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Abstract

This research study investigated the perceptions of academic advisors in the Florida College System (FCS) concerning globalization, internationalization, and their role in the process of internationalizing their colleges. Participants in the study included 54 academic advisors from 15 of the 28 colleges in the FCS. The sample was comprised primarily of female advisors with master’s degrees, who had been working in higher education for less than 13 years. This was a nonexperimental, quantitative study and analyses included descriptive statistics, ordinary least squares regression, and Pearson’s product moment correlations.

The results revealed that the responding advisors believe that globalization is inevitable and good, and that colleges must prepare to face any challenges that result from it. They also indicated that the advisors thought colleges should engage in several strategies that could lead to progress in internationalization, including international exchanges of faculty and staff, study abroad opportunities for students, and the development of collaborative relationships between their college and foreign institutions. Advisors also indicated relatively strong support for the assertions that globalization and internationalization were important, and would continue to increase in importance going forward. They also generally agreed with the concept that academic advisors should be involved in the process of internationalization at their colleges, but their agreement in this instance was not as strong as it was when discussing globalization and internationalization more generally.

In contrast, advisors did not as readily agree that students should take additional courses in foreign language, or that colleges should actively recruit foreign students. The majority of
advisors also rejected the idea that the college should adopt a broad, international/global definition of diversity that includes language, customs, and ethnicity. They did not as readily envision the role of academic advisors in the process of internationalization to be as important or necessary as the overall concept of progress in the areas of internationalization and globalization. That is, advisors indicated more agreement with the theory, but not as much agreement with the practice, of internationalization as it relates to their job responsibilities.
Chapter One

Introduction

Although globalization is not a new phenomenon, the pace of globalization began to accelerate rapidly after the World Wars of the last century (Smithee, 2012). Along with globalization has come an increasing trend toward internationalization, the process by which institutions of higher education foster global competence, as well. Internationalization became a political priority in the United States for higher education in particular because of the launch of Sputnik, the first successful human-produced satellite, in 1957 by the Soviet Union (Clark, 2013; Jolly, 2009). One immediate response from the United States was the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958 (Clark, 2013; Ayers & Palmadessa, 2015; Jolly, 2009). The NDEA provided funding for students in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) as well as study in foreign languages (Jolly, 2009; Mohr, 2017). In particular, the foreign language component of that act was a precursor to some aspects of internationalization as it later developed in institutions of higher education.

With regard to globalization, businesses and political interests initially led the charge, but institutions of higher education and leaders in education began to move toward a more global focus in the 1960s with the passage of the International Education Act (IEA) (Arum & Van de Water, 1992; Standish, 2014). The lack of funding for that effort caused it to be mostly ineffective, but at least those in positions of authority began to focus attention on the issue of internationalization in education (Arum & Van de Water, 1992). After the government began to direct attention toward the issue of internationalization in education, other stakeholders in higher
education also began to recognize the need to address the issue (Harder, 2010). Not only did leaders in institutions of higher education respond to the new government focus on internationalization, but eventually other associations and organizations such as the American Council on Education (ACE) began to promote and support internationalization in higher education as well (Clark, 2013; Harder, 2010; Smithee, 2012).

The need to internationalize universities seems to be a foregone conclusion to many at this point, but some still question what role, if any, internationalization should take at the community colleges (Harder, 2010). Over the last two decades in particular, universities have begun to emphasize the need to internationalize, but community colleges have been somewhat slower to take up the challenge, and many of them still do not include internationalization as a central goal (Brennan & Dellow, 2013). Some claim the community college exists to serve only the local community, some decry the woeful state of financial support and begrudge any dollar spent on anything deemed by them to be of secondary importance, and others find a host of other reasons to resist internationalization (Agnew, 2012; Brennan & Dellow, 2013; O’Connor, 2009).

More recently it has become increasingly popular for community colleges to claim they value internationalization, and although much progress has been made in this area, measuring the level of that commitment remains at best an inexact science (Bissonette & Woodin, 2013; Harder, 2010). There is no single measurement that can summarize the level of true commitment that a college has made to the process of internationalization, and the task of differentiating between stated goals and concrete actions is sometimes daunting. One possible way to measure the level of internationalization at a college is the American Council on Education College Survey (Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement, 2012; Clark, 2013; Harder, 2010). The Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE), a program of the
American Council on Education (ACE), conducted the nationwide survey aimed at mapping internationalization in institutions of higher education throughout the United States of America in 2001, 2006, and 2011. According to the 2012 report, the Mapping Internationalization on U.S. Campuses Project is “The only comprehensive source of data on internationalization in all sectors of U.S. higher education” (Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement, 2012, p. 4). According to the 2006 ACE survey, there has been an increase in efforts to pursue internationalization at community colleges, but the results are not uniform across colleges in different settings such as urban, suburban, and rural (Harder, 2010).

Another possible indicator of intent to pursue internationalization could be its inclusion in the mission statement of an institution of higher education. Recently it has become more popular to include internationalization, global citizenship, or something similar in the mission statements of universities (Hser, 2005; Stevens, 2012), but a survey of universities in Colorado revealed only about one-fourth of them had internationalization or significant components of it explicitly mentioned in their mission statements (Theobald, 2008). The literature concerning internationalization in community colleges is not as well developed, and the type of data analyzed in the Colorado study are not as readily available (Ayers, 2015). In his 2011 study in which he analyzed the mission statements of 421 community colleges in 43 states, Ayers discovered the unsurprising fact that community colleges from more urban settings as well as those with larger size were more likely to mention a global context for the organizational mission. This is consistent with the expectation that community colleges that are larger as well as those from more heavily populated areas will exhibit a higher degree of internationalization (Clark, 2013; Harder, 2010). In all, less than 20% (82 out of 421) of the mission statements in
Ayers’ study placed the mission of the college in a global context, and even then it was not an integral part of the mission, but rather more of a background issue (Ayers, 2011).

Many developments have influenced internationalization in higher education in general, and in community colleges in particular, even as the pace of internationalization has accelerated. For example, the end of the cold war precipitated a shift in perspective away from traditional political concerns to more economic issues, particularly as they relate to the need for workforce training (Romano & Dellow, 2009). The transition from the traditional model of higher education as a broad-based, liberal arts experience to a more specific preparation for a particular career was accompanied by a new set of expectations for institutions of higher education, and workforce development is seen by many as the main raison d'être for colleges and universities (Gouveia, 2010). In that context, there is increased pressure on community colleges to produce graduates who are simultaneously both globally competent and specifically trained for a particular career (Romano & Dellow, 2009). This seems to support the position that workforce development should take precedence over a liberal arts education, but the current economic context dictates that most workers will change not only jobs but also careers many times throughout their working life (Gouveia, 2010; Levin, 2000; Romano & Dellow, 2009). In that case, a broad-based liberal arts education emphasizing critical thinking skills, communicative competency, and global awareness would be more likely to prepare graduates for the adjustments needed as they transition from one career to another, rather than a narrowly focused curriculum designed primarily to train graduates for one specific career (Dellow, 2007; Gouveia, 2010; Ng, Choudhuri, Noonan, & Ceballos, 2012; Robson, 2011).

Regardless of the position a researcher may take with regard to the need for postsecondary education to consist primarily of workforce training or to include a more broad-
based, liberal arts education, changes in the global economy, along with the economic boom of
the 1990’s and the accompanying acceleration of development in the realms of technology and
telecommunications, necessitated significant progress in the area of internationalization (Dellow,
2007; Friedman, 2007; Wagner, 2008). As Friedman posited in his 2007 book The World Is Flat,
the advantages previously enjoyed by developed nations such as the United States of America
are being removed quickly by the dissemination of information and technology. He quoted
Nandan Nilekani, the CEO of Infosys Technologies Limited in Bangalore, India, who said, “The
playing field is being leveled” (Friedman, 2007, p. 7). In many ways, the new global milieu into
which the graduates of U.S. community colleges are being thrust requires an entirely new
perspective on exactly what “workforce development” actually entails, and the responsibility of
community colleges to prepare graduates for that workforce now includes not only traditional
components but also new, global components as well (Romano & Dellow, 2009; Robson, 2011;
Wagner, 2008).

Trepidation surrounding the proclaimed crisis known as Y2K at the end of the
millennium was soon forgotten as the understanding and focus of policymakers in the United
States of America and many other nations subsequently were affected significantly by the events
of September 11, 2001 (Treat & Hagedorn, 2013). The initial fear and distrust that followed the
attacks of that day slowly transitioned into a new push for increased understanding and
engagement of those who hold a perspective different from that of many local communities in
the United States (Treat & Hagedorn, 2013). The need for global understanding and cooperation
today is greater than it has been at any time in the past, especially as communication and
commerce are no longer as restricted by space and time as they once were. The worker of the
twenty-first century must be ready to compete globally for jobs even in the local market
As students enter the community college and begin the process of obtaining a degree or credential, it is imperative that they have relevant guidance with regard to how they can best prepare themselves to compete in the global job market. One key group of people that can have a significant influence on the students as they make important decisions and create a plan for progress is academic advisors (Drake, 2011; Zhang, 2016a). Indeed, the advisors serve as a crucial link between students and a plethora of services, activities, and opportunities (Burt, Young-Jones, Yadon, & Carr, 2013; Drake, 2011; Zhang, 2016a). There is ample support for the integral role played by academic advising in the success of most students (Drake, 2011; Zhang, 2016a; Zhang, 2016b).

Before discussing the research questions for this study it is necessary for the sake of clarity to explore the definitions of some key terms, including globalization, internationalization, global competence, state college, and academic advisor.

**Definitions**

One true difficulty with the task of internationalizing community colleges is the ambiguity surrounding the meanings of terms such as globalization, internationalization, and global competence. Once the definitions of these terms are established a productive discourse can ensue, but until there is agreement on the definitions it will be difficult to convey ideas in a meaningful way. Thus, the discussion of the definitions of these terms comes early in the chapter.

**Globalization.** Although the vocabulary has changed over the years and some of the terms are even now not universally defined, the term “globalization” began to take on greater
significance after Theodore Levitt popularized it in his 1983 article in the *Harvard Business Review* (Scholte, 2008). In higher education, Knight posited one commonly accepted definition of globalization as “the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, and ideas … across borders” (Knight, 2003, p.3). Some disagree with this definition, stating that borders presume nations, and crossing borders entails internationalization rather than globalization (Scholte, 2008). Although there is still significant disagreement about the precise definition of globalization, the definition given by Knight was used as a framework for understanding in this study.

**Internationalization.** Internationalization can be defined as an amorphous construct of ideas or as a practical set of concrete goals and actions to be carried out by an institution of higher education. Knight correctly notes a definition focused on activities or outcomes would be too restrictive, since it could only be applied at the institutional level, but a definition at the opposite extreme would also be of little value since it would be so broad as to include almost anything (Knight, 2004). This latter case is illustrated by the choice of many authors to refer to internationalization as the response given by higher education to the reality of globalization in the realms of business and politics (Agnew, 2012). As Knight noted above, this definition is too broad to be of any practical use, so she proposed a working definition of internationalization to be, “the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions, or delivery of post-secondary education” (Knight, 2003, p. 2). This definition offers a framework that is simultaneously specific enough to direct the conversation and yet broad enough to be flexible in its implementation, and to “apply to many different countries, cultures, and education systems” (Knight, 2004, p. 11). This served as the definition of choice for this work. As a more specific measure NAFSA, Association of International Educators, listed
some characteristics of a campus that is successful at internationalization. Gerhart reported, “Among those characteristics are having a statement in the mission or planning documents regarding international education, having administrative and/or board-level support of internationalization, being clearly internationalized across schools, divisions, departments and disciplines, having a process that has demonstrable results for students, and having its commitment reflected in the curriculum” (Gerhart, November 8, 2004). Although the precise definition of “being clearly internationalized” is not given, this list might serve as a reasonable indicator of internationalization. Internationalization is a process rather than a goal, and therefore it is not a matter of asking which institutions of higher education are internationalized, but rather where a particular institution is located on the continuum of internationalization.

