their home countries. U.S. universities see good revenue potential associated with these arrangements. HEI 7 is negotiating with a for-profit organization that will facilitate, according to SIO 7, “providing [HEI 7] credits overseas at study centers.” HEI 18 developed an early start program in China, whereby Chinese students earn credits while still in China. This program acts as a feeder of international students to HEI 18. SIO 18 explained that from his institution's perspective the program “was primarily driven by a very pragmatic approach to revenue generation. On the Chinese side it was driven simply by the educational demand.”

Similarly, HEI 26 worked with a private organization to develop a feeder program based on the same principle as HEI 18’s program: using the feeder program as a recruitment tool that brings tuition-paying international students to campus. According to SIO 26 “students would . . . study at [name of organization omitted] study centers in China, and basically already get their sort of first year of general education credits during that time. And then they would come into a summer bridge program coordinated by [name of HEI omitted].” Students would then enroll in HEI 26 as regular international students. SIO 26 noted that the feeder program became problematic and was suspended because the institution “had very little control over the students we were actually getting and their level of preparedness. So we just decided from a resource

perspective, it just wasn't worth it." Students were enrolling in the program without the skills and academic background necessary to succeed at an U.S. university, which was problematic for them in that they faced a high risk of failure. From HEI 26's perspective this was also problematic in that enrolling poorly prepared students not only put the university's reputation at risk but required it to invest resources in students who were less likely to succeed and graduate than domestic students. HEI 26 has temporarily stopped the program as they re-evaluate the quality of students they receive through the program, their preparation to succeed in the academic environment of HEI 26, and the resources that must be invested for them to be successful.

The delivery of credit abroad has the potential to provide highly coveted U.S. higher education to foreign students without those students assuming the extensive costs associated with traveling to and living in the United States for multiple years. However, HEI 26's experience shows that, as is often the case with new initiatives, there are problems associated with credit abroad activities. Its use of a third party liaison to the foreign student market seems to have diminished HEI 26's control over the program. As more U.S. HEIs deliver credit abroad to foreign students, best practices will develop to guide program designs in ways that will better benefit both institutions and the students they serve.

Nurturing international alumni. Another interesting development in the activities of international offices is the nurturing of relationships with international alumni. Alumni relations offices at U.S. colleges and universities have long nurtured domestic alumni by developing alumni networks, publishing alumni newsletters, inviting alumni to campus events, and otherwise keeping alumni engaged with their alma mater, in the hope that these alumni will eventually contribute financially to their alma mater. International alumni have traditionally been

ignored in these efforts at all but a few universities, but this situation seems to be changing. HEIs 8, 12, 13, 15, and 26 specifically identified networking with foreign alumni. IO 12's internationalization plan assigns Alumni Relations the responsibility to "establish a network of alumni living and working abroad." SIO 13 commented on the importance of nurturing international alumni in light of the current fiscal climate: "It is important to spend time and resources cultivating international alumni because I still believe that they represent an untapped pool of resources and support that the university will increasingly need as it moves into an era where state support continues to decline." SIO 13 hopes eventually to receive financial support from alumni living abroad, as is expressed in IO 13's mission statement: "to co-opt international alumni and other entities to support the global agenda through giving." A report by an international education committee at HEI 13 specifically requests that "a development officer will be assigned to the [international office] who will work alongside the Vice Provost to make global education an organizing principle for fundraising at the university." IO 15 has not yet begun nurturing alumni but do hope to receive donations to support international education in the future.

A few months after this study's interview with SIO 18, IO 18 hired a director for international alumni development. A full time position dedicated to nurturing international alumni is rare in the field of international education but suggests a growing realization that international students often come from wealthy families and are likely to one day be in a financial position to support their alma maters. Considering that IO 18 is especially entrepreneurial, it is not a surprise to see SIO 18 at the forefront of international alumni development.

It will be interesting to see how the nurturing of international alumni will play out. Soliciting alumni for donations rarely happens outside of the United States and is thus a new concept to many international alumni. The question will thus be whether students choose to adopt a practice of the host country where they studied or to practice the norms of their home countries, where alumni typically do not make donations to their alma maters. The time and resources invested by SIOs into building relationships with their alumni may not provide a return during SIOs' tenure at their institutions. It can take decades of relationship building for alumni to choose to financial support their alma maters. In this respect SIOs are laying groundwork for funding that may materialize long after their departure.

High-priority activities for international offices. SIOs described a number of activities that they consider to be priorities in their offices. Some of these priorities reflect their philosophical belief in the value of international education to students. Examples are education abroad, internationalization of campus (increasing domestic students' exposure to international cultures and students, both inside and outside the classroom), and activities that support international students (social programming, academic support, and orientations). Other activities are priorities because they generate revenue for an international office. Examples are international student recruitment, grant writing, training programs, and education abroad. Better understanding these activities and the various reasons why SIOs assign them priority will allow me to answer two research questions, those regarding how international offices set priorities among the activities they engage in, and how entrepreneurialism influences their strategies and activities.

Priorities based on philosophical support for international education. International offices prioritize certain activities because their SIOs deem them to be valuable to students. For

example, SIOs 2, 3, 15, 18, 29, and 30 explicitly support education abroad because of its positive impact on students. These SIOs stated that increasing the quantity of study abroad enrollments, the quality of programming, or both is important because the experience has intrinsic value for students. SIOs 7, 10, 16, 17, and 27 also make education abroad a priority; although they did not explain their rationale, at least some of their motivation is likely philosophical. SIO 13 stated, “I think it’s just as important for us to provide services that matter to the constituents we serve because those constituents actually are the heart of the mission of the institution. It’s about serving students.” SIO 18 commented on the educational benefits of international travel for students. SIO 29 noted that because most students at his institution have never been outside the United States, education abroad is especially important. SIO 29 and his administration believe “students need to have a broader vision.” SIO 30 elaborated on that theme:

The overall priority would be that we are helping [HEI 30] students really better understand the world and their place in it. You know, it’s a really big and broad goal, but you know, that sort of takes many forms. I do feel like almost everything that we do in our office in some way, shape, or form ties back to that. . . . Some of that is sending our students abroad, giving them that first-time international experience, and our students are not, generally speaking, very well-traveled. Many of them have never left the city or [state omitted], so giving them a firsthand international experience really does help broaden their perspective.

Many SIOs also believe that it is important for domestic students to have an international experience while on campus. SIOs 4, 5, 6, 16, and 23 discussed making curriculum internationalization a priority. These Senior International Officers are advocating for a stronger international dimension in general education and departmental curriculum. Although

international offices are not directly responsible for curriculum, SIOs can champion curriculum internationalization and encourage departments through stipends for faculty willing to work on adding a global dimension to their degrees. SIO 5 spoke in general of students having more “international learning experiences on campus,” while SIOs 6, 24, and 30 discussed the positive mutual influence that domestic and international students can have on each other. SIO 30 appreciates how international students are “helping to diversify our campus so that students have, you know, are encountering other perspectives in the classroom, really. I really do value the unique perspectives and the diversity that our international students bring.” SIO 16 wants to develop graduates who are “globally competent.” These ideas are consistent with broad changes in the field of international education. Campus administrators have realized that not all students will study abroad, so it is important to provide global experiences to students who stay on campus.

Several SIOs mentioned the importance of having international students be successful on campus. They recognize the educational and personal benefits to international students of having close contact with domestic students. SIO 5 implemented a weekly coffee hour during which domestic and international students meet and interact. Out of a student body of about 6,000, some 125 students per week attend the coffee hour. SIO 7 commented that it is important for international students to succeed both socially and emotionally. SIO 26 wants to develop programming for international students that will enrich their experience.

SIOs expressed the importance of having international students have a fulfilling personal and academic experience at their institutions. This is important considering that SIOs typically do not regularly interact with students. Administrators at their level usually interact with faculty and other administrators, not directly with students. In addition, SIOs' responsibilities often

revolve around such tasks as budgeting, personnel management, and strategic planning. It is thus significant that SIOs prioritize activities that they believe offer benefits to students, even though they have little direct interaction with students.

Philosophical support for international education contrasts with the entrepreneurial motivations discussed in the following section. Research on entrepreneurialism in higher education suggests that entrepreneurial behaviors are sometimes pursued at the expense of the student experience. This research has shown that international offices set priorities based on both their benefits to students and their ability to generate revenue. In spite of the entrepreneurial motivations of SIOs, it is important to recognize that international offices pursue activities such as education abroad, the internationalization of campus, and support services for international students in large part because of their positive impact on students. Later I will address SIOs' views on the compatibility between entrepreneurial and educational goals.

Priorities based on budgetary considerations. Some international offices set priorities based on the budgetary impact of particular activities. An example I have already discussed is increasing international student enrollment because of the tuition rates these students pay. In discussing institutional support for international student enrollment, SIO 1 stated, “One of the big reasons is just financial.” SIO 1 explained that at this institution lost revenue from a recent decrease in out-of-state enrollment was counterbalanced by higher international student enrollment. SIO 16 acknowledged that international student recruitment is increasing in importance as state funding for the university is reduced. Both HEIs 1 and 16 rely on international student enrollment to bring vital tuition dollars to campus. Considering recent cuts in public money for higher education (Rizzo, 2004; Roherty, 1997), HEIs are looking for alternative sources of revenue (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). Therefore, one would expect

international student enrollment to become an increasingly important priority at HEIs. This entrepreneurial activity is a convenient source of revenue in that it is considered to have educational value and is philosophically supported by SIOs, as I have already shown.

SIOs 15 and 29 are conscious of the impact of education abroad programs on their budgets. SIO 15 prioritizes education abroad and collects revenue from students who study abroad. SIO 29 related education abroad to the economic downturn and HEI 29's budgetary challenges, describing education abroad as a resource-free way of expanding the institution's curriculum. Students are able to take classes abroad in subjects not offered at HEI 29, without cost to HEI 29. This is a commonly cited efficiency in the field of international education. Relationships with foreign institutions allow universities to immediately expand the depth of courses available to students. As SIO 29 noted, these synergetic relationships are especially important as universities try to operate with fewer public dollars.

There are three more activities that some international offices engage in because of their ability to generate revenue. First, SIO 20 prioritizes grant opportunities because of their funding implications. Second, SIO 12 prioritizes a cultural competency training program for U.S. military personnel. Although budgetary considerations were not explicitly cited as a reason for this priority, the program contract is worth \$1.2 million, which doubtless has some influence on the priorities of the international office. Third, SIO 18 cited the program in which foreign students can earn HEI 18 credit abroad, expressing reservations about the institutional motivations behind this program: "the . . . program is a perfect example of where an inordinate amount of university resources went toward supporting a for-profit function." All three of these activities are nontraditional in international education. International offices rarely pursue grants, and SIO 12 was the only person to mention a cross-cultural training program. The delivery of credit abroad

to foreign nationals, described by SIO 18, was mentioned by only two other interviewees (SIOs 7 and 26). A desire for revenue seems to be motivating SIOs to explore new opportunities in international education and indicate that entrepreneurialism is a force that will influence the evolution of the field. The prioritization of activities according to their revenue-generating potential may become an increasingly influential factor if public support for higher education continues to shrink, and thus may impact how internationalization evolves on campuses.

Although engaging in new activities based on their entrepreneurial potential presents a certain degree of risk, there are opportunities for reward in finding untapped revenue sources. Pursuing grant funding (SIO 20) is not especially risky, but HEIs 12 and 18 are engaging in new and potentially risky activities as they pursue revenue through the delivery of credit abroad to foreign students. Financial risks exist in monetary commitments to the program and investments of staff time in program development. Difficulties inherent in controlling the quality of such programs and in potentially bringing under-qualified students to campus pose reputational risks. These activities indicate that international offices, sometimes at the direction of their universities, are engaging in behaviors more commonly found in the private sector; namely, risk-taking in order to generate revenue. Private organizations are often more willing than public organizations to take risks due to their ability to generate profits. We are now seeing historically public organizations such as public universities move closer to the private end of the public-private spectrum and engage in behaviors more commonly associated with private organizations as they seek ways to make up for dwindling public funding.

Summary. International offices are engaging in new and innovative activities in response to forces encouraging entrepreneurialism. These activities are not, except for nurturing international alumni, described by international offices in their strategic plans, mission

statements, or value statements. Strategic plans and statements focus on traditional international education activities such as international student services, international scholar services, internationalizing the curriculum, and education abroad. Not having these activities featured in publically available documents may be due to the fact that international offices are testing the waters and unsure how committed they are to pursuing these initiatives. In addition, SIOs may perceive many of these new activities as risky and therefore want to gauge their success before publicizing them. If programs succeed and grow, one would expect that they will begin to appear in strategic plans and other publically available documents.

Not only have internationalization activities changed over the past ten years, but SIOs expect changes to continue over the coming five years. As the fundamental activities that international offices engage in evolve due to entrepreneurial pressures, so too does the face of international education. New activities are appearing and some traditional activities are being pursued with greater vigor as international offices become increasingly conscious of the revenue implications of their priorities.

Strategies

The forces encouraging entrepreneurialism have important strategic implications. Not only do they impact international education, but SIOs also point to the strategic importance of two initiatives tied to entrepreneurialism: international student recruitment and increasing enrollments in international programs.

Strategic partnerships in support of international student recruitment. As I have already discussed in this chapter, international student recruitment is growing at the institutions I examined. Not only is recruitment activity growing, but international offices are increasingly

playing strategic roles in the recruitment of international students. In part international students are an important source of out-of-state tuition for HEIs, so they and their enrollment management divisions are increasingly leveraging the global expertise of their international offices to promote that revenue stream. HEI 1 has recognized the importance of drawing on both the international office's and enrollment management's expertise, as SIO 1 explained:

We [the IO] sit on an international enrollment group with them [Enrollment Management] to kind of plan out [HEI 1]'s strategy for international student recruitment. So I participate a lot in that, but I don't control the resources that actually could happen, like the admissions office people in Budget [do]. But the Admissions Office doesn't have that expertise on international recruiting. So we worked kind of in partnership to get that done.

SIO 1 went on to explain that international student recruitment has become more important as out-of-state enrollments from a neighboring state have decreased. SIO 7 addressed the same dynamic, whereby international student recruitment is making up for stagnant out-of-state enrollments. The Internationalization Plan of HEI 12 explains that the international office will “in coordination with ... Admissions ... develop an international student recruiting plan.” Admissions is then given targets for international student enrollments over three years. SIO 15 stated that the strategic recruitment of international students is new to his institution: “The international recruiting is definitely new. That never used to be part of this office, never used to be systematically approached on campus in any way so we become much more systematic and much more intentional about our international recruiting efforts.” SIO 15 pointed out that the population of high school graduates in his state is dropping. Therefore, HEI 15 essentially faces a choice between keeping in-state enrollment numbers steady by loosening admissions criteria, or

maintaining their admission standards and relying on international student recruitment to compensate for reductions in in-state enrollments.

HEIs 1, 7, 12, and 15 all face challenges in attracting domestic students. All three have brought their international offices into the student recruitment process in order to better compete for international students. This development allows the international offices to play more prominent and valuable roles on their campuses. HEIs' entrepreneurial needs have encouraged a strategic partnership between international offices and enrollment management divisions in order to strengthen international student recruitment.

Growing enrollment in international activities. In general, education abroad enrollments have increased, as have the number of international students on campus and the areas of responsibility of international offices. Many interviewees mentioned the growth and expansion of activities, including SIOs 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 15, 17, 19, 21, and 24. As SIO 17 noted, "What has changed in both offices is the amount of work because the number of students going in both directions [inbound and outbound] has increased significantly." SIO 18 stated that "the levels of overall [international] engagement of the university have probably increased, conservatively, ten times." The increased activity reported by interviewees is consistent with national data on international education. The Institute for International Education's 2011 report entitled "Open Doors" documents significant growth in international education activity over the past decade. For example, U.S. study abroad enrollments approximately doubled in a decade, from 143,590 students in academic year 1999–2000 to 270,604 students in 2009–10. Meanwhile, the number of international students enrolled at U.S. higher education institutions increased from 547,867 students in 2000–01 to 723,277 students in 2010–11 (Bhandari & Chow). It is no

surprise that interviewees have experienced enrollment growth in keeping with this general growth trend.

Entrepreneurialism can drive the growth of international programs in two ways. First, reporting growth is an important strategy for leaders of units that are competing for resources. Growth justifies the need for additional resources to manage increased responsibilities. For example, IO 5's 2012 strategic plan asks for funding to hire an additional staff member once they reach enrollments of 200 education abroad students per year. HEI 12's internationalization plan requests additional staff lines in education abroad and international student services to support expected increases in enrollments. The decrease in public funding for higher education has reduced resources available throughout public universities and heightened the intense competition for the limited resources that exist. Thus, demonstrating that enrollments are growing is an important component of advocating for additional resources among directors of all student affairs offices, including international offices.