**Global competence.** One important outcome of the process of internationalization is global competence, but the definition of global competence is similarly difficult. The overall consensus now is that global competence involves awareness, appreciation, and acceptance of cultures and worldviews other than one’s own, but otherwise specific definitions diverge in sometimes significant ways (Knight, 2004). For the purpose of this study the term “global competence” denotes the global or international component of the skill set acquired by successful students at an institution of higher education that has achieved significant progress in internationalization. As a general rule this skill set can be assumed to include awareness, appreciation, and acceptance of other cultures and worldviews.

**State/community college.** For purposes of this study the overall category of community college refers both to institutions of higher education for which the associate’s degree is the highest degree awarded and those for which it is the predominant degree awarded. The Florida College System (FCS) consists of twenty-eight community and state colleges, all of which until
recently granted only professional certificates and associate’s degrees. The state colleges now have the ability to grant a limited number of bachelor’s degrees also, but their missions are still primarily those of community colleges.

**Academic advisors.** The role of academic advisors has changed significantly since institutions of higher education began to offer choices in general education, implement diverse delivery systems, and respond to political, social, and economic demands. These changes required institutions to invest in hiring, training, and developing professionals who were skilled in working with the whole student. Simply put, “Academic advising is integral to fulfilling the teaching and learning mission of higher education” (Campbell & Nutt, 2008, p. 5). As an indication of the role of academic advisors, Swecker, Fifolt, and Searby (2013) stated, “academic advising involves a student and an academic advisor establishing a relationship to facilitate decision making, resource identification, problem solving, and goal setting in the advisee’s personal, professional, and academic endeavors” (p. 47). The responsibilities of academic advisors are not restricted only to helping students choose classes, but often go into such diverse areas as motivating students and helping them connect to campus resources (Burt et al., 2013).

For the purposes of this study “academic advisors” are operationally defined as: student affairs professionals who “stimulate learning, set high expectations, establish goals with adequate flexibility for individuals, provide support, get input, offer feedback, and facilitate a variety of interactions” (Shockley-Zalabak, 2012, p.14). The job responsibilities of academic advisors certainly still include the traditional task of helping students select the most appropriate courses in the best sequence, but now often have been expanded to include advocacy, retention, intervention, and career development. As Drake posits in her 2011 article, “[g]ood academic advising also provides perhaps the only opportunity for all students to develop a personal,
consistent relationship with someone in the institution who cares about them” (p. 10). The relationships formed by academic advisors with students can play an integral role in student retention and success (Drake, 2011; Zhang 2016a). A comprehensive search of the websites of all 28 colleges in the Florida College System (FCS) revealed that all but two of them refer to their employees who fulfill the role of academic advisors by the title “academic advisors”. One of the other two colleges referred simply to “advisors” or “personal advisors”, and the second one titled them “instructional advisors”. Since the job responsibilities and expectations for these employees are the same as those of “academic advisors” at the other 26 colleges, I used the term “academic advisor” to refer to the population of interest and the participants throughout this study.

**Statement of the Problem**

Community colleges are increasingly focusing on internationalization as a necessity as they prepare graduates for the twenty-first century workforce. The demands of businesses and the community for a more globally savvy workforce have necessitated many changes in higher education, some of which are difficult to implement. Community colleges are struggling with the need for internationalization during a time of increasing budget duress, and often give only limited support for truly fostering global awareness and competence in the college population. The challenge for many community colleges is how they can implement strategies to achieve internationalization in a way that achieves maximum return for investments that remain within budget constraints (Hudzik, 2010; Templin, 2010).

In the area of internationalization of higher education there is relatively little research about community colleges when compared to the literature about four-year colleges (Robertson, 2015; Valeau & Raby, 2007). Additionally, there is even less literature concerning the role of co-
curricular departments in internationalization, particularly as it relates to community colleges (Burdzinski, 2014). Within the literature about co-curricular personnel, the role of academic advisors in internationalizing higher education has received very little attention (Burton, 2012). This gap is truly an oversight, as a crucial part of the college experience is the interactions students have with their academic advisors (Drake, 2011; Hale, Graham, & Johnson, 2009; LaRocca, 2017; Vianden, 2015; Vianden & Barlow, 2015; Vianden, 2016; Zhang, 2016a). Academic advisors are an important link in the chain leading from matriculation to graduation, and they have a unique opportunity to influence students in ways that are either difficult or impossible for other college professionals (Bland, 2003). Indeed, academic advisors are a crucial link in the connection between students and their college or university, and student retention, persistence, and success are directly linked to the quality of the relationships between students and academic advisors (Drake, 2011; LaRocca, 2017; Vianden, 2015; Vianden, 2016). For this reason the perceptions of academic advisors regarding global competence, globalization, and internationalization are important, and the effectiveness of the college in pursuing internationalization depends in many ways on those perceptions and the actions they engender.

**Purpose of the Study**

In the context of increased demands on community colleges to prepare students for the global realities of the present world, researchers must determine the role of each department in the college with regard to meeting those demands. Since academic advisors are an important link between students’ curricular and co-curricular experiences at the college, the role academic advisors in state and community colleges in Florida perceive themselves to have in internationalizing their college is a topic of great interest. Additionally, this study investigated the relationship between key demographic factors and the perceptions of academic advisors in
the Florida College System (FCS) regarding internationalization. Since little research has been conducted in this area, this study adds to the current body of knowledge.

Research Questions

This research study addressed the following questions:

1. What are the perceptions of academic advisors within the FCS about globalization and internationalization?

2. What are the perceptions of academic advisors within the FCS about how internationalization should be a part of their job responsibilities?

3. How are certain advisor and institutional characteristics related to advisors’ perceptions about the role of academic advisors in internationalizing the community/state college?

4. How are the perceptions that academic advisors within the FCS hold on globalization and internationalization related to their perceptions of the role of academic advisors in internationalizing the college, controlling for advisor and institutional characteristics?

5. What is the relationship between the perceptions of academic advisors within the FCS about globalization and internationalization and their self-perceived level of personal participation in international activity and success of their institution in maintaining an international focus?

Limitations

This study provides insight into the perceived role of academic advisors in the pursuit of internationalization of public state and community colleges in the Florida College System, but is not generalizable to universities, private colleges, technical colleges, or colleges that operate in a context that is significantly different from the Florida College System. It also does not give results that can be generalized to academic or other co-curricular departments.
This study does not include any analysis of student outcomes, faculty perceptions, or other measures of internationalization. There is a need for further research in this area, but this study considered only some part of the internationalization of a specific group of professionals in particular institutions of higher education. Also, as a quantitative investigation this study did not address the lived experiences of academic advisors.

Significance of the Study

In today’s increasingly connected world, institutions of higher education must adequately prepare their graduates to compete and perform well not only in knowledge of academic content but also in competence in intercultural and international interactions (Dellow, 2007). This requires an adjustment of most institutions’ approaches to the preparation, presentation, and delivery of postsecondary education, and necessitates a significant level of commitment to the process of internationalization by all stakeholders at the college. In particular, in order for efforts by administrators, faculty, and other stakeholders to be as effective as possible, staff such as academic advisors, who interact with students regularly and have such an impact on the students’ college experience, must contribute significantly to the internationalization efforts of the college.

Since academic advisors and their interactions with students are largely responsible for much of the experience of the students, including retention from year to year, persistence through to graduation, and involvement in co-curricular activities, the level of commitment to internationalization by academic advisors has a direct impact on the level of success achieved by students in acquiring a more global perspective, and, by extension, the level of success of the academic institution in the process of internationalization (Burton, 2012). For this reason, research into the perspectives of academic advisors concerning internationalization is important and useful (Drake, 2011; LaRocca, 2017; Vianden, 2015; Vianden, 2016).
The findings of this study would be of interest to administrators in community colleges, since knowledge of the current level of commitment to internationalization on the part of the advisors could be useful to them as they develop policy and allocate resources to encourage progress in internationalization at their colleges. The results could also be useful for professional academic advisor organizations as they decide what types of professional development and other support to offer to their members. Additionally, these results could be of interest to stakeholders in academic advising departments so they can get a picture of the perceptions of advisors in their departments. Finally, researchers in higher education could find the conclusions of this study informative as they consider the current state of internationalization in community colleges, particularly with regard to how academic advisors perceive their role in the process of internationalization. Since academic advisors play such an important role in the experience of the students at the college, the perceptions of the advisors will certainly impact the students in many ways, including their level of progress in internationalization.

Summary

The missions, priorities, and goals of higher education institutions of all types and community colleges in particular have changed continually since the end of the Second World War, and one aspect of that change is the trend toward globalization in business and politics and the resulting push toward a more international focus in education.

There is a need for research into the role of academic advisors in the internationalization of community colleges, and this study serves as a snapshot of the current perceptions on the part of academic advisors at the public state and community colleges of Florida. Each college as a whole can progress in internationalization only when all its component parts are involved in the process, and this study investigated the perceptions of academic advisors concerning the role
played by their department. The relevant literature concerning internationalization of community colleges and various strategies for making progress in it will be the subject of Chapter Two.
Chapter Two

A Review of the Literature

There is no lack of current literature about the issues of globalization and internationalization, but there is a need to improve understanding about the role of community colleges in these processes, and in particular the roles of various departments within community colleges in pursuing internationalization for their institutions (Burdzinski, 2014; Clark, 2013; Robertson, 2015). This review of the literature begins with an overview of globalization, follows with a look at internationalization, and examines the need for internationalization at community colleges. The narrative then continues with a look at ways to measure internationalization, followed by some of the unique challenges faced by community colleges as they attempt to pursue internationalization. After a review of several strategies for internationalization, including the role of the curriculum and the co-curriculum in internationalization, the discussion concludes with the role of academic advisors in internationalization.

Globalization

As noted in Chapter One, the term “globalization” began to take on greater significance after Theodore Levitt popularized it in his 1983 article in the Harvard Business Review (Scholte, 2008). In higher education, many would accept Knight’s definition of globalization as “the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, and ideas … across borders” (Knight, 2003, p.3). This is not to say there is no disagreement about the definition or even the nature of globalization. Rosenberg wrote a post-mortem on globalization, and declared the concept dead and its use as an explanatory framework impossible (Rosenberg, 2007). Scholte rejected the
main premise of Knight’s definition by framing the entire discussion in the context of social relations (Scholte, 2008). In his construction the definition given by Knight would comprise a list of characteristics of what he called internationalization, but would not suffice as a definition of globalization. He insisted that borders presume nation-states, and internationalization is the increasingly fluid transportation of ideas, people, goods, and services between those nations. Scholte claimed the use of the word globalization to refer to what he called internationalization is one of four “intellectual culs-de-sac” that do not lead to any new knowledge (Scholte, 2008, p.1473). In his construction, the local, national, and international all coexist with the global, and the global is not necessarily related to geography, politics, or economics (Scholte, 2008). Knight also acknowledged the role of nations in her definition, but differentiated between globalization as she defined it above and the current trend in higher education toward internationalization (Knight, 2004). When considering the concept of globalization in other disciplines it is not surprising to find significant diversity in the definition of the term, but the absence of a consensus on the definition can cause serious difficulties in the discourse. It is almost as though scholars are speaking different languages to each other, and as a result research can be hindered. However, in the field of higher education there is beginning to be a general consensus concerning the core elements of a definition that provides an adequate foundation upon which to hold a meaningful conversation. Even in the absence of a standardized definition of globalization, there is general agreement that globalization is a reality that is unlikely to disappear in the foreseeable future (Dodds, 2008; Scholte, 2008).