Study abroad is a major contributor to the growth in international education that SIOs pointed out. HEI 19's education abroad enrollments have tripled in five years. SIO 3 believes that the growth in education abroad enrollments over the past decade will continue in the foreseeable future. SIO 10 cited a goal of significantly increasing "the number of kids that are studying abroad and having an education abroad experience." SIO 18 echoed that "there's been tremendous growth in [outbound] student mobility." This tremendous growth is indicative of substantial political support for education abroad on campus. For enrollments to increase so quickly, academic departments must be promoting education abroad, either on their own initiative or under the direction of central administration. The phenomenal rate of growth at HEI

19 implies that strong support probably existed at both the upper administrative and departmental levels.

International student enrollments have also been growing. SIO 4 noted, “We’ve already doubled the number of exchange students coming to campus since I arrived,” and he plans to intensify his office’s efforts in this area in the future. SIO 3 expects the number of international students on campus to continue growing in the future. HEI 10 has identified a strategic goal of increasing the number of international students on campus over the next five years. SIO 15 would like to see international students represent 10% of HEI 15’s student population, and has similar expectations for growth in education abroad enrollments.

On the downside, SIO 19 acknowledges that the increase in international student enrollments has stressed the office’s resources. The fact that growth stresses resources is an important consideration. On the surface, it seems counterintuitive that an office would strain its existing resources in order to develop new resources. Yet growth in an office’s activities and responsibilities gives a SIO an excellent argument when lobbying for additional resources. SIO 3 gave an example of this argument: “You know, there are more students studying abroad, there is more need for staff, so that’s why we have been able to hire and to add more staff.” HEI 15 makes a similar connection but with regard to international students: “If our international enrollments grow substantially, it will be easier to argue for additional funding support.” SIO 21 played upon her university’s desire to increase education abroad enrollments. She argued that to do so, her office would need additional resources. She received these resources and has since created a budget model in which education abroad enrollments generate direct revenues to her office. For international offices to receive the additional financial support needed to manage growing programs, SIOs may find that they need to show that their funding is inadequate for

their growing responsibilities. From an entrepreneurial perspective, SIOs have an incentive to strain their current resources through growth in order to demonstrate to the upper administration that their offices are underfunded.

A second way that entrepreneurialism creates an incentive to grow enrollments applies to offices that are funded on a per-user basis. Some SIOs identified increasing enrollments as a strategy for generating revenue. Although many international offices receive funding based on enrollments, some SIOs specifically addressed the strategic implications of connecting revenue to enrollments. IO 1 charges a fee to every international student on campus, thus correlating the office's revenues to enrollments. SIO 8 receives a portion of the tuition paid by every student who studies abroad. SIO 13's predecessor supported the alignment of enrollments and resources and therefore requested an enrollment-based funding model. At the time, enrollments in international programs were low and thus the budgetary implications of this model for IO 13 were minimal. Since that time, SIO 13 has clearly understood the revenue implications of increasing enrollments in particular international activities and has thus targeted specific programs that generate revenue for his office (i.e., outbound exchange enrollments and the number of students from China enrolled in dual-degree programs). Enrollments in those programs have dramatically increased, as has revenue for the office.

IO 24 formerly received funding tied directly to enrollments but that has now changed. SIO 24 preferred the old model on the basis that "it makes people, gives them more incentives frankly to be entrepreneurial when they have to earn their own salaries." She further explains

There's a direct correlation between the fact that you have a job and the fact you went out and hustled to get 60 students to go on a program or something. And you made it happen and you've marketed it right, and I see the difference with people on general fund who

get paid no matter whether they're doing a good job or not. I mean ultimately maybe they get fired but they could go for years just doing a very mediocre job and it doesn't matter.

SIO 24 prefers direct funding mechanisms because when funding is specifically tied to enrollments, employees understand that they must be effective if the office is to generate sufficient revenue to sustain itself, and the tone of the office changes.

This study has found that SIOs recognize the revenue implications of increasing enrollments whether or not their offices are funded on a per-student basis. International offices have some incentive to increase enrollments regardless of how they are funded, because growing enrollments lead to more resources. Those offices whose revenue is directly tied to enrollments tend to emphasize those activities that are most profitable for them. Those offices that do not have a direct correlation between enrollments and revenue have greater liberty to determine which activities they will develop. Essentially, a direct correlation between enrollments and revenue reduces the freedom of an international office to determine for itself which international activities are most important to pursue: whoever establishes the funding model to some extent sets the office's priorities and by extension the international priorities of the entire campus. Whether these priorities are consciously and strategically decided upon, or are based simply on convenience, is a subject that deserves further attention and study. An upper administrator may choose a funding model that is convenient and practical for the campus, but is not well aligned with strategic goals, thus creating an incentive structure that does not mesh with the institution's long-term vision.

Balancing Entrepreneurial Needs and Educational Priorities

Interviewees were asked specifically about their offices' engagement in entrepreneurial behaviors, and about whether or not tension exists between their office's educational goals and

entrepreneurial pressures. Academic capitalism has shown this tension to exist at the institutional level. At the international office level, tension between educational goals and entrepreneurialism could manifest itself in a number of ways. In education abroad, international offices may commit their resources to recruitment and enrollment, and away from supporting students while they are abroad. In international student recruitment, international offices may be tempted to lower admission standards in order to admit a larger number of students. Higher enrollments in both cases would lead to greater revenues, but may not be in students' best educational interests. How interviewees' addressed balancing education and entrepreneurialism revealed a variety of perspectives on how they overlap.

Many SIOs (2, 6, 7, 8, 13, 15, 21, and 28) believe entrepreneurialism and education to be compatible in their offices. International offices that are funded based on enrollments are incentivized to do the very thing that they believe in for educational reasons—to increase the volume of students engaging in international education. SIO 13 views the fact that his office is funded based on education abroad enrollments to be “a wonderful incentive to send as many students abroad as possible.” SIO 21 comments that growing enrollments is “good for the bottom line.” SIO 28 explains how his emphasis on education abroad enrollments aligns with his office's funding: “It's not that the fees made them priorities, it's just that they were priorities and there's an easy opportunity to direct money towards those priorities.” The alignment between educational goals and funding streams indicates that entrepreneurialism may contribute to some international offices' educational agendas. By being entrepreneurial and pursuing revenue, these SIOs are simultaneously developing the educational visions of their offices. However, this will only be the case when educational goals and revenue streams align, which only 8 of the 30 SIOs

interviewed specifically state is true in their offices. Other SIOs describe making efforts to balance education and entrepreneurialism, in instances where the two are not well aligned.

These SIOs have adopted individual approaches to find a balance between entrepreneurial needs and educational goals. SIO 4 starts by identifying what his office wants to accomplish from an educational perspective, then determines what revenue is necessary to achieve his goals. Thus, he ensures that educational priorities are driving how revenue is generated, rather than vice versa. SIO 17 first ensures that decisions are academically grounded before considering the budgetary implications of those decisions. SIO 8 states that education and entrepreneurialism “are largely aligned to the extent that a large part of my task is to bring them into alignment.” SIO 24 acknowledges that her office's enrollment-based funding structure creates an incentive to lower admission standards in order to enroll more students in international programs. Nevertheless she has decided to maintain strict admittance criteria for programs: “Money is not the final factor at all . . . I want solid programs with integrity.” These examples show that a degree of tension does exist between education and entrepreneurialism in international offices. Yet interviewees indicate that they are able to manage this tension in a way that does not compromise the educational priorities of their offices.

Some interviewees addressed the fact that their funding models incentivize particular behaviors. SIO 9 acknowledges that her office receives more funding from students who go on one particular kind of education abroad program, but stated that this incentive does not cause her staff to funnel students toward that program. This kind of incentive likely exists in the different kinds of education abroad funding identified in this study. Some education abroad offices charge a fee to all students going abroad while others retain a portion of the tuition paid by outbound exchange students. International offices funded by exchange enrollments face pressure to

promote exchange programs more than others. The same can be said of third-party provider programs that pay international offices for the number of students referred to their programs. International offices have a financial incentive to promote those third-party programs over others. Such financial incentives present an interesting scenario that is common in education abroad. The Forum for Education Abroad has addressed this tension to a limited degree in its *Code of Ethics for Education Abroad* (2011). The code states that “A potential conflict of interest exists when personal or institutional interests, whether financial or non-financial, may be seen as competing with the best interests of the students.” The Forum explains that in such conflicts of interest, students’ interests should guide the behaviors of international offices.

Whether or not programs that provide greater financial returns are marketed more actively than others is at the discretion of staff. Although staff may generally encourage students to participate in programs that meet their needs, there is no doubt that financial pressure exists to support particular programs. SIO 11 acknowledges a similar tension in the recruitment of international students. The recruitment of degree-seeking international students does not bring revenue to IO 11, whereas recruiting non-degree-seeking ESL students does. SIO 11 concedes that he sometimes does question why he recruits degree-seeking students at all. IO 12 focuses on a national training program that generates revenue for the office but does not necessarily serve their institution, state, or region. Although IO 12 benefits from the program SIO 12 feels the program “pulls us a little bit off mission.” These cases indicate that when funding models do not align with educational priorities, it is left to the discretion of international office staff to decide how to resolve this conflict. How SIOs strike a balance will depend on their educational priorities, the degree to which they need (or choose) to pursue revenue, and pressures that may exist beyond the international office to engage in particular behaviors. For example, even if the

recruitment of degree-seeking international students does not fund an international office, the fact that an institution's senior leaders value this activity may provide enough of an incentive for SIOs to make it a priority.

The degree to which SIOs feel a need to be entrepreneurial will depend upon their budget. SIOs that are well funded, such as 13 and 18, will feel less pressure to develop entrepreneurial activities. SIOs that are struggling to balance their books, such as 28, will feel a greater need to engage in entrepreneurialism. This is evident in the fact that SIO 28 is increasing the study abroad fee charged to students. Therefore, the degree of an international office's engagement in international entrepreneurialism is affected by the strength of the forces encouraging entrepreneurialism at their particular institution.

SIOs 3, 4, 9, 16, and 20 explained that being entrepreneurial allows their offices to pay for new educational programming or in the case of SIO 4 to maintain existing levels of programming. Being entrepreneurial allows IO 9 to provide funding to some student organizations. SIO 16 believes it is incumbent on him to ensure that some of the fees study abroad students pay are used to provide programming and services to those students. SIO 20 uses revenue from some programs to fund other programs that do not generate revenue but are still important to offer to students. SIO 24 expressed frustration that the fees charged to international students have increased at HEI 24 without a corresponding increase in services for those students. Those fees are captured by HEI 24's upper administration, which has not provided IO 24 with additional funding despite the fee increase. Thus IO 24 serves as a revenue generator for the university. Having an international office serve as a revenue center crosses an important philosophical line in that students are paying fees that do not underwrite services they could benefit from. This potentially problematic scenario deserves additional attention and research.

One additional point should be considered when examining the impact of funding models that are tied to enrollments. The concept was only addressed by SIO 15 but most likely influenced the vast majority of international offices where revenue is tied to enrollments. Tying funding to enrollments encourages international offices to increase their enrollments and thus gives them incentives to make their programs attractive to students. As SIO 15 explained, “We have to figure out which programs are going to be most attractive to our customers.” Giving students this type of influence over their educational programming can certainly be positive in that their needs can be voiced and addressed. On the other hand, what students want is not always what is best for them. It is difficult to establish exactly how much control students should have over their education, but without doubt international offices should retain a certain degree of control over educational programming because their staff have a better understanding than students of how different kinds of international programs affect students and benefit them educationally.

Interestingly, no SIO discussed the impact of entrepreneurialism on student access. Academic capitalism has shown that as universities become increasingly entrepreneurial, access to educational services suffers, particularly among low income students. This concept is relevant to international offices that seek to generate revenue through user fees. As user fees are introduced and grow, lower income students will have less access to international education services. This may not have been mentioned for three reasons. One, SIOs may not be aware of the impact of higher fees on access (unlikely). Two, SIOs may not be comfortable acknowledging the negative impact that these changes are having on portions of their student population. Three, in some cases, entrepreneurialism may not be lessening student access. For example, education abroad offices that are funded by capturing the tuition paid by outbound

exchange students are not increasing the cost of education abroad to those students. Students continue to pay regular tuition, as if they were still on campus.

In general SIOs expressed that the education of their students is their most important priority. SIO 26 explained, “There’s definitely a sense of not just growth for revenue’s sake but really a sense of we need to take care of these students.” A review of the mission, vision, and value statements of interviewees’ international offices clearly supports this view. The student experience and student development are highlighted in most mission statements. IO 7’s mission statement explains that it has “a commitment to engagement at the international level, that we may educate active and responsible global citizens.” A report from an international education task force at HEI 13 has an entire section dedicated to student development. IO 26’s vision includes a “transformation of [students’] perceptions and attitudes toward other nations, peoples, and cultures, will instill in them a commitment to using the knowledge and skills acquired at the University to contribute positively to a more just, sustainable, and peaceful world.” The value statement of IO 21 reads “Education Abroad at [HEI 21] will provide academically-sound, international experiences for all [HEI 21] students, irrespective of demographic, academic discipline, or financial need, that promote intercultural competence, disciplinary scholarship and foreign language acquisition.” Mission and vision statements that do not express the importance of student development tend to focus on the international offices’ administrative responsibilities.

SIO 27 described how he balances education and entrepreneurialism: “we try to stay educators with an entrepreneurial spirit.” The use of the word “try” does suggest tension between these two priorities. SIO 2 acknowledged this tension: “It’s good that we have a standards organization like the [Forum for Education Abroad] to kind of make sure that people are still directing students to the program that’s right.” (The Forum publishes best practices that provide

international offices with ethical guidelines.) Despite these comments from SIOs 2 and 27, most SIOs reported that their educational and entrepreneurial goals generally align. By, for example, having enrollments tied to funding, SIOs are incentivized to offer international education services to a greater number of students. Although this may be largely true, some SIOs may be reluctant to disclose a need to sacrifice educational goals for reasons of revenue. Budgetary considerations are rarely discussed publically in statements and strategic plans. IO 29's mission statement briefly discusses the importance of cost-efficient study abroad programming. Efficiency is mentioned in IO 22's mission. HEI 12's campus internationalization plan talks about a summer language program based on a self-supporting business model. Public statements are unlikely to fully reflect the internal workings of any organization.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The separate topics of internationalization and entrepreneurialism in higher education have been studied extensively but often separately. Bridging these two subjects - how entrepreneurialism is affecting internationalization - has received limited empirical attention despite numerous observations that internationalization is becoming increasingly driven by a desire to generate revenue. A shift from academic to entrepreneurial motivations in internationalization impacts the strategies and activities that international offices choose to pursue. Changes in international strategies and activities have implications for universities as well as the students and communities that they serve. This study explored these changes. The impact of a shift towards entrepreneurial internationalization is explored by the primary research question of “How is entrepreneurialism influencing the strategies and activities of international offices in public U.S. universities?” Four additional sub-questions expanded upon this guiding research question:

- What forces are encouraging international offices to be entrepreneurial?
- How are the activities managed by international offices changing?
- How are the strategies of international offices changing?
- How are international offices balancing their educational and entrepreneurial goals?

Summary of the Findings

My findings were presented in four different parts: forces encouraging entrepreneurialism, activities, strategies, and balancing educational versus entrepreneurial priorities.

The first part, Forces Encouraging Entrepreneurialism, considered the external influences that encourage international offices to be entrepreneurial. Three primary factors result in international offices' increased engagement in entrepreneurial behaviors: the expectations of upper administrators, growing student demand for international services, and changes in funding. Upper administrators are increasingly interested in internationalization's ability to generate revenue; specifically, through tuition paid by international students. International offices are subject to more and more pressure to increase international enrollments in order to play an entrepreneurial role for their institutions. Demand for international services from students is also increasing. Enrollments in activities such as education abroad have grown quickly, challenging international offices to provide services to a greater number of students. Keeping up with student demand requires additional funding that is rarely available through general funds thus leaving international offices with the option of generating their own revenue. Finally, this study has found that international offices are increasingly responsible for their own funding. General funds are growing at a slower rate than international activities. Internationalization is developing rapidly on university campuses, driven primarily by student demand for services. Without general funding increases to pay for this growth, international offices are left with the prospect of generating their own revenue. Much of this revenue is being generated through user-pays funding models using both tuition capture and additional fees for the services provided by international offices.