**Internationalization**

As discussed previously, globalization has been variously defined as an economic reality, a political construction, or an anthropological phenomenon (Knight, 2004). Similarly,
internationalization can be defined as an amorphous construct of ideas or as a practical set of concrete goals and actions to be carried out by an institution of higher education. Knight correctly noted a definition focused on activities or outcomes would be too restrictive, since it could only be applied at the institutional level, but a definition at the opposite extreme also would be of little value since it would be so broad as to include almost anything (Knight, 2004). This latter case is illustrated by the choice of many authors to refer to internationalization as the response given by higher education to the reality of globalization in the realms of business and politics (Agnew, 2012). As Knight noted above, this definition is too broad to be of any practical use, so she proposed a working definition of internationalization to be, “the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions, or delivery of post-secondary education” (Knight, 2003, p. 2). This definition offers a framework that is simultaneously specific enough to direct the conversation and yet broad enough to be flexible in its implementation, and to “apply to many different countries, cultures, and education systems” (Knight, 2004, p. 11). Knight (2013) further pointed out internationalization is a process rather than an ideology, and thus is distinct from internationalism.

There is much agreement that internationalization is a good goal for institutions of higher education to strive to obtain, and many strategies for internationalization have been proposed, though there is no consensus concerning what approach is best (Hser, 2013; Raby & Valeau, 2007; Treat & Hagedorn, 2013; Whitehead, 2015). Indeed, it may very well be the case that there is no “best” approach that can be universally applied, but rather a list of possibilities that yield varying results based on the culture, context, and nature of each educational institution (Bissonette & Woodin, 2013; Harder, 2010; Hser, 2013; Knight, 2013). In the current context of increasing emphasis on international education and the push to provide students with
opportunities to develop or enhance a global perspective, it is the duty of institutions of higher education to adapt to the current circumstances and give their students the tools they need to succeed in an increasingly competitive global marketplace (Dellow, 2007).

**The Need for Internationalization at Community Colleges**

Though the pressure to internationalize began within the universities, it eventually filtered down to the community colleges as well, particularly as pressure mounted for a more globally prepared and competent workforce (Dellow, 2007; Robson, 2011). Students who graduate without necessary global awareness and intercultural skills will have a difficult time obtaining good jobs as the workforce becomes more global in scope, yet the community colleges are in many cases lagging behind the demand (Dellow, 2007; Ng et al., 2012).

Some have begun to suggest the conversation should change significantly from the dichotomous view of many researchers in higher education as they differentiate between globalization and internationalization. At a different level, the milieu in which community colleges operate has traditionally resulted in colleges focusing exclusively on the perceived needs of those in close geographical proximity to the college, and many stakeholders at the community college level even now claim the community college should not be involved in issues either global or international in scope (Green, 2007). However, the rapidly changing demands of local employers as they begin to connect with global partners and compete with global rivals are forcing many community colleges to reevaluate their stance with regard to globalization and internationalization (Dellow, 2007; Robson, 2011). Indeed, many are now suggesting there should be a new understanding of the community college context as simultaneously both global and local (Patel & Lynch, 2013; Scholte, 2008). As Scholte (2008) stated, the rise of suprateritoriality does not negate the importance of territorial space, but neither can the local
territorial space now operate in isolation from the larger global context. This premise suggests researchers in higher education should incorporate some of the terminology currently being used in business, technology, and sociology, particularly as it relates to “glocalization” and having a “glocal” perspective (Hazelkorn, 2016; Patel & Lynch, 2013; Ward, 2015). The use of the newly invented word “glocal” emphasizes the “both – and” nature of the discussion, as opposed to a dichotomous view in which the discussion is constrained to an “either – or” context. The term originated in the phrase “think globally, act locally”, and encompasses both actions and perspectives (Hazelkorn, 2016, p. 458). In this glocal framework, the differences between cultures are not removed, but rather the fear of those differences is assuaged (Patel & Lynch, 2013). This is perhaps another way of characterizing one aspect of global competence, as understanding can be achieved without forfeiting one’s own culture.

The need for people to have global competence and the accompanying understanding of cultures and perspectives other than their own is greater today than at any time in history as the flow of people and information has developed from a relative trickle not too long ago to a virtual torrent today. Companies are increasingly international in their perspectives, leadership structure and focus (Dellow, 2007). Many multinational companies need a labor pool that is ready to communicate and work across the globe as suppliers and consumers can easily come from any place, and companies that are not equipped to compete in this global environment can hardly expect to succeed (Dellow, 2007; Milliron, 2007). It is therefore necessary for community colleges to graduate globally literate workers who are prepared to contribute to their employers and who can compete with international workers for the best positions in their chosen field. This mandate to educate students with a new emphasis on the global (or perhaps the glocal) perspective and prepare them for employment in the current global environment requires the
inclusion of the so-called soft skills in the curriculum in addition to presenting the academic content with components of the global and international context included (Dellow, 2007; Milliron, 2007; Mitchell, Skinner, & White, 2010; Patel & Lynch, 2013).

In this context of global competition not only between companies but also between workers there is a need for community colleges to reassess priorities, goals, assumptions, and practices to better serve the students and the community. In the past, institutions of higher education often imposed a false dichotomy between what could be termed as local and what ordinarily would be considered global, but, as noted above, there is currently a need for colleges to recognize the emerging reality that the “global” has become the “local” in many respects (Agnew, 2012; Bermingham & Ryan, 2013). This is at least in part a result of the rapid dissemination of information since the inception and widespread use of the Internet, which literally expanded the definition of “community” to include many people and entities that are not necessarily located in close geographical proximity to the community college (Raby, 2012). Thus the community college must continue to meet the needs of students while providing service to the community, even with this expanded definition of community. As a part of this process, the mission of the community college is evolving to include a more global focus rather than simply considering the local milieu (Levin, 2000; Raby, 2012). The geographically restricted sense of community once held by community colleges is now inadequate, and the colleges are now required to adopt a wider view of a globally interconnected world in which the graduate of the community college could be expected to participate in cross-cultural communications and international interactions as a part of their job even if they obtain employment in a locally based company (Milliron, 2007; Perry & Southwell, 2011; Zhang, 2016a). Not only are students facing the challenge of obtaining employment in an increasingly competitive global workplace, but the
students themselves often do not originally come from the community in which they now live and study, and increasing numbers of international students are choosing to study at community colleges (Raby, 2012; Zhang, 2016a; Zhang, 2016b). This results in new demands on the community college not only to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse student body but also to address the needs and concerns of an ever expanding community.

**Measuring Internationalization at Community Colleges**

In order for a community college to achieve significant progress in internationalization, it is necessary for internationalization to become an integral part of the college culture. This would include commitment and effort from administration, faculty, staff, and students. The ideal outcome for a college that claims to be on the path toward internationalization must include tangible progress among each of these groups.

**Measuring internationalization among administrators.** A possible measure of commitment to internationalization among administrators is the importance they place on it in policy decisions and budgeting. Indeed, the lack of financial support to implement stated goals in the area of internationalization was the single greatest obstacle to internationalization according to many respondents in the 2009 study of faculty by O’Connor. While many administrators would claim to value internationalization as a worthy goal, the actual priority placed on it when funds are allocated often does not comport with that claim, at least in the perceptions of the faculty (O’Connor, 2009).

**Measuring internationalization among faculty.** Significant progress toward internationalization among faculty is evident in the development and implementation of the curriculum and their presentation of the content in their courses. The perceptions of faculty, however, vary widely concerning how much administrative support they have for implementing
a plan to pursue internationalization through internationalizing the curriculum (Clark, 2013; O’Connor, 2009; Oredein, 2016). One main obstacle to faculty awareness of institutional commitment to internationalization is a lack of clear communication on the part of administrators (O’Connor, 2009; Oredein, 2016). Even though there may be policies in place to promote internationalization at a college or even throughout a college system, if the policies are not clearly communicated to the people tasked with implementing them their effectiveness will at the least be significantly diminished. As O’Connor found, some faculty in his study were not aware of the support level for internationalization in the administration, and over half did not know the support level of the governing board (O’Connor, 2009). That led to the perception on the part of faculty that support for global initiatives among administration and the board was limited.

**Measuring internationalization among staff.** The staff at a community college have an important role in helping the college pursue internationalization, although their contribution is not emphasized in the literature as much as that of administrators and faculty (Burdzinski, 2014). Support personnel and staff, and in particular academic advisors, have an important role to play in giving students an opportunity to gain an international perspective and globally marketable skills (Shushok, Henry, Blalock, & Sriram, 2009).

**Measuring internationalization among students.** Internationalization among the students is readily evident in the way they work in their jobs after graduation. If they have acquired the soft skills mentioned by Dellow (2007) and others, and if they interact well with colleagues from other nations or cultures, then their progress toward internationalization is evident. The perceptions of students concerning internationalization are often shaped by the faculty and other representatives of their institution of higher education, such as advisors (Stevens, 2012). The majority of students express a desire to expand their global awareness, but a
lack of financial resources, among other factors, can detract from their ability to pursue that increased awareness through most traditional means such as study abroad (Stevens, 2012). This makes it imperative that students have the opportunity to gain the necessary global perspectives and skills through their experiences while studying at the college.

**Challenges to Internationalization at Community Colleges**

There are many challenges to internationalization that are common to all institutions of higher education, and some others that are more common in community colleges. Among these challenges are student diversity, the need for remedial instruction, a general lack of commitment to internationalization, and a narrow, geographically restricted definition of community. Each of these challenges will be discussed in this section.

**Student diversity.** Community colleges face unique challenges in producing globally competent graduates. First among these challenges is how to emphasize and facilitate the development of a global perspective for such a diverse student body. With an open access model comes the challenge of meeting the needs of students who are both young and old, first time in college and returning after many years away from formal education, still not sure what career they want to pursue and working full time, responsible to care for children and responsible to care for aging parents (Miller, Grover, Deggs, D'Amico, Katsinas, & Adair, 2016; Sealey-Ruiz, 2013; Zhang, 2015). There can be no single approach that will work comprehensively for all the various backgrounds and demographics represented in the typical community college student body, so the college must design an approach to internationalization that will give the greatest probability of success to the greatest percentage of the students (Green, 2007).

**Need for remedial instruction.** A second challenge community colleges face in producing globally competent graduates is the large percentage of students who enter community
colleges unprepared for college-level instruction, particularly in reading, writing, and mathematics (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2016). Students who are struggling to reach college-level proficiency in basic general education disciplines are not likely to be focused on expanding their horizons beyond their immediate milieu, and may not see the benefit of gaining a global perspective. It is quite an achievement for many of these students even to commit to pursuing postsecondary education at all, so the leap from a possibly narrow focus to a truly global perspective might be too far for some to make without considerable encouragement. Any attempt to internationalize the curriculum of developmental or remedial classes is likely to meet with stiff resistance on many levels, and in many cases could be considered even to be detrimental to the chances of the students to achieve success. These courses are already plagued by abysmally low success rates, and placing an additional burden on the students and instructors in these courses could be viewed as excessive (Jenkins, Jaggars & Roksa, 2009).

After students pass the initial hurdle of gaining college-level proficiency in reading, writing and mathematics they often find themselves two or more semesters into their college education, and feel pressure to finish the remainder of their course requirements as quickly as possible (Crisp & Delgado, 2014; Finkel, 2017). Adding a global or international component to their education could be regarded by some as an unnecessary hindrance to their academic progress.

**Lack of commitment to internationalization.** A third obstacle to internationalization at community colleges is the difficulty of convincing the administration, faculty, and staff to commit to internationalization in every department and at every level (Green, 2007; Harder, 2010; Stearns, 2009). Many administrators would place internationalization low on their list of
budget priorities, and limited financial resources would undoubtedly be depleted long before departments, faculty, and staff received the substantial resources needed to implement effective strategies for internationalization. Assuming the majority of administrators placed high priority on internationalization and implemented policies aimed at promoting internationalization, there could still be significant difficulty in getting the faculty and staff to buy in to the concept and participate fully in the process. Some instructors could hold the view that their academic disciplines are not relevant to internationalization, while others could resist simply because they are already burdened with a significant workload and cannot commit additional time and effort to effect the change necessary to further the cause of internationalization. As is the case with faculty, many staff members could also view their contributions to the college community and the student experience to be irrelevant to the objective of internationalization. Also, many employees at community colleges are already expected to fulfill multiple roles, and budget constraints can limit the ability of community colleges to hire sufficient staff to devote adequate attention to all the work that must be done (Green, 2007; Harder, 2010; Stearns, 2009). If the already overworked staff are tasked with the additional responsibility of contributing to the pursuit of internationalization at the college they might feel it would detract from their ability to fulfill their other responsibilities adequately.

Narrow definition of community. A final obstacle to internationalizing community colleges could be the possible perception on the part of outside stakeholders such as community leaders, local politicians, and the board of trustees that internationalization should not be a part of the mission or activities of the community college. If they hold the perspective that “community” is narrowly defined to include only the people and institutions in close geographical proximity to the college then they could think any push for internationalization
would be inappropriate for the community college. On the other hand, if these outside stakeholders can be convinced that the definition of “community” must now be expanded to include many entities outside the local area in the strictest sense of that word, particularly since even local businesses and entities now are so often globally connected, then it is possible to infuse the culture, mission, and vision of the college with priorities and strategies for progress in the area of internationalization (Patel & Lynch, 2013; Ward, 2015). In any case, as the economy continues to include more global and international elements it will likely become easier to convince outside stakeholders of the need to educate community college students in a more truly international way.

**Strategies for Internationalization at Community Colleges**

The most important component of implementing a plan to pursue internationalization is the desire to do so. For this reason it is imperative that the board of trustees, board of governors, or other governing body place high priority on internationalization as a concept, because otherwise the efforts of other stakeholders will certainly have diminished effectiveness because there would be no financial support for them. It is also necessary for the college leadership (president, vice-presidents, provosts, etc.) to have a clear vision of the need for internationalization, along with stated goals for other college employees to strive to attain, and to communicate that vision and those goals clearly and consistently (Boggs & Irwin, 2007; Burdzinski, 2014; Green, 2007).

**Mission statement.** As noted above, the first step in achieving progress in the area of internationalization is for those in authority to make it a priority. One indicator of commitment to internationalization by college leadership is its inclusion in the college mission statement. As for the colleges in the Florida College System, a search of all 28 college websites revealed that ten
of the colleges had some aspect of internationalization included in their mission statements. Many of those mission statements had phrases such as “global society” (four colleges), and “global community” (three colleges). The other three colleges had “global citizenship”, “global awareness”, and “global economy” in their respective mission statements. There were an additional five colleges whose mission statements included “diversity” or “diverse community”, but the remaining thirteen colleges included no mention of a diverse, global, or international context for the college mission.

**Study abroad.** There are many strategies a college administration can implement in the pursuit of internationalization, but some are not as effective or as practical as others. One strategy that has been shown to be an effective way to help students obtain a global perspective is offering students a study abroad experience, but the prohibitive cost, especially for many community college students, is a deterrent to widespread use of this method for internationalization in this context (Green, 2007). Also, because of the nature of the study abroad experience it is necessarily limited to a relatively small group of students, and so could not have the widespread impact that is needed. There is certainly a direct benefit for the students involved and any with whom they communicate, so study abroad should be one component of any strategy for pursuing internationalization, but it is insufficient in itself to serve as the sole catalyst for internationalization of the college community.

**International exchanges.** A related strategy of possible interest is the use of international exchanges of faculty as a means of bringing an international education to the students much more efficiently. Just one faculty member from another country could impact many students while working in their host country for one or more semesters, while a faculty member from the host country who went abroad for a year could use that experience to impact
students for several years afterward (Choi, Khamalah, Myeong Hwan, & Burg, 2014; Garson, 2005; ten Cate, Mann, McCrorie, Ponzer, Snell, & Steinert, 2014). A visiting faculty member from another country or culture could also influence the resident faculty of the department in which they work, and could possibly contribute to increased understanding throughout the college community as they interact with other members of the college community (Mamiseishvili, 2011).

In cases where physical international exchanges are impractical for financial or other reasons, virtual exchanges can be arranged. One way to create the opportunity for such an exchange is through implementing collaborative learning experiences as suggested by the Center for Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL Center) from the State University of New York (SUNY). The COIL Center conducts yearly conferences and offers support and development opportunities for faculty seeking to incorporate online assignments, interactions, or other learning for their students in partnership with students from an institution in another country (State University of New York [SUNY], n.d.). Online interaction such as this can provide a benefit for all participants at minimal cost (Buck Sutton, 2018).

**International students.** Another valuable resource is the population of international students who are already on campus (Brennan & Dellow, 2013; Sawir, 2013). It is possible for the college to offer some incentive for the international students to help in this regard. As Tracey Ivey noted in her study, Oregon State University offers in-state tuition to international students if they will contribute to internationalizing the university by giving talks to students and faculty (Ivey, 2009). A similar strategy could be useful at the community college level, particularly as the population of international students attending community colleges in the United States increases (Anayah & Kuk, 2015; Zhang, 2016a). It is a reasonable incentive for the international
students to contribute to their institution and in return to have their tuition reduced or to receive
some other consideration.

Employee development. In addition to these suggestions it is necessary for community
colleges to engage actively in employee development that will help the staff and faculty
themselves acquire an international perspective (Knight, 2004). The staff can work to promote an
atmosphere conducive to internationalization, and direct students to the classes and resources
that encourage the development of an international or global perspective as well as the skills
necessary for their futures (Robertson, 2015; Vianden, 2015; Vianden, 2016). As the faculty
begin to understand the importance of internationalization not only for the good of the students
but also for the good of the community and the college they can act as significant contributors to
the process of internationalization. Since faculty are usually charged with the responsibility to
create the curriculum and then to deliver it to the students in a meaningful way, their input into
internationalization of the curriculum is invaluable.

Internationalization of the curriculum. The process by which faculty engage the
students and exert leadership in internationalizing both the curriculum and the whole college
experience for the students can be a vital link in reinvigorating the college and the community.
This can effect positive change in the college, and with the appropriate effort and emphasis can
become an enduring part of the fabric of the institution (Mellow & Talmadge, 2005; Whitehead,
2015). Clifford and Montgomery expanded on the framework of Kitano (1997) and emphasized
the difference between “inclusive” curriculum in which internationalization is added onto the
existing content and “transformative” curriculum that involves a “fundamental shift in positions
and relationships” (Clifford & Montgomery, 2015, p.50). There is certainly support for the merit
of the proposition that transformative learning can effectively bring about the internationalization
of the curriculum since transformative learning in this situation can produce the desired results at every level of the college (Clifford & Montgomery, 2015). It is not enough, however, to bring internationalization to the curriculum without addressing the rest of the college experience as well.

In the setting of rapidly changing definitions of community and newly emerging contexts for education at the community college there is a need for the college to adequately prepare the students in a holistic way, from the overall college experience all the way down to the level of the curriculum. In order for this to succeed, advisors and other staff must initiate the process as they connect students with resources available at the college and prepare students to come to the classroom ready to learn, faculty must be proactive in bringing the world into the classroom, and administrators should help the staff and faculty to accomplish that goal by establishing policies that foster an educational culture that promotes that outcome.

The future seems likely to bring more rather than less globalization, and the students of the future need to be ready to face the challenges that accompany that increase. A globally competent person will be much better prepared to compete and succeed in that new environment, so it is the ethically necessary responsibility of the community college to provide students with the opportunity to develop that competence as well as mastering the necessary academic content. There is also a growing need for institutions of higher education to instill in their students an ability to think analytically and to develop ways of thinking that are globally aware (Stearns, 2009). One difficulty with this emphasis on what for some would be a new skill is the ubiquitous demand that students learn increasing quantities of subject matter as the volume of information explodes in many fields. The students are responsible for learning and retaining vast amounts of material, while at the same time learning how to analyze and apply that knowledge (Stearns,
To this requirement is now added the need for the student to be globally competent. This can seem to present conflicting interests within the curriculum, but that does not necessarily have to be the case (Agnew, 2012).

Even in the midst of the emphasis by administrators on increased global awareness and competence among students at the universities, there has been a distinct disconnect between the stated goals of administration and the practices of faculty as they interact directly with students (Stohl, 2007). Stohl concluded that faculty as a whole are decidedly uninformed about the true nature of internationalized curriculum and the relevance of internationalization to their respective disciplines (Stohl, 2007). As Stohl pointed out, if the faculty members are not encouraging students to expand their horizons then no one should be surprised when the vast majority of students are not pursuing international competence (Stohl, 2007). In such an environment it is no wonder that so many students are graduating without developing a truly international perspective (Stohl, 2007). The literature concerning internationalization of curriculum and the role of faculty and other academic components of the college in accomplishing that mission is fairly robust, but little research has been done in the area of internationalizing the co-curriculum and the role of co-curricular departments in that process (Franklin-Craft, 2010; Pope & Mueller, 2000).

**Internationalization of the co-curriculum.** All the strategies mentioned above focus on the role of administrators and faculty, particularly as they strive to achieve progress in internationalization in the academic arena. However, if a college is to advance in internationalization it is necessary for the whole college to participate, including departments that sometimes are not considered by all to be academic departments, such as academic advising (Ward, 2015). Significant progress in the internationalization of an academic institution cannot occur without at least garnering the support of administrators and policy makers, and more likely
will require specific directives from college leadership before other stakeholders will take on the
task in earnest. Additionally, there is much support in the literature for the importance of the role
of faculty in participating in the internationalization of a college (Bradshaw, 2013). However,
there is little research on the potential role of non-administrative personnel from co-curricular
departments in pursuing internationalization (Burton, 2012). The co-curricular components of the
college experience and their importance in the task of pursuing internationalization are often
overlooked, but ignoring their contributions to the process leaves out a vital element (Ward, 2015).
Successful pursuit of internationalization requires a holistic approach, and that must
necessarily include every part of the college community having a role in the process.

One deterrent to internationalization of the co-curriculum is the intertwined nature of
college culture and co-curricular activities. Institutional culture is often slow and difficult to
transform, and so efforts to internationalize the co-curriculum are sometimes unsuccessful
(Ward, 2015). An additional challenge to internationalizing the co-curriculum is the vast quantity
of activities, services, and programs included in it. This can leave a college daunted by the sheer
number of options, and it is often difficult to determine which parts of the co-curriculum should
be targeted for internationalization when time and resources are limited (Ward, 2015). Another
problem with internationalizing the co-curriculum is the voluntary nature of most co-curricular
activities. Students may or may not engage in the activities, and so the impact of an
internationalized co-curriculum could be diminished (Hunter & White, 2004; Ward, 2015). A
final difficulty plaguing efforts to internationalize the co-curriculum is the lack of any natural
means to assess the effectiveness of those efforts. Since most co-curricular activities involve
voluntary participation and do not have assigned grades or records of attendance, it can be
difficult not only to motivate students to participate but also to determine the effectiveness of
that participation (Hunter & White, 2004; Ward, 2015). Although there are inherent difficulties in maximizing the impact of an internationalized co-curriculum, the effort required to infuse internationalization into every part of the college experience and culture ultimately pays significant dividends. One of the most important departments on campus for informing students and helping them get connected with resources and opportunities is academic advising.

**Role of Academic Advisors in Pursuing Internationalization**

There is a distinct need for professionals closely connected to students to articulate the importance of faculty efforts to infuse internationalization into their courses, the stated goals of administrators with regard to internationalization, and the perceived needs of employers as they demand a more globally competent workforce. With this insight students and advisors together can chart a course leading to future success for the students. The ideal people to communicate with students are academic advisors. It is precisely these professionals who relay important aspects of the college experience to the students as they also engage students in the college experience (Drake, 2011; Vianden & Barlow, 2015; Vianden, 2016).