The second part, Activities, examined how the activities of international offices have changed over time and how Senior International Officers expect them to change in the future. International offices are seeking revenue by engaging in innovative international activities. Entrepreneurial SIOs are pursuing revenue through activities that are new to the field of

international education. One activity that a number of SIOs are exploring and that has received a lot of attention when discussed at international education conferences is the international delivery of credit to foreign students. Some U.S. institutions are choosing to offer their courses abroad to foreign students. Although this has been done for some time at branch campuses, we now see U.S. HEIs engaging in this practice on the campuses of foreign universities rather than solely at branch campuses. The delivery of credit abroad to foreign students holds promise in light of clear demand for this service from students abroad. There are inherent risks, however, as was exemplified by IO 26 suspending their program due to concerns regarding the quality of the foreign students enrolled. SIO 18 expressed that his university is committing an excessive amount of resources to a similar program. International educators do not yet have a clear understanding of the best practices associated with the delivery of credit abroad to foreign students. A second relatively new activity in international education is the nurturing of international alumni. Former international students have historically been ignored by development offices that have focused on domestic alumni. International alumni are now being identified as potential donors to U.S. universities and are receiving increased attention from their alma maters. It is clear that the entrepreneurial spirit found in international offices has motivated SIOs to explore new and innovative activities, or in SIO 27's words to "generate revenue with innovative programming." A lack of financial support from central administrations is essentially encouraging exciting new developments in international education as SIOs look beyond traditional international activities. How long the current budgetary challenges in higher education last will impact the general funding outlook for international offices, and whether or not their staff continues to explore new activities in pursuit of revenue.

Entrepreneurial ambitions have also intensified the pursuit of established international activities. International offices are more often pursuing dual degrees with foreign partners and increasing their recruitment of international students. Both of these changes are based on the revenue associated with the out-of-state tuition paid by international students. Dual degrees serve as an indirect recruiting mechanism by bringing international students to campus once they have started degrees abroad. The sending institution serves as the recruiter. Out-of-state tuition generated by these recruitment activities can play an important role for universities trying to plug budgetary holes caused by decreasing state subsidies.

The third part of my findings, Strategies, looked at how entrepreneurialism is changing the strategies implemented by international offices. International offices have made two strategic changes in pursuit of revenue for the office or their institutions. One, international offices are changing how they pursue international student recruitment. International recruitment has traditionally been housed in either enrollment management or the international office. Universities are increasingly utilizing the expertise of both units in order to more successfully attract international students to campus. International offices provide international connections, an understanding of the international student market, and cultural understanding while enrollment management provides recruitment expertise. Two, international offices are strategically growing programming in order to generate revenue. Higher enrollments give SIOs a strong argument for increased funding when requesting allocations from central administrations. In addition, offices that are funded on a per-user model for particular activities increase their funding by developing those activities.

The final and fourth part of my findings exams how SIOs balance entrepreneurial needs with educational priorities. One must question whether the attention that SIOs give to generating

revenue for their offices distracts them from the task of serving students. This study found that variation exists in how different SIOs balance entrepreneurialism and educational goals. Some SIOs believe the two to be compatible while others feel tension between the two priorities. A variety of approaches are used by SIOs to balance entrepreneurialism with education.

Ultimately, SIOs expressed that serving students is their top priority despite pressures to generate revenue. Revenue generating activities are designed by SIOs around the primary goal of providing valuable educational experiences to the students of their institutions.

Entrepreneurialism is shaping the activities and strategies of international offices. A shortage of general funds is encouraging international offices to seek revenue through innovative internationalization activities and by increasing the volume of students they serve. These changes may have long-term effects on the field of international education as campus leaders recognize that international offices are able to generate their own revenue and therefore may feel less need to fund those offices. Future declines in funding may encourage international offices to be even more entrepreneurial than they are now, thus intensifying the changes identified in this study.

An unexpected finding of this research involves the misalignment of incentives and strategic goals. Senior university leadership should ensure that units are incentivized to engage in behaviors that serve the university's strategic goals. Funding models serve as an important incentive structures in that units will develop the activities that fund their offices. At some institutions, a misalignment seems to exist between institutional goals and the funding of international offices. Upper administrators have told SIOs that they want more international student on campus while international offices' funding models are not connected to international enrollments. Thus, international offices are being told to do one thing but rewarded to do something else. This misalignment will weaken some HEIs' ability to pursue their strategic

goals. Not only does this impact the institution, it impacts international offices. International offices benefit by being central to the core goals and missions of their institutions. SIOs that pursue activities that are not central to the goals of their institutions are moving their offices towards the periphery of their institutions. SIOs should therefore encourage their supervisors to align their international offices' funding mechanism with institutional strategic goals. Although this change would allow international offices to play more important roles for their institutions, it would weaken SIOs' power to prioritize the activities of their offices. A greater power to mold internationalization would be handed to upper administrators. This could impact the delivery of non-revenue-generating programming and thus should be carefully considered by SIOs. Further research is needed on this subject.

Contribution to the Literature

Through my research I wanted to understand how entrepreneurialism is affecting the internationalization of public U.S. universities. My findings suggest that opportunities for revenue are shaping how internationalization is pursued. International offices are engaging in new activities such as delivering credit to foreign students in their home country, nurturing international alumni, and more actively pursuing established activities that generate revenue. There is also more collaboration between international offices and enrollment management in order to leverage the expertise of both units, with the end goal of bringing more international students to campus. My findings also revealed that although Senior International Officers see some tension between educational and entrepreneurial priorities, most prioritize the student experience.

My research contributes both theoretical and practical knowledge to literature on higher education. On the theoretical front, this study has clarified the impact of entrepreneurialism on campus internationalization. Although studies have discussed how higher tuition rates for international students has encouraged international recruitment, research has rarely gone beyond international recruitment to look more broadly at all international activities. This study has shown that entrepreneurialism affects, to some degree, almost all activities and strategies pursued by international offices. Some activities and strategies are especially important because of their ability to provide funding to a HEI. Activities such as education abroad that do not generate revenue for an institution are often pursued in such a way that revenue is generated for the international office. Future studies on campus internationalization should therefore take entrepreneurialism into account as a significant force shaping international activities and strategies.

On the practical front, international educators must understand that their field is being shaped by entrepreneurialism. International education professionals operate in an interconnected academic ecosystem in which their priorities are shaped by the needs of institutions. In interviews for this study, SIOs generally expressed that their superiors focused on the budgetary impact of internationalization while the international office was responsible for educational priorities. These different priorities must be balanced and managed by SIOs. International offices are therefore left to be the voice on campus for the educational benefits of internationalization. Vocalizing and pursuing those benefits requires international educators to understand how entrepreneurialism is shaping internationalization in order to assess whether strategies and activities are developing in a manner that will benefit students. The international education community should be conscious of the changes occurring in their field in order to steer

those changes in a way that benefits not only HEIs' and international offices' budgets, but students and possibly the broader communities served by institutions.

My research has also contributed to the development of academic capitalism theory. Authors such as Sheila Slaughter and Gary Rhoades (2004) and Sheila Slaughter and Larry Leslie (1997) have explained how entrepreneurialism has impacted colleges and universities. This study expands upon academic capitalism by exploring how entrepreneurialism impacts individual administrative units within HEIs. University leaders not only engage in academic capitalism by identifying revenue sources for their institutions, but also by encouraging different parts of their institutions to be entrepreneurial. That pressure then shapes the activities and strategies of those units. Although this study explained how international offices are engaging in entrepreneurialism, one would expect such engagement to happen in other units on campus. An understanding of how academic capitalism impacts individual units requires researchers to move from a macro to micro-view of academic capitalism. Academic capitalism has, as shown in this study, impacted campus internationalization. But how have student affairs, university libraries, academic support services, and individual academic departments been affected? Have changes in these units impacted student access? If so, what are the long-term implications of changes in access? A shift towards a micro-view of academic capitalism could provide a deeper understanding of how academic capitalism has permeated our higher education institutions.

Some work on the micro-view of academic capitalism has been done in discussions around the role of interstitial organizations and how they contribute to academic capitalism (Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Interstitial organizations are, in the case of higher education, multiple units within a university that engage in a particular activity and eventually cause the university to view that activity as important. The collective weight of these organizations has

contributed to the development of academic capitalism in higher education. This study has shown international offices to be one of these interstitial organizations. Although this research has shown that entrepreneurial behaviors are encouraged in international offices in part by university leadership, SIOs have also played a role in the development of international entrepreneurialism. As interstitial organizations, international offices are contributing to the development of academic capitalism at an institutional level.