If a college hopes to achieve internationalization, it is not enough for the administrators to make a statement declaring internationalization to be a goal. Similarly, faculty efforts alone, while contributing significantly to the process of internationalization as the college strives to meet the goals laid out by the administration, are insufficient to accomplish the task. It is necessary for those who guide, inform and prepare the students to select the right classes and engage in extracurricular activities to participate in the internationalization of the college (Burton, 2012). Academic advisors serve as an important key to internationalization, since they are the ones who work in the trenches, helping students prepare for the college experience and connecting students with faculty and other resources as students journey through the maze of
higher education looking for clear direction (Burton, 2012; Zhang, 2016b). Academic advisors serve a crucial role in connecting students with every aspect of their college or university, and student retention, persistence, and success are directly linked to the quality of the relationships between students and academic advisors (Drake, 2011; LaRocca, 2017; Vianden, 2015; Vianden, 2016). Not only do academic advisors possess the information necessary to encourage internationalization among students, but they also have the opportunity to form the relationships that could lead to increased effectiveness of the overall college experience in causing transformational changes in the lives of the students (Hunter & White, 2004). It is necessary for students to be integrated into the college community for their college experience to have the desired impact. To this end, it is necessary for academic advisors to play a role in the experiences, and the potential for internationalization, of the students (Robertson, 2015; Vianden, 2015; Vianden, 2016).

Examining the perceived role of academic advisors in internationalization. There is some literature relating to the perceived role of academic advisors in pursuing internationalization at institutions of higher education, but that body of work focuses on the perceptions of advisors at universities and does not address the perceptions of advisors at community colleges (Burton, 2012). Much of the literature that focuses on the pursuit of internationalization at community colleges investigates the contributions of students (Stevens, 2012), faculty (Clark, 2013; O’Connor, 2009), or administrators (Burdzinski, 2014), but does not reveal the perceptions of academic advisors in that endeavor.

Additionally, much previous work dealing with academic advisors at the university level involved phenomenology or other qualitative methods, and therefore presented a very narrowly focused, but deep, understanding of the perceptions only of the few participants in that study
(Burton, 2012). This research presents a more broad-based picture of the perceptions of academic advisors, and those advisors work in a very different context from the participants in Burton’s 2012 study. The overall picture obtained by this study leads to a more complete understanding of current perceptions among academic advisors at community colleges in any context that is similar to the Florida College System as they consider what role, if any, they think they should have in promoting internationalization at their institutions.

Summary

As globalization is increasingly emphasized, colleges are responding with various levels of commitment to internationalization. There are certain challenges to internationalization that are common to all institutions of higher education, but there are also some others that are unique to community colleges. Among these are the typical demographics of the student body at the community college as compared to most universities, the historical mission of community colleges as interpreted by many stakeholders to include only those issues and cultures in close geographical proximity to the college, limited funding, and many faculty and staff members already performing multiple tasks and therefore unable to devote significant time and resources to pursuing internationalization. Although there can be some overlap between universities and colleges even in these obstacles, the nature of the difficulty in the community colleges is not as fully researched as that of the universities. In particular, the literature concerning the contributions of academic advisors in community colleges toward internationalization is lacking, and more studies need to be done in this area in order to paint a more complete picture of the state of internationalization in the community colleges.

There has been some emphasis on pursuing internationalization by infusing it into the curriculum, or even by implementing a curriculum aimed at achieving transformative learning,
but if internationalization is to make significant progress in community colleges the colleges will have to employ a holistic approach that includes the co-curricular aspects of the college experience as well. The work of academic advisors is an integral part of bringing that co-curricular experience to the students, and the role of academic advisors in internationalizing the campus needs to be more thoroughly investigated. The methods used in this study to investigate the perceived role of advisors in that process of internationalization will be the subject of Chapter Three.
Chapter Three

Methods

This chapter addresses the population, research design, survey instrument, data collection procedures, steps taken to ensure the protection of human participants for this study, variables of interest, and procedures for analyzing the data. The scope of this study is limited to state and community colleges in the Florida College System (FCS), and focused on the academic advising department within student affairs. The method for this study was a quantitative analysis of responses to the survey “Perceived Roles of Academic Advisors in Pursuing Internationalization at Florida Community and State Colleges.” The survey was modified with permission (Appendix A) from the instrument used by Donna Burdzinski in her 2014 study.

Research Questions

This research study addressed the following questions:

1. What are the perceptions of academic advisors within the Florida College System (FCS) about globalization and internationalization?

2. What are the perceptions of academic advisors within the FCS about how internationalization should be a part of their job responsibilities?

3. How are certain advisor and institutional characteristics related to advisors’ perceptions about the role of academic advisors in internationalizing the community/state college?

4. How are the perceptions that academic advisors within the FCS hold on globalization and internationalization related to their perceptions of the role of academic advisors in internationalizing the college, controlling for advisor and institutional characteristics?
5. What is the relationship between the perceptions of academic advisors within the FCS about globalization and internationalization and their self-perceived level of personal participation in international activity and success of their institution in maintaining an international focus?

**Research Design**

This was a quantitative analysis of survey results obtained from academic advisors in Florida College System (FCS) institutions and employed descriptive and inferential statistics. Johnson and Christensen posit that descriptive, nonexperimental research is performed “to provide an accurate description or picture of the status or characteristics of a situation or phenomenon” (2014, p. 407). They stated that such research can lead to understanding of relationships that already exist, while not necessarily seeking to establish cause-and-effect relationships. The purpose of this study was to identify the relationships that may exist between certain demographic variables and the perceptions of academic advisors concerning internationalization, globalization, and their role in promoting the pursuit of internationalization at their institutions. For this reason it is appropriate to use a descriptive, nonexperimental design for this study (Kumar, 2005).

**Population and Sampling Frame**

The population of interest is all academic advisors working in the twenty-eight state and community colleges in the Florida College System (FCS). An exhaustive search of the websites of all twenty-eight colleges revealed a potential population of 591 individuals. The sampling frame was all academic advisors for whom I could obtain valid e-mail addresses, and the sample consisted of all academic advisors who responded to the survey after being invited to do so by e-mail. Thus, 579 advisors at colleges in the FCS, after removal of the e-mail addresses of
individuals who no longer worked for the respective colleges or for whom the e-mail address
given on the college website was invalid, were sent invitations to participate in the survey. Of
those contacted, a total of 54 advisors responded.

Seven of the fifty-four respondents did not provide answers to any of the demographic
questions, and six of those seven did not respond to the questions concerning internationalization
or their perceived role in it. They therefore had to be excluded from the analysis for Research
Questions Two, Three, Four, and Five. Four of the remaining respondents omitted one or more
responses to the Globalization and Internationalization sections of the survey. Those respondents
were not considered in any analyses that depended on the Globalization and Internationalization
composite scores. When all respondents who could be included for any part of the analysis were
considered, the response rate was 9.3%. The effective response rate was 7.4% when considering
only those respondents who completed the entire survey.

As noted in Chapter Two, there were ten of the twenty-eight colleges in the FCS that
included some global or international context for the college mission. Participants in the survey
worked at fifteen of the twenty-eight colleges in the FCS, including seven of the ten colleges that
had a global or international context for the college mission, as well as eight of the colleges that
did not mention such a context for the college mission. Thus, the percentage of colleges with
internationalization in the mission statements represented in the survey was somewhat higher
(46.7%) than the percentage of all such colleges in the FCS (35.7%). A more complete
description of the demographic composition and the characteristics of the sample is given in
Chapter Four.
**Instrument**

The survey instrument for this study, “Perceived Roles of Academic Advisors in Pursuing Internationalization at Florida Community and State Colleges,” (Appendix B) was adapted with permission (Appendix A) from the instrument, “Perceptions Toward Globalization and the Role of Student Affairs Administrators in Internationalization of Community Colleges,” used by Donna Burdzinski in her 2014 study. The purpose of Dr. Burdzinski’s study was to discover the perceived role of student affairs administrators in the internationalization of community and state colleges, and this study focuses on the perceived roles of academic advisors in that process as they carry out the policies and directives of those administrators. The survey used for this study was designed to measure the advisors’ viewpoints concerning the importance of globalization and internationalization to the country, to their academic institutions, and to them personally. Additionally, the survey focused on whether advisors think globalization and internationalization will be an inevitable part of the college experience in the future, and what role the advisors understand themselves to have in internationalizing their respective colleges.

Dr. Burdzinski adapted her survey from an earlier one used by Dr. Bonnie Clark (2013), who in turn had incorporated elements from the surveys of Dr. Nancy Genelin (2005) and Dr. Gavin O’Connor (2009).

Dr. Clark (2013) used the Question-Understanding Aid (QUAID) tool to evaluate the clarity of her survey instrument, and also conducted a pilot study of the instrument. The QUAID tool was developed at the University of Memphis by Dr. Arthur Graesser and others, and “assists survey methodologists, social scientists, and designers of questionnaires in improving the wording, syntax, and semantics of questions. The tool identifies potential problems that respondents might have in comprehending the meaning of questions on questionnaires.”
(Graesser, Wiemer-Hastings, Kreuz, Wiemer-Hastings, & Marquis, 2000, p. 254). In their 2016 study, Maitland and Presser describe QUAID as follows:

Question Understanding Aid is based on computational models developed in the fields of computer science, computational linguistics, discourse processing, and cognitive science. The software identifies technical features of questions that have the potential to cause comprehension problems. It rates each survey question on five classes of comprehension problems: unfamiliar technical terms, vague or imprecise predicate or relative terms, vague or imprecise noun phrases, complex syntax, and working memory overload.

QUAID identifies these problems by comparing the words in a question to several databases (e.g., Coltheart’s MRC Psycholinguistics Database) (p. 365).

Maitland and Presser performed an analysis of seven different methods of assessing survey reliability, and concluded that QUAID was a statistically significant predictor of unreliability (Maitland & Presser, 2016). An added benefit of using the QUAID tool is increased reliability and validity for the results of the survey, since respondents are more likely to understand the meanings of the questions (Graesser, et al., 2000; Graesser, Cai, Louwerse, & Daniel, 2006).

Dr. Clark did not indicate that she had to make any adjustments based on her analysis of her survey using the QUAID tool. After analyzing her survey with the QUAID tool, she conducted a pilot for her survey. For the pilot study she sent the survey to 107 faculty from a community college in New York that was not a part of her final study, and 21 of them completed the survey and provided feedback (Clark, 2013). Her pilot study resulted in just a few modifications, including the reduction of the survey from 60 to 58 questions because of perceived redundancy as reported by the participants in the pilot study (Clark, 2013).
Before the administration of her modified survey instrument Dr. Burdzinski also used the QUAID tool to check the clarity and readability of her survey questions, and no modifications were suggested by the tool. She then obtained feedback from students in a student affairs master’s level class. The feedback she received from that class provided relevant guidance with regard to the length of time necessary to complete the survey and the clarity and completeness of the survey (Burdzinski, 2014). Dr. Burdzinski also created the composite mean scores of the constructs of Globalization, Internationalization, and the perceived Role of student affairs administrators from several items on the survey. She checked the correlation of each item within the relevant section of the survey with the corresponding composite score, and removed any items with a low correlation from that factor’s score. She also calculated Cronbach’s alpha ($\alpha$) coefficient to check for the reliability of each of the composites, and obtained values of $\alpha$ near .88 or more for each one, indicating a high degree of internal consistency (Burdzinski, 2014; Cortina, 1993; Kline, 2000).