This research also contributes to Neo-institutional Theory, particularly coercive and normative isomorphism. Coercive isomorphism explains that organizations become increasingly similar over time due to their shared political environments. This study has shown that a driving force behind entrepreneurial internationalization is a shortage of general funds. General funds have been in short supply in U.S. higher education since the recession of 2009, when political support for funding higher education weakened. International offices are engaging in the same behavior, entrepreneurial internationalization, in reaction to weakened political support for higher education. Normative isomorphism explains that organizations become increasingly homogenous as their fields are professionalized. Although the effect of the professionalization of international education on entrepreneurialism was not discussed by SIOs, it is likely that professional bodies have contributed to the interest in revenue and how revenue is pursued. Organizations such as NAFSA: Association of International Educators host conference sessions that discuss entrepreneurial activities and funding mechanisms. In addition, networking events at conferences present opportunities for SIOs to talk about what is happening in their offices including budgetary matters. Members of these professional bodies therefore see successes and failures in entrepreneurial internationalization and are lead towards those practices that have

worked for their peers. International educators also see the attention paid to entrepreneurialism by their peers and may feel a need to do the same.

This research expands upon neo-institutional theory by showing that relationships exist between different isomorphic pressures. Political views towards higher education in the U.S. (coercive isomorphism) have largely driven attention paid to entrepreneurialism by professional international education bodies (normative isomorphism). Professional organizations would likely not run as many conference sessions that discuss funding issues if universities had not encountered funding cuts due to the 2009 recession. This expansion of neo-institutional theory also applies to mimetic isomorphism - change resulting from organizations' similar responses to uncertainty. As the future of higher education funding became increasingly uncertain during the recession, HEIs responded by increasing alternative sources of revenue. Thus a coercive change (political support through funding) resulted in mimetic response (reacting to this uncertainty through entrepreneurialism). It is important to understand that isomorphic forces are interconnected and do not exist in isolation.

Implications for Practice

This study has shown that entrepreneurialism is changing the strategies and activities of international offices. These changes are being driven by market forces rather than a decision that change is needed to better serve students. This is a cause for concern and must be considered by the international education community. Market-driven changes may result in positive changes for students but considering the externalities⁸ inherent in education markets, it is worth ensuring that the educational priorities of international offices are not squeezed out. While SIOs should

⁸ See positionality statement in Chapter 3 for more information on externalities in higher education.

take responsibility for ensuring a sound educational component to programming, professional bodies such as NAFSA and the Forum for Education Abroad could play an important role in developing best practices regarding how revenue-generating activities should complement educational priorities. The Forum has done so to a limited degree by producing guidelines on the financial arrangements between education abroad offices and third party education abroad providers. Professional bodies should provide guidance on appropriate levels of fees for international education services. The SECUSSA list serve for international educators regularly sees posts from members asking about how much their peers charge for education abroad or international student fees. This information is clearly in demand. In addition, professional organizations should publish guidelines on how to treat education abroad programs that cost less than home tuition. International offices would benefit from guidance regarding ethical and legal implications of charging students their home tuition, paying the education abroad program directly, and keeping the difference.

International offices will need to adapt to the changing international education landscape. As new activities are introduced to the field, international education professionals will need to develop the knowledge-base and skill set necessary to manage these new activities. Senior International Officers may need to receive training in business principles such as negotiations, marketing, strategic development, and economics. Presidents and provosts might increasingly look for SIOs with business backgrounds to complement the international and education-based skill sets that many SIOs already have. Professional organizations should offer training sessions on these topics and how they can be applied to international education. Although business backgrounds are increasingly important in the new international education landscape, so are SIOs with a deep understanding of campus internationalization. This research suggests that

successful entrepreneurial SIOs have a clear understanding of internationalization activities and how they must be pursued and managed if they are to generate resources for an institution. A clear understanding results from training in internationalization and experience in the field. This indicates that international education as a field is becoming increasingly professionalized. An era of having faculty without experience in international education step in as SIOs may be coming to a close.

This research also indicates that SIOs need to carefully consider how their offices are funded. As international offices are expected to become increasingly entrepreneurial, where those offices find revenue has the potential to steer them off-course. SIOs must ensure that their funding mechanisms encourage activities that both further their internationalization visions as well as contribute to the strategic goals of their institutions. International offices are best positioned close to the core of their institutions by contributing to fundamental strategic goals. A central, rather than peripheral, position helps ensure that a unit will have the political support to thrive in an organization (Hackman, 1985). SIOs should negotiate for funding mechanisms that encourage activities that are of strategic importance to their HEIs. An alignment of incentives through funding mechanisms and the goals of the institutions will result in international offices that play more important roles for their institutions and thus are more highly valued by university leadership.

In addition to implications for U.S. universities, this research also has implications for HEIs outside of the United States. Certain activities in international education involve competition for a limited number of resources or students. For example, international student recruitment involves competition among universities to attract a limited pool of internationally-mobile students to their campuses. Greater competition for a finite number of students will

affect universities worldwide, including those that have been recruiting for a long time. The growth of international recruitment identified in this study will impact foreign universities trying to attract international students as they now face growing competition from U.S. universities. This study also found increasing pressure on enrollments in education abroad. Education abroad units may feel the need to reduce minimum requirements for their programs in order to recruit more students. Doing so would impact foreign universities that would host lower quality U.S. students on short-term study abroad programs.

A second implication that impacts universities worldwide is the fact that SIOs interviewed in this study were clearly part of a larger ecosystem. This research found that the degree to which SIOs engage in entrepreneurialism is influenced by the policies and expectations of their supervisors. Entrepreneurialism is encouraged or discouraged by policies regarding the allocations of general funds and expectations regarding the strategies and activities that international offices will pursue. Some SIOs operate in a professional environment supportive of risk-taking and the pursuit of revenue. It should therefore be clear to presidents and provosts that SIOs are not operating in isolation. The general environment present in HEIs will impact the behaviors of international offices and other university units. This can impact hiring decisions. An entrepreneurial SIO is less likely to be hired by a fiscally conservative university as both the hiring committee and the job applicant may not see a clear fit. Presidents and provosts that want to see greater international entrepreneurialism should therefore not only try and hire entrepreneurial SIOs, but ensure that they have created an environment that supports risk-taking and the pursuit of revenue.

Implications for Research

This study has shown the impact of entrepreneurialism in internationalization beyond traditional international student recruitment. New international activities are being practiced as international offices increasingly focus on revenue-generation. The new activity of international delivery of credit to foreign students is not well understood and could have substantial implications for enrolled foreign students and the reputation and investments of universities. Research should be conducted to provide guidance to international offices interested in engaging in this activity. Studies could look at what has caused some of these projects to succeed and others to fail.

This research provided a summary of the activities that fund international offices. Further research should be conducted on what percentage of international offices' total budgets come from particular activities. Budgetary contributions can be tracked to monitor the development of entrepreneurialism in international education. By comparing, over time, financial contributions from certain activities to international office engagement in those activities, researchers can gauge the role of revenue in international offices' decisions to pursue particular activities. This information would allow studies to better understand if particular activities are not pursued due to a lack of financial returns. Additionally, an in-depth analysis of funding mechanisms would allow for a better understanding of how effectively SIOs are engaging in international entrepreneurialism. It is unclear whether or not international offices are using full financial analyses to guide their entrepreneurial behaviors. A better understanding of the costs associated with entrepreneurial activities would allow researchers to discover whether these activities are in fact generating profits.

Future research should also seek to understand which sources of revenue pay for particular international offices expenses. For example, how are salaries paid? Are international student fees spent exclusively on programming for international students? Connecting revenues to expenses would allow researchers to clarify if and how particular international education activities are subsidizing other activities. If subsidization is found to be happening, the question of whether or not it is appropriate to subsidize some students with the fees of others could then be addressed.

Most importantly, the field of higher education needs further research on funding models and their role as incentive structures. The fact that upper administrators are not connecting international office funding with desired behaviors is a missed opportunity to further the strategic goals of a university. This disconnect is probably also happening in other units. University leadership can use funding mechanisms to align their international offices with strategic goals, something that is especially important during a time of intensifying competition in the higher education market.

International education is changing in fundamental ways as new motivations drive the internationalization agenda. Academic capitalism, a force shown to have permeated higher education institutions, is affecting the strategies and activities pursued by international offices. Changing strategies and activities will profoundly impact campus internationalization as the costs of services change for students, new and innovative programming is offered, and students are more actively recruited to engage in international activities. International offices are expected to increasingly prioritize activities based on their ability to generate revenue. One hopes that the alignment of entrepreneurial and educational priorities described by SIOs in this study will continue. University leaders may increasingly ask international offices to generate

their own funding as it becomes clearer that international offices have the ability to do so. The future of campus internationalization is tied to academic capitalism. If academic capitalism continues to play a more influential role at our universities, the changes identified in this study will become the new normal in international education.

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

This survey is part of a study designed to explore how the internationalization of American public universities is changing. I will be asking you 9 questions and 8 sub-questions regarding your university's international engagement. Your responses will not be used beyond this study without your permission. This study is entirely voluntary. You may withdraw from the study at any time. The identity of interviewees and their institutions will not be publically reported. Thank you for participating.

1. What are your responsibilities at the University of _____?
2. Please describe the international activities that your office is responsible for.
 - a. Are the international activities that you just described different than the activities that your office was responsible for ten years ago? If so, how are they different?
 - b. If so, why has your office changed the international activities that it is responsible for?

Probe -> If entrepreneurialism is not mentioned, ask if a need to generate revenue has motivated changes in activities.

3. How do you foresee your office's international activities changing in the coming five years?
 - a. Why will your office move in the direction that you have just described?

Probe -> If external motivators (outside of the international office) are not discussed, ask if external motivations play a role in changing responsibilities.

4. What international activities are considered to be a priority in your office?

- a. Why are these activities especially important?

Probe -> If external pressures (outside of the international office) are not discussed, ask if external pressures, beyond the international office, play a role in prioritizing activities.

5. How is your office funded?

6. Have your funding sources changed in the past ten years? If so, how?
 - a. If so, why do you think your funding sources have changed?
7. How do you expect your funding to change in the coming five years?
 - a. Why do you expect these changes in funding?
8. Do you feel a need for your international office to be entrepreneurial?
 - a. If so, why do you feel a need to be entrepreneurial?
 - b. If so, how has entrepreneurialism influenced the management of your international office?
9. If a need to be entrepreneurial is identified: How do you balance your office's educational and entrepreneurial priorities?

APPENDIX B: CODES

The following codes and sub-codes were used to organize the information obtained in interviews.

Activities

- Past activities
- Current activities
- Future activities
- Priorities

Strategies

- Change in strategy
- Incentives

Guiding Forces

- HEI need to generate revenue
- International Office need to generate revenue
- International Office educational
- Central Admin
- Beyond the university
- Student demand

Funding

- Out of State Tuition
- International student fee
- Central Administration Funding
- Study Abroad
- English as a Second Language Program
- Change
- Opportunistic

Entrepreneurialism

- Education vs. entrepreneurialism
- Alignment

REFERENCES

- Aarrevaara, T., Dobson, I., & Elander, C. (2009). Brave new world: Higher education reform in Finland. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 21, 89-106.
- Adams, T. (2007). The development of international education in Australia: a framework for the future. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3/4), 410-420.
- Adams, T., Leventhal, M., and Connelly, S. (2012). International student recruitment in Australia and the United States: approaches and attitudes. In H. de Wit, D. Deardorff, J.D. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of International Higher Education*, pp. 399-416. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Altbach, P. and Knight, J. (2006). The Internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *The NEA 2006 Almanac of Higher Education*. National Education Association. Retrieved from http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/pga/pdf/Altbach-Knight_2007.pdf
- Asteris, M. (2006). British universities: the “coal exporters” of the 21st century. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10(3), 224-240.
- Banks, M. and Bhandari, R. (2012). Global student mobility. In H. de Wit, D. Deardorff, J.D. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of International Higher Education*, pp. 325-342. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Becker, R. F. J. (2009). *International branch campuses: Markets and strategies*. London, UK: The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education.

- Bevis, T. (2002). At a glance: International students in the United States. *International Educator Summer* (5), 12-17.
- Bhandari, R. and Chow, P. (2011). *Open doors: Report on international educational exchange*. New York: Institute of International Education.
- Bloom, D. (2005). Raising the pressure: Globalization and the need for higher education reform. In G. Jones, P. McCarney, and M. Skolnik (Eds.), *Creating knowledge strengthening nations: The changing role of higher education*. pp. 21-41. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Böhm, A., Follari, M., Hewett, A., Jones, S., Kemp, N., Meares, D., et al. (2004). *Forecasting international student mobility—A UK perspective*. London: British Council, Universities UK and IDP Education.
- Brockington, J. (2002). Moving from international vision to institutional reality: Administrative and financial models for education abroad at liberal arts colleges. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 6 (3), 283-291.
- Bureau of Economic Analysis (2012). U.S. Department of Commerce. Retrieved from <http://bea.gov/international/>
- Burgess, P. and Berquist, B. (2012). Cross-border delivery: projects, programs, and providers. In H. de Wit, D. Deardorff, J.D. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of International Higher Education*, pp. 325-342. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Burn, B. (2002). The curriculum as a global domain. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 6(3), 253-261.

- Burnett, S. and Huisman, J. (2010). Universities' responses to globalization: the influence of organizational culture. *Journal of Studies in International Education*. 14(2), 117-142.
- Cai, Y. and Kivisto, J. (2011). Tuition fees for international students in Finland: where to go from here? *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 1028315311429001, 1-24.
- Carbone, J. and Winston, G. (2004). Saving, wealth, performance, and revenues, in U.S. colleges and universities. *The Review of Higher Education*, 28(1), 97-128.
- Clark, B. (1998). *Creating entrepreneurial universities: Organizational pathways of transformation*. Oxford: International Association of Universities and Elsevier Science Ltd.
- Commission on the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Fellowship Program (2005). Global competence and national needs. Washington, D.C. Retrieved from:
<http://www.nafsa.org/resourcelibrary/default.aspx?id=16035>
- Cornell Cosmopolitan Club (1913). The students of the world and international conciliation. Eith international congress of students. *Souvenir Book*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell Cosmopolitan Club. As cited in Glazier, L. and Kenschaft, L. (2002). Welcome to America: The World War I era and the rise of international education in the United States. *International Educator* Summer (5), 5-11.
- Creswell, J. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Davies, J. (1992). Developing a strategy for internationalization in universities: Towards a conceptual framework. In C. Klasek (Ed.) *Bridges to the future: Strategies for*

- internationalizing higher education*, pp. 177-190. Carbondale: Association of International Education Administration.
- deWit, H. (Ed). (1995). *Strategies of internationalization of higher education. A comparative study of Australia, Canada, Europe and the United States*. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.
- DiMaggio, P., and Powell, W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147-160.
- Duke, C. (2002). Cyberbole, commerce, and internationalization: desperate hope and desperate fear. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 6(2), 93-114.
- Ehrenberg, R. (2003). Reaching for the brass ring: The U.S. News & World Report rankings and competition. *The Review of Higher Education* 26(2), 145-62.
- Fischer, K. (2008). Yale plans multi-million dollar expansion of its presence in India. The Chronicle of Higher Education. November 28. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Yale-Plans-Multimillion-Dol/11517/>
- Fischer, K. (2010). In economic downturn colleges eye international education: cut back or forge ahead? The Chronicle of Higher Education. August 29. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/In-Economic-Downturn-Colleges/124167/>
- Garrett, R. (2004). *Transnational delivery by UK higher education, Part I: Innovation and competitive advantage*. London, UK: The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education.
- Glazier, L. and Kenschaft, L. (2002). Welcome to America: The World War I era and the rise of international education in the United States. *International Educator* Summer (5), 5-11.

- Green, M.F., Marmolejo, F., and Egron-Polak, E. (2012). The internationalization of higher education: future prospects. In H. de Wit, D. Deardorff, J.D. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of International Higher Education*, pp. 439-???. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hackman, J.D. (1985). Power and centrality in the allocation of resources in colleges and universities. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30(1), 61-77.
- Harmon, G. (2006). Australia as a higher education exporter. *International Higher Education*. Retrieved March 20, 2006, from http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/newsletter/News30/text001.htm
- Hawthorne, L. (2012) Designer immigrants? International students and two-step migration. In H. de Wit, D. Deardorff, J.D. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of International Higher Education*, pp. 417-433. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Heyl, J.D. and Tullbane, J. (2012). Leadership in international higher education. . In H. de Wit, D. Deardorff, J.D. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of International Higher Education*, pp. 113-131. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hira, A. (2003). *The brave new world of international education*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- Hoffa, W. (2000). A history of US study abroad: Beginnings to 1965. Lancaster, PA: Frontiers and The Forum on Education Abroad.