The current survey instrument was adapted from Dr. Burdzinski’s instrument, with questions from the demographics, Globalization, and Internationalization sections copied almost unchanged. Only the questions Dr. Burdzinski had in the section addressing the perceived role of student affairs administrators now have been modified to apply to academic advisors, and one question from the first section of the previous survey was separated into two questions after receiving feedback from an academic advising department, as described in the pilot section below. The current version of the QUAID tool was then used to confirm the appropriateness of all questions in the entire survey instrument for this study after all changes had been made, and the tool indicated that no additional changes were needed.
The process by which the current survey instrument was developed produces the expectation that it possesses reliability and validity. The calculations of Cronbach’s alpha for the composite scores in Dr. Burdzinski’s study lead to the conclusion that the scales have internal consistency, and, since a score above 0.7 is considered strong, the corresponding calculations for this study result in the same conclusion, as demonstrated in Table 1 (Cortina, 1993; Kline, 2000). Confidence in the reliability of this survey instrument is bolstered by the results of the analysis using the QUAID tool as well. Additionally, there is content validity, as evidenced by the feedback given by experts in the field who participated in the pilot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Reliability of Research Composites Using Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research composites</td>
<td>Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of Globalization composite</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of Internationalization composite</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability of Role composite</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey consists of four sections, containing a total of 36 questions (Appendix B). The first section, “Globalization” (Globalization), contains 8 questions. The second section, “Internationalization” (Internationalization), contains 10 questions. The third section, “Academic Advisors’ Role in Internationalization” (Role), contains 4 questions. The last section consists of 14 demographic questions. With the exception of the demographic questions the survey asked respondents to rate their perceptions on a Likert-type scale with five response options. The levels are as follows: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree. The full survey along with all possible responses is included in Appendix B.

**Pilot**

As a part of the process of developing the survey instrument for this study, as outlined above, I conducted a pilot. The pilot survey was sent to five professional academic advisors, one assistant director, and one director from an academic advising department at an institution of
higher education that was not a part of the final survey. The survey was sent by e-mail to all seven of the potential respondents, and four advisors and one director provided feedback. Those who gave feedback about the survey recommended some modification to the definition of “academic advisor” in the directions for the section concerning the role of academic advisors, and suggested question seven in the original survey, which read, “Overall, globalization is something we must accept, and we must find ways to successfully respond to the challenges it will create”, should be separated into two questions, as it is in the current version of the survey. The only other modification suggested was the possibility that respondents might be confused by the phrase “multicultural affairs” in what is now question 10 and think it refers to a department within the college rather than a broad concept within the culture and understanding of the college community. As a result of that feedback the question was changed to include the phrase “the concept of”, and so now it reads, “The concept of ‘multicultural affairs’ at my college should include a broad international/global definition of diversity (to include language, customs, ethnicity, etc.).” The pilot contributes to the expectation that the current survey possesses content validity, and subsequent analysis by the QUAID tool bolsters the belief that it is also reliable.

Data Collection Procedures

The target population consists of all academic advisors at all twenty-eight state and community colleges in the Florida College System (FCS). I constructed a list of e-mail addresses for the academic advisors at each of the state and community colleges in the FCS by contacting representatives of all the colleges for which I have contacts, and by conducting an exhaustive website search to obtain the other e-mail addresses. After approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of South Florida (Appendix C), I used e-mail to contact the survey participants from all colleges in the FCS, and the e-mail included a letter of informed consent.
along with the invitation to participate in the study. Prospective participants were informed that by clicking the link in the e-mail to access the online survey they were giving their informed consent to participate (Appendix D). It was clear that the survey was sent by me for the purpose of conducting research for my dissertation, and was not from the respective colleges nor from any person who exercises authority over the participants (Appendix E).

All academic advisors who chose to participate completed the survey online utilizing the Qualtrics survey tool, and responses were anonymous. A follow-up e-mail was sent after the first and second weeks of the data collection process. That e-mail expressed thanks to any who had already participated, and encouraged all others to participate in a timely manner. The survey had to be completed in a single sitting, but it was relatively short and only two of the advisors who responded required more than eleven minutes to complete the survey. More complete information about the demographics and response rate of the participants is provided in Chapter Four.

**Protection of Human Participants**

I sent a letter of informed consent (Appendix D) with the link to participate in the online survey, and all participants were informed that by responding to the survey they were giving their informed consent. All responses were anonymous, and no personally identifiable information was published. Only descriptive statistics and summary analyses were included in the published dissertation. In preparation for this study I completed the Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) training regarding the protection of human subjects (Appendix F).
Variables of Interest

The variables of interest were the perceptions of academic advisors concerning globalization, internationalization, and the perceived roles of the advisors in those processes. Further investigation into the relationships between the background of the advisors and their perspectives also were conducted. The variables relate to the research questions as follows:

Research Question One (perceptions about globalization and internationalization) was answered by an analysis of survey questions 1-18 (Globalization and Internationalization sections). The questions in the first section asked participants to indicate their level of agreement with statements about the impact of globalization on the country (survey question 1: “Overall, I think globalization is a good thing for the United States economy.”), themselves (survey question 2: “Overall, I think globalization is a good thing for me.”), and their colleges (survey question 6: “Globalization will require major changes in how my college educates students.”). Questions in the second section asked participants to indicate their level of agreement with statements about the impact of internationalization on how colleges serve and educate their students (such as survey question 9: “My college should have a plan designed to increase international/global understanding among students.” and survey question 10: “My college should encourage faculty to provide study abroad opportunities for students to travel/study in other countries.”). Respondents answered the individual survey questions in these sections on a Likert-type scale with the following five levels: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree.

Research Question Two (perceptions about the role of advisors) was answered by an analysis of survey questions 19-22 (Academic Advisors’ Role in Internationalization section). These questions gave advisors who responded to the survey an opportunity to indicate their level
of agreement with certain roles they could have as they assist students who are primarily from the United States (survey question 21, “I think academic advisors should have a significant role in advising students to choose courses that will help them develop an international perspective.”), as well as students who come to study here from abroad (survey question 22, “I think academic advisors should have a significant role in assisting students from other countries to learn about U.S. higher education practices and procedures (e.g., plagiarism, academic integrity, and classroom etiquette.”). In a similar manner to Research Question One above, respondents answered the individual survey questions in this section using the same Likert-type scale with five levels.

Research Question Three (relationship between the demographic characteristics and the perceived role of advisors) was answered by an analysis of selected survey questions from 23-33 and 36 (Demographics section) along with a composite score for survey questions 19-22 (Academic Advisors’ Role in Internationalization section), computed by adding the scores for all four questions in the third section of the survey and dividing by four. The relevant questions from the demographic section of the survey were questions 26 (“How many total years have you worked in higher education?”), 27 (“What is your highest degree earned?”), 30 (“What international experience (travel/study) outside of the United States have you had?”), and 33 (“Please indicate what experience you have had with international student exchange programs.”). All response options for these questions are given in Appendix B. An additional control variable for this research question was the level of commitment a college has to internationalization, as indicated by the mission statement of the college. I performed an exhaustive search of the websites of all 28 colleges in the Florida College System to see if the college mission statement included any mention of globalization or internationalization. Colleges that mention
globalization, internationalization, global citizenship, or some similar global context for the college mission were assigned a value of 1 (one) for this variable, whereas colleges that did not mention any of those things were assigned a value of 0 (zero). Participants were then assigned one of these two values based on their response to survey question 36 (“At which institution do you work?”). Additional demographic information (such as gender, age, number of years working as an academic advisor, country of birth, and fluency in languages other than English) was collected, but was not used in the analysis for this study.

Research Question Four (relationship between globalization/internationalization and role of academic advisors, controlling for advisor and institutional characteristics) was answered by an analysis of the composite scores for Globalization, Internationalization, and Role of the academic advisors, while controlling for potential relationships between role and advisor and institutional characteristics. The composite scores were obtained by creating an arithmetic mean, calculated by adding the scores of all questions in the relevant section of the survey, and then dividing by the number of questions in that section (eight, ten, and four, respectively). This procedure is consistent with the analysis performed by Dr. Burdzinski in her study, as described above. I also checked the alpha reliability of my scores in a manner similar to Dr. Burdzinski’s study. There was a high degree of multicollinearity between the separate composite scores for the Globalization and Internationalization sections of the survey. For that reason it was necessary to combine those separate composite scores into a single composite, calculated as the arithmetic mean of all responses to the first eighteen questions in the survey. Details concerning the combined composite score are discussed in the Data Analysis section below. The control variables used for Research Question Four were the same demographic and institutional variables used as described above to address Research Question Three.
Research Question Five (relationship between globalization/internationalization and international activity and success of the college in maintaining an international focus) was answered by an analysis of the composite scores for survey questions 1-8 (Globalization) and survey questions 9-18 (Internationalization) along with survey questions 34 (“How would you rate your own participation in any kind of international activity in comparison with that of the majority of your peers?”) and 35 (“How would you rate the success of your institution in maintaining an international focus for students?”) from the Demographics section. The response options for survey item 34 were 1 = nominal, 2 = minimal, 3 = fair, 4 = very good, 5 = extensive, and 6 = don’t know. The response options for survey item 34 were 1 = very poor, 2 = poor, 3 = fair, 4 = good, and 5 = very good. I used the same composite scores (separate Globalization and Internationalization scores) as described above for Research Question Four when I answered Research Question Five.

Data Analysis Procedures

I used a nonexperimental quantitative design employing descriptive statistics, Pearson’s r correlation between variables, and Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression analysis (Johnson & Christensen, 2014). In addressing Research Questions Three, Four, and Five, I used a composite score for each of the “Globalization”, “Internationalization”, and “Role” sections of the survey, and, for Research Question Four, created a combined composite score for both “Globalization” and “Internationalization”, as appropriate. Certain independent variables for the analysis used to address Research Questions Three and Four were eliminated as necessary when multicollinearity was present. For example, “age”, “years of experience in higher education”, and “years in an academic advising position” were found best to be represented by “years of experience in higher education” (so the other two variables were removed), since that variable contributed more to the
coefficient of multiple determination than the other two. Each of the variables removed or combined because of multicollinearity are discussed in more detail below for each research question.

The research questions were addressed by an analysis of the data in the following manner:

Research Question One (perceptions about globalization and internationalization) was answered by an analysis of survey questions 1-18 (Globalization and Internationalization sections of the survey). This analysis employed descriptive statistics, including the mean, standard deviation, frequencies, and relative frequencies of the survey items.

Research Question Two (perceptions about the role of advisors) was answered by an analysis of survey questions 19-22 (Role section of the survey). This analysis also included descriptive statistics such as the mean, standard deviation, frequencies, and relative frequencies of the survey items.

Research Question Three (relationship between the demographic characteristics and the perceived role of advisors) was answered by a multiple regression (OLS) model utilizing the responses to selected survey questions from 23-33 and 36 (demographic section) as independent variables and a composite score for the role of advisors in internationalization, obtained by adding the scores for the questions in the third section of the survey and dividing by four, as the dependent variable. An additional independent variable for this analysis was the level of commitment a college has for internationalization, as indicated by the inclusion of some component of internationalization in the college mission statement. As noted in Chapter Two, there were ten of the twenty-eight colleges in the FCS that included some global or international context for the college mission. Participants in the survey worked at seven of those ten colleges,
as well as eight of the colleges that did not mention an international or global context for the college mission.

Since the data indicated some multicollinearity among the independent variables, some of the variables were excluded from consideration. For example, the variables of age, years of experience in higher education, and years in an academic advising position were related, so it was appropriate to consider only one of them in the analysis (Stevens, 2007). In order to determine which variables to include, I calculated the variance inflation factor (VIF), tolerance, intercept-adjusted condition index, and the proportion of variation corresponding to each condition index for each of the possible independent variables. The largest VIF (and therefore smallest tolerance) as well as the largest proportion of variation corresponding to the maximum condition index 3.338 are all obtained by survey question 24 (“In what year were you born?”), survey question 25 (“How many years have you worked at a community college in an academic advising position?”), and survey question 26 (“How many total years have you worked in higher education?”). Since all of these variables have to do with the age of the participant, I decided to exclude two of them from the model. When I used the $R^2$ method to choose the best subset of independent variables to use in making the model, question 26 was included in the model with the highest coefficient of multiple determination ($R^2$-square value) for four, five, six, and seven variables, but questions 24 and 25 were not. For this reason I excluded questions 24 and 25 from my model, and included question 26. In a similar way other variables were eliminated or selected so that the final model utilizes five independent variables. Those variables are “How many total years have you worked in higher education?” (survey question 26), “What is your highest degree earned?” (question 27), “What international experience (travel/study) outside of the United States have you had?” (question 30), “Please indicate what experience you have had with
international student exchange programs” (question 33), and whether or not internationalization is included in the mission statement of the college.

The original five-variable model was based on data containing five potential outliers as indicated by Cook’s distance using the rule 4/n, but the number of potential outliers was reduced to four when only entries with Cook’s distance greater than three times the mean of all distances were considered. Those four outliers were removed to obtain a much better model that had statistical significance with p-value less than .001. Research Question Four (relationship between globalization/internationalization and role of academic advisors, controlling for advisor and institutional characteristics) was answered by multiple regression (OLS) model utilizing as independent variables the composite scores for Globalization and Internationalization (variables of interest) and advisor and institutional characteristics (control variables). The composite score for the perceived role of academic advisors, calculated as the arithmetic mean of responses in the Role section of the survey (survey questions 19-22), served as the dependent variable. There was a high degree of multicollinearity ($N = 45, r = .62$, condition index 2.72, proportion of variation in Globalization composite .72, proportion of variation in Internationalization composite .86) between the separate composite scores for the Globalization and Internationalization sections of the survey. For that reason it was necessary to combine those separate composite scores into a single composite, calculated as the mean of all responses to the first eighteen questions in the survey. This aggregate score served as the independent variable of interest, and the demographic and institutional characteristic variables, chosen as above in addressing Research Question Three, were control variables. Cronbach’s alpha was .853 for this new composite, indicating that it is more reliable than the two separate composite scores it replaced (Cronbach’s alpha .81 and .73, respectively). After removal of four outliers and with the new, combined composite score
the model was significant (p < .0001) and the coefficient of multiple determination was .48 after adjusting for the number of variables in the model.

Research Question Five (relationship between globalization/internationalization and international activity and success of the college in maintaining an international focus) was answered by an analysis of survey questions 1-18 (Globalization and Internationalization section) along with survey questions 34 and 35 from the Demographics section. I calculated correlations between the composite scores for Globalization and Internationalization with the responses to survey questions 34 (“How would you rate your own participation in any kind of international activity in comparison with that of the majority of your peers?”) and 35 (“How would you rate the success of your institution in maintaining an international focus for students?”).

Table 2 summarizes the analyses and the corresponding survey questions for each research question.

Table 2
Analyses of Survey Questions to Address Research Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>Analyses conducted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What are the perceptions of academic advisors within the Florida College System (FCS) about globalization and internationalization? (survey questions 1-18)</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics, including mean, standard deviation, frequencies, and relative frequencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What are the perceptions of academic advisors within the FCS about how internationalization should be a part of their job responsibilities? (questions 19-22)</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics, including mean, standard deviation, frequencies, and relative frequencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How are certain advisor and institutional characteristics related to advisors’ perceptions about the role of academic advisors in internationalizing the community/state college? (questions 19-22, 26, 27, 30, 33, 36)</td>
<td>Multiple regression, using the demographic items from questions 26, 27, 30, 33, and results from analyzing the respective mission statements of each of the colleges (based on each participant’s response to question 36) as independent variables and a composite score for the role (based on questions 19-22) as the dependent variable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
### Table 2 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>Analyses conducted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. How are the perceptions that academic advisors within the FCS hold on globalization and internationalization related to their perceptions of the role of academic advisors in internationalizing the college, controlling for advisor and institutional characteristics? (questions 1-22, 26, 27, 30, 33, 36)</td>
<td>Multiple regression, using a combined composite subscore based on Globalization (survey questions 1-8) and Internationalization (questions 9-18) as the independent variable of interest and a composite score for the role (based on questions 19-22) as the dependent variable, controlling for certain advisor and institutional characteristics from questions 26, 27, 30, 33, and results from analyzing the respective mission statements of each of the colleges (based on each participant’s response to question 36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What is the relationship between the perceptions of academic advisors within the FCS about globalization and internationalization and their self-perceived level of personal participation in international activity and success of their institution in maintaining an international focus? (questions 1-18, 34, 35)</td>
<td>Calculated Pearson’s r correlations between composite Globalization and Internationalization scores with responses to questions 34 and 35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary

In this quantitative study I considered the perspectives of academic advisors in public community and state colleges in the Florida College System concerning globalization, internationalization, and their role in internationalization. I also investigated the relationships, if any, between the background of the academic advisors and their perceptions concerning their role in internationalization. Finally, I used the study to address what relationships may exist between advisors’ perceptions concerning globalization and internationalization and institutional and personal progress or involvement in internationalization.

It is appropriate for this study to utilize a nonexperimental design to investigate the perceptions of academic advisors because the purpose of this study was to identify the relationships that may exist between the variables of interest, but not to seek to establish any cause-and-effect relationships. Those relationships are the subject of Chapter Four, which will
cover the results of the survey, and will address those results in the context of the research questions.
Chapter Four

Results

The main purpose of this study was to ascertain the perceptions and attitudes of academic advisors in the Florida College System (FCS) concerning globalization, internationalization, and what role, if any, they believe they should have in the internationalization of community and state colleges. The survey was designed to measure the advisors’ viewpoints concerning the importance of globalization and internationalization to the country, to their academic institutions, and to them personally. Additionally, the survey focused on whether advisors think globalization and internationalization will continue to be important in the future, and what role the advisors understand themselves to have in internationalizing their respective colleges. A final part of the study was designed to determine how certain demographic variables may be related to advisors’ perceptions as measured in the other parts of the study. There has been little research into the role of co-curricular personnel in internationalizing institutions of higher education, and even less attention has been paid to this issue in co-curricular departments at community colleges, so this research enhances understanding in this area.

Research Study

The Florida College System (FCS) consists of twenty-eight community and state colleges, all of which until recently granted only professional certificates and associate’s degrees. The state colleges now have the ability to grant a limited number of bachelor’s degrees as well, but their missions are still primarily those of community colleges. This research study
investigated academic advisors’ perceived role in internationalizing their colleges within the FCS.

**Population and sample.** The population of interest was all academic advisors working in the twenty-eight state and community colleges in the FCS. The sampling frame included 579 academic advisors for whom I could obtain valid e-mail addresses, and the sample consisted of all respondents to the survey after the invitation to participate was sent by e-mail. Of those contacted, there were a total of 54 respondents, giving a 9.3% response rate. Seven of the 54 respondents provided answers only to the globalization portion of the survey. They therefore had to be excluded from all analysis for this study except for the calculation of Cronbach’s α coefficient for the Globalization section and the descriptive statistics used to address parts of Research Question One. Four of the remaining respondents omitted one or more responses to the Globalization and Internationalization sections of the survey, and therefore also were not considered in that part of the analysis that depended on those composite scores. Additional respondents were omitted from the analysis as required if their responses were found to be outliers. The sample size of usable responses ranged between 41 and 47 for most of the analyses, as detailed below.

In all, respondents who indicated the college at which they worked came from 15 of the 28 colleges in the FCS, as summarized in Table 3. Nine of the respondents did not answer the question concerning their place of employment, and thus it was impossible to determine which other colleges, if any, were represented in the sample. The valid percentage of academic advisors was calculated as the percentage of respondents from each college in the sample who indicated their college. The valid percentages resulted in the calculation of a 95% confidence interval that included the actual percentage of the population from each of the represented colleges. This
supports the conclusion that the sample was representative of the population with regard to the percentage of advisors who worked at the various colleges.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cum. %</th>
<th>Pop. %</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Broward College</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>[-6.6, 14.0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daytona State College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>[-2.1, 6.5 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Florida State College</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>[1.9, 20.3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Gateway College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>[-2.1, 6.5 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Keys Community College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>[-2.1, 6.5 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida SouthWestern State College</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>[-6.6, 14.0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State College at Jacksonville</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>[3.4, 23.3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian River State College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>[-2.1, 6.5 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami Dade College</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>[-6.6, 14.0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach State College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>[-1.6, 10.5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk State College</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>[-2.1, 6.5 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Petersburg College</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>[8.3, 31.7 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Fe College</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>[-1.6, 10.5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State College of Florida, Manatee-Sarasota</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>[-1.6, 10.5]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia College</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>[1.9, 20.3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Percent represents the percentage of the entire sample who participated from that college. Valid % gives the percentage of all respondents who revealed their institution. Cum. % is the cumulative percentage. Pop. % gives the percentage of the population who work at the respective colleges. The 95% confidence interval is calculated from the sample for the population percentage for each college, and is reported in percentages.

The majority of respondents were female (N = 35, 76.1%), and the rest who responded to the question concerning gender were male (N = 11, 23.9%). There were no responses from anyone identifying themselves as belonging to the “Transgender” or “Other” categories. This is consistent with the population of interest, which is comprised of 74.4% females, 21.8% males, and 3.8% for whom gender could not be determined. The observed population proportion is well within (.64, .88), the 95% confidence interval for the population proportion of females based on this sample. This supports the conclusion that the sample is representative of the population.
based on gender. Complete details of the responses of the participants concerning their gender are given below in Table 4.

Table 4  
_Frequencies of Responses by Gender_  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid %</th>
<th>Cum. %</th>
<th>Pop. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ages of the respondents ranged from 27 to 64 years, with the greatest concentration between the ages of 30 and 39 (N = 17, 37.0%). Of the respondents, one-third were born before 1971, and one-third were born after 1982. The complete results for the ages of the respondents are summarized in Table 5. Not all of the ages for the academic advisors in the population of interest were available.

Table 5  
_Frequencies of Responses by Age_  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
<th>Cum. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of years each of the respondents has worked in higher education varied from 1 to 25, with a median value of 10 years. The vast majority of participants who responded to this survey item have worked in higher education for less than 13 years, but nearly one-fifth have worked in higher education for more than 19 years, as indicated in Table 6. No data were
available for 8 respondents who did not answer this question, so the valid percentage was calculated as a percentage of the 46 respondents for whom data were available.

Table 6  
Frequencies of Responses by Number of Years in Higher Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of years in higher education</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
<th>Cum. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest degree earned by the respondents was overwhelmingly the Master’s degree. The rest of the respondents had a Bachelor’s degree, except for two respondents who had an Associate’s degree. There were eight participants who did not respond to this question in the survey. Refer to Table 7 for the results.

Table 7  
Frequencies of Responses by Highest Degree Earned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Degree</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid percent</th>
<th>Cum. %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, the sample was overwhelmingly comprised of female participants with Master’s degrees, mostly aged between 30 and 49 years. Most of them have been working in higher education less than 13 years. Additionally, for those characteristics for which population information was available, the sample appeared to be representative of the population.
Research Questions and Results

In this section each of the research questions will be presented along with the relevant statistics that resulted from the survey. The findings include descriptive statistics, Pearson’s r correlation between variables, and Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression analysis. Composite scores, as described in Chapter Three, were computed and used in the analysis of Research Questions Three, Four, and Five.

**Research Question One.** What are the perceptions of academic advisors within the Florida College System (FCS) about globalization and internationalization?

This research question is addressed by the part of the survey that investigates the perspectives of the participants concerning how globalization and internationalization relate to the country, their college, and the participants themselves. Descriptive statistics for the Globalization and Internationalization portions of the survey are given in Table 8.