- Hudzik, J. (2009). Campus-based models to support internationalization: principles, prerequisites, and an example. AIEC Annual Conference, October. Retrieved from: <http://www.nafsa.org/resourcelibrary/default.aspx?id=18956>
- Hudzik, J.K. and Stohl, M. (2012). Comprehensive and strategic internationalization of U.S. higher education. In H. de Wit, D. Deardorff, J.D. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of International Higher Education*, pp. 61-81. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Jencks, C. and Riesman, D. (1977). *The academic revolution*, Chapter 4. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Johns, G. (2004). *The global value of education and training exports to the UK economy*. London: The British Council and UKTI.
- Keller, G. (1983). *Academic strategy: The management revolution in American higher education*. Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Knight, J. (2003a). GATS, trade and higher education: perspective 2003 – where are we? The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education. United Kingdom.
- Knight, J. (2003). Updated internationalization definition. *International Higher Education*, 33(summer). Retrieved from http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/newsletter/News33/Newslet33.htm
- Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(spring), 5-31.

- Knight, J. (2005). An internationalization model: responding to new realities and challenges. In H. de Wit, I.C. Jaramillo, and J. Gacel-Avila (Eds.), *Higher Education in Latin America: The International Dimension*, pp. 1-38. Washington D.C.: The World Bank.
- Knight, J. (2007). Internationalization brings important benefits as well as risks. *International Higher Education*, 46(winter).
- Knight, J. (2012). Concepts, rationales, and interpretive frameworks in the internationalization of higher education. In H. de Wit, D. Deardorff, J.D. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of International Higher Education*, pp. 27-43. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Knight, J., & deWit, H. (1995). Strategies for internationalisation of higher education: historical and conceptual perspectives. In H. deWit (Ed.), *Strategies for Internationalisation of Higher Education: A Comparative Study of Australia, Canada, Europe, and the United States of America*. Amsterdam: European Association of International Education.
- Knight, J., & deWit, H. (Eds.). (1997). *Internationalization of higher education in Asia Pacific countries*. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.
- Knight, J., & de Wit, H. (Eds.). (1999). *Quality and internationalisation in higher education*. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation & Development.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lee, Jenny J. & Helm, Matthew (in press). Student affairs capitalism. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*.

- Lewin, T. (2008). Lawsuit Takes Aim at College's Billing Practices for Study Abroad. The New York Times. March 9. Obtained from <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/03/09/education/09studyabroad.html>.
- Marginson, S. and Rhoades, G. (2002). Beyond national states, markets, and systems of higher education: A glonacal agency heuristic. *Higher Education* 43, 281–309.
- Marginson, S. and van der Wende, M. (2009). The new global landscape of nations and institutions. In OECD Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (Ed.), *Higher Education to 2030, Volume 2: Globalisation*. pp. 17-57. OECD.
- Marshall, C. and Rossman, G. (2006). *Designing qualitative research* (4th Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mazzarol, T., Soutar, G., and Seng, M. (2003). The third wave: Future trends in international education. *The International Journal of Educational Management* 17(3), 90-99.
- McLendon, M., Hearn, J., and Deaton, R. (2006). Called to account: Analyzing the origins and spread of state performance-accountability policies for higher education. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 28(1), 1–24.
- Mitchell, D. E., & Nielsen, S. Y. (2012). Internationalization and Globalization in Higher Education. Obtained from http://cdn.intechopen.com/pdfs/38270/InTech-Internationalization_and_globalization_in_higher_education.pdf
- NAFSA (2010). Senator Paul Simon Study Abroad Foundation Act. Retrieved from <http://www.nafsa.org/publicpolicy/default.aspx?id=6692>

- OECD (2009). Higher education to 2030: Globalisation (Volume 2). Retrieved from http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=TM5oXHquY74C&oi=fnd&pg=PT91&dq=university+international+branch+campus&ots=osn1CEzk_V&sig=A-v-6Tz480ldHirs3MHK_s4kAK8#v=onepage&q=university%20international%20branch%20campus&f=true
- Olcott, Jr., D. (2009). Global connections to global partnerships: Navigating the changing landscape of internationalism and cross-border higher education. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, 57(1), 1 - 9.
- Olcott, Jr., D. (2009, October). Back to the UK future: Trends in internationalism and cross-border higher education. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 13(4), 98-103.
- Ordorika, I. and Pusser, B. (2007). Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México as a state-building university. In P.G. Altbach and J. Balán (Eds.), *Transforming research universities in Asia and Latin America: World class worldwide*. pp. 189-215. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Rizzo, J. (2004). *A (less than) zero sum game? State funding for public higher education: How public higher education institutions have lost*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, NY.
- Roherty, B.M. (1997). The price of passive resistance in financing higher education. In P. Callan and J. Finney (Eds.), *Public and Private Financing of Higher Education*. pp. 3-29. Westport, CT: The Oryx Press.
- Rumbley, L.E., Altbach, P.G., and Reisberg, L. (2012). Internationalization within the higher education context. In H. de Wit, D. Deardorff, J.D. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.), *The SAGE*

- Handbook of International Higher Education*, pp. 3-27. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ryan, M. (2003). Contemporary issues in student housing finance. In Schuh, J. H. (Ed.). *Contemporary financial issues in student affairs* (pp. 59-71). New Directions for Student Services, 103. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Scott, P. (1998). Massification, internationalization, and globalization. In P. Scott (Ed.), *The globalization of higher education* (pp. 108-129). Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Scott, P. (2000). Globalization in higher education: Challenges for the 21st century. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 4(spring), 3-10.
- Shams, F. and Huisman, J. (2012). Managing offshore branch campuses: an analytical framework for institutional strategies. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 16(2), 106-127.
- Shanghai Ranking Consultancy (2011). Academic ranking of world universities. <http://www.arwu.org/>
- Slaughter, S. (1998). ASHE presidential speech: Federal policy and supply-side institutional resource allocation at public research universities. *The Review of Higher Education*, 21(3), 209-244.
- Slaughter, S. and Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Slaughter, S. & Rhoades, G. (1996). The emergence of a competitive research and development policy coalition and the commercialization of academic science and technology. *Science, Technology, and Human Values*, 21(3), 303-39.

- Slaughter, S. and Rhoades, G. (2004). Chapter 12 from *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*. Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1997). *Grounded theory in practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Taylor, J. (2004). Towards a strategy for internationalisation: lessons and practice from four universities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8 (2), 149-171.
- Tolbert, P. (1985). Institutional environments and resource dependence: Sources of administrative structure in institutions of higher education. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 30(1), 1-13.
- Trondal, J. (2002). The Europeanisation of research and higher educational policies. *European Integration Online Papers*, 6(12). Retrieved from <http://eiop.or.at/eiop/texte/2002-012.htm>
- University Communications (2009). ABOR to discuss system realignment, numerous UA projects. UA News. June 17. Obtained from <http://uanews.org/node/26035>.
- Van de Water, J. (2000). The international office: taking a closer look. *International Educator*, 30 (Spring), 30-33.
- Vincent-Lancrin, S. (2009). Cross-border higher education: trends and perspectives. In OECD Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (Ed.), *Higher Education to 2030, Volume 2: Globalisation*. pp. 63-86. OECD.
- Volk, C., Slaughter, S., and Thomas, S. (2001). Models of institutional resource allocation: Mission, market, and gender. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 72(4), 387-413.

- Walters, D. and Adams, T. (2001). Global reach through a strategic operations approach: an Australian case study. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 5(4), 269-290.
- Waters, M. (2001) *Globalization* (2nd Edition). New York, NY: Routledge Publishing.
- Welch, A. (2012). Opportunistic entrepreneurialism and internationalisation of higher education: Lessons from the antipodes? *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 10(3), 295-315.
- Williams, G. and Kitaev, I. (2005). Overview of national policy contexts for entrepreneurialism in higher education institutions. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 17 (3), 125-141.
- Wit, H.D. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States and Europe: a historical, comparative, and conceptual analysis*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Ylijoki, O. (2003). Entangled in academic capitalism? A case-study on changing ideals and practices of university research. *Higher Education* 45(3), 307-35.