Table 8
**Frequency Distributions and Descriptive Statistics for Survey Questions Regarding Globalization and Internationalization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall, I think globalization is a good thing for the United States economy.</td>
<td>32.1% (17)</td>
<td>58.5% (31)</td>
<td>9.4% (5)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (53)</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Overall, I think globalization is a good thing for me.</td>
<td>25.9% (14)</td>
<td>48.1% (26)</td>
<td>22.2% (12)</td>
<td>3.7% (2)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (54)</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A global economy will require workers in my community to have the ability to work with people from other countries.</td>
<td>30.2% (16)</td>
<td>62.3% (33)</td>
<td>3.8% (2)</td>
<td>3.8% (2)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (53)</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A global economy will require workers in my community to have the ability to work with people from other cultures.</td>
<td>39.6% (21)</td>
<td>56.6% (30)</td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (53)</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 8 (continued)
Frequency Distributions and Descriptive Statistics for Survey Questions Regarding Globalization and Internationalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. A global economy will require workers in my community to have the ability to respond to a changing job market by reinventing themselves.</td>
<td>24.5% (13)</td>
<td>50.9% (27)</td>
<td>22.6% (12)</td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (53)</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Globalization will require major changes in how my college educates students.</td>
<td>16.7% (9)</td>
<td>50.0% (27)</td>
<td>13.0% (7)</td>
<td>20.4% (11)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (54)</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Overall, globalization is something we must accept.</td>
<td>43.4% (23)</td>
<td>37.7% (20)</td>
<td>17.0% (9)</td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (53)</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. We must find ways to successfully respond to any challenges globalization will create.</td>
<td>38.9% (21)</td>
<td>55.6% (30)</td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td>3.7% (2)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (54)</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My college should have a plan designed to increase international/global understanding among students.</td>
<td>29.8% (14)</td>
<td>66.0% (31)</td>
<td>4.3% (2)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (47)</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The concept of “multicultural affairs” at my college should include a broad international/global definition of diversity (to include language, customs, ethnicity, etc.).</td>
<td>27.7% (13)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>6.4% (3)</td>
<td>53.2% (25)</td>
<td>12.8% (6)</td>
<td>100% (47)</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My college should encourage students to take more than the minimum requirement in foreign language courses.</td>
<td>13.0% (6)</td>
<td>21.7% (10)</td>
<td>39.1% (18)</td>
<td>23.9% (11)</td>
<td>2.2% (1)</td>
<td>100% (46)</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. International exchange opportunities should be available to faculty and staff at my college.</td>
<td>51.1% (24)</td>
<td>40.4% (19)</td>
<td>8.5% (4)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (47)</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 8 (continued)
Frequency Distributions and Descriptive Statistics for Survey Questions Regarding Globalization and Internationalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. My college would benefit from having a collaborative relationship with an institution in another country.</td>
<td>29.8% (14)</td>
<td>53.2% (25)</td>
<td>12.8% (6)</td>
<td>4.3% (2)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (47)</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. All associate degree students at my college should be required to complete at least one course with an international/global focus.</td>
<td>32.6% (15)</td>
<td>54.3% (25)</td>
<td>8.7% (4)</td>
<td>4.3% (2)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (46)</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. All bachelor’s degree students at my college (if any) should be required to complete at least one course with an international/global focus.</td>
<td>43.5% (20)</td>
<td>50.0% (23)</td>
<td>6.5% (3)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (46)</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My college should create a campuswide task force to examine how the college can better prepare students for a global economy.</td>
<td>6.5% (3)</td>
<td>67.4% (31)</td>
<td>17.4% (8)</td>
<td>8.7% (4)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (46)</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. My college should actively recruit students from other countries.</td>
<td>15.2% (7)</td>
<td>32.6% (15)</td>
<td>43.5% (20)</td>
<td>6.5% (3)</td>
<td>2.2% (1)</td>
<td>100% (46)</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My college should encourage faculty to provide study abroad opportunities for students to travel/study in other countries.</td>
<td>44.7% (21)</td>
<td>51.1% (24)</td>
<td>4.3% (2)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (47)</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although most of the participants expressed general agreement with most of the survey items, there were a few notable exceptions. Less than half of the participants responded positively (either “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”) when asked if their “college should include a broad international/global definition of diversity” (survey item 10), students should “take more than the minimum requirement in foreign language courses” (survey item 11), and their “college
should actively recruit students from other countries” (survey item 17). As would be expected, these same items, along with survey item 6 (“Globalization will require major changes in how my college educates students.”), had responses with the lowest mean scores. When these items are considered together, there appears to be a context in which diversity, foreign language acquisition, and foreign student enrollment are not prioritized by the academic advisors who participated in this study. In such an environment it is reasonable for respondents to indicate only lukewarm support for the idea that colleges will have to make major changes in how they educate their students.

The highest percentages of positive responses (either “Strongly Agree” or “Agree”) were given in support of international exchange opportunities for faculty and staff (“International exchange opportunities should be available to faculty and staff at my college.”, survey item 12, 91.5%), “Overall, I think globalization is a good thing for the United States economy” (item 1, 91.6%), “A global economy will require workers in my community to have the ability to work with people from other countries” (survey item 3, 92.5%), “A global economy will require workers in my community to have the ability to work with people from other cultures” (item 4, 96.2%), “We must find ways to successfully respond to any challenges globalization will create.” (survey item 8, 94.4%), “My college should have a plan designed to increase international/global understanding among students” (survey item 9, 95.7%), “All bachelor’s degree students at my college (if any) should be required to complete at least one course with an international/global focus” (survey item 15, 93.5%), and “My college should encourage faculty to provide study abroad opportunities for students to travel/study in other countries” (survey item 18, 95.7%). These results, considered together, indicate strong support for international exchanges of faculty, staff, and students. There also seems to be agreement that globalization is a good thing (and also
likely to continue or increase), and that colleges might need to have a plan in place to deal with the inevitable challenges that result from it. This agreement does not carry over into all parts of the survey, however.

About one-fifth of the respondents (20.4%) disagreed with the statement “globalization will require major changes in how my college educates students” (survey question 6), but none of the respondents strongly disagreed with the statement. Only 13 respondents (27.7%) strongly agreed with the statement “The concept of ‘multicultural affairs’ at my college should include a broad international/global definition of diversity (to include language, customs, ethnicity, etc.)” (survey question 10), and there were no responses in the “agree” category. Almost two-thirds of the respondents (66.0%) either disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement, and the remaining three participants (6.4%) were ambivalent. So, in contrast to the previous discussion of topics in which advisors indicated a high level of agreement with certain concepts, advisors did not seem to indicate much support for fostering a multicultural context for learning at their college, and did not think that their college would have to make major changes in how students are educated. That is, while advisors responded that colleges must create a plan designed to deal with globalization, they do not think that plan will include major changes to the delivery of education to the students.

The distribution of responses to survey question 11 (“My college should encourage students to take more than the minimum requirement in foreign language courses.”) was nearly symmetric, and the number of responses in the “Neither Agree Nor Disagree” category for this question was second largest (18, 39.1%) out of these 18 survey items. The survey question with the largest frequency in the “Neither Agree Nor Disagree” category (20, 43.5%) was item 17 (“My college should actively recruit students from other countries.”), which also had a nearly
This is in stark contrast to the expectation from the literature that foreign exchange students can have a significant impact on the internationalization of an institution of higher education (Brennan & Dellow, 2013; Ivey, 2009; Sawir, 2013). Overall, participants did not seem to have strong opinions either way in both of these cases, indicating that they did not place much importance on (or strongly object to) foreign language learning or the possible impact of foreign exchange students on the internationalization of the college. Of the other sixteen survey items in the first two sections of the instrument, only two had more than 20% of respondents chose “Neither Agree Nor Disagree” (item 2, “Overall, I think globalization is a good thing for me”, 22.2%, N = 54, and item 5, “A global economy will require workers in my community to have the ability to respond to a changing job market by reinventing themselves”, 22.6%, N = 53).

The majority of participants seemed to indicate general agreement with the concepts that globalization is good, growing, and will require colleges to plan for changes that accompany increasing globalization, but they did not as readily agree to the proposition that colleges will have to change the way they educate their students. Many participants also did not seem to agree that their college should create a broad, inclusive concept of multicultural affairs to include an international/global definition of diversity that addresses differences in language, culture, or ethnicity.

**Research Question Two.** What are the perceptions of academic advisors within the FCS about how internationalization should be a part of their job responsibilities?

The second research question is addressed by an analysis of the part of the survey that investigates the perspectives of the participants concerning their role in pursuing
internationalization at their colleges. The frequencies and relative frequencies of the responses of the participants to the questions in the Role section of the survey are presented in Table 9.

Table 9
*Frequency Distributions and Descriptive Statistics for Survey Questions Regarding Role*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I think academic advisors should have a significant role in</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. …helping students to understand how globalism will impact their lives.</td>
<td>12.8% (6)</td>
<td>38.3% (18)</td>
<td>29.8% (14)</td>
<td>19.1% (9)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (47)</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. …helping students celebrate the growing diversity of ethnicities, religions, and cultures on campus.</td>
<td>23.4% (11)</td>
<td>38.3% (18)</td>
<td>27.7% (13)</td>
<td>8.5% (4)</td>
<td>2.1% (1)</td>
<td>100% (47)</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. …advising students to choose courses that will help them develop an international perspective.</td>
<td>21.3% (10)</td>
<td>53.2% (25)</td>
<td>21.3% (10)</td>
<td>4.3% (2)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>100% (47)</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. …assisting students from other countries to learn about U.S. higher education practices and procedures (e.g., plagiarism, academic integrity, and classroom etiquette).</td>
<td>31.9% (15)</td>
<td>40.4% (19)</td>
<td>12.8% (6)</td>
<td>8.5% (4)</td>
<td>6.4% (3)</td>
<td>100% (47)</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When responding about their perceived role in internationalizing the college, the participants were much more likely (22.9% of all responses) to indicate that they neither agreed or disagreed with the statements in the Role section, as compared to 13.3% of all responses in the Globalization and Internationalization sections. Also, the mean responses for each of the survey questions in the Role section are lower than the means of at least 13 of the 18 questions in the Globalization and Internationalization sections. A comparison of the overall results in the Role section of the survey to the results in the first two sections indicate that the participants did not see their role in internationalization to be as significant as the general concepts of internationalization and globalization. This is evident in the lower mean scores overall for survey items in the Role section, as well as higher relative frequencies for responses in the “Disagree” and “Strongly Disagree” categories as compared to most questions in the Globalization and
Internationalization sections of the survey. There was, however, still some support for advisors to have a role in the internationalization of their colleges (“Agree” or “Strongly Agree” for at least 51.1% of responses in each item).

Advisors who participated in the survey had a high rate (19.1%) of negative responses (all “Disagree”, no “Strongly Disagree”), as well as 29.8% who responded “Neither Agree Nor Disagree”, when asked whether they think that advisors have the responsibility for “helping students to understand how globalism will impact their lives” (survey item 19). This indicates that many advisors may not envision their role to include guidance or direction of students beyond the context of their academic pursuits.

**Research Question Three. How are certain advisor and institutional characteristics related to advisors’ perceptions about the role of academic advisors in internationalizing the community/state college?**

The relationships of the demographic variables to the perceptions of the participants regarding globalization and internationalization were clearly evident, though the strength of those relationships was not overwhelming. The coefficient of multiple determination when considering all observations was .35, so approximately 35% of the variation in the dependent variable could be accounted for by the variation in the set of predictors ($R^2 = .35, p < .01$). The adjusted coefficient of multiple determination, which accounts for the number of variables in the model, was .26, and thus indicates that much less of the variability in the dependent variable could be attributed to the variability in the predictors.

The original analysis was based on data containing five potential outliers as indicated by Cook’s distance using the rule 4/n, but the number of potential outliers was reduced to four when only entries with Cook’s distance greater than three times the mean of all distances were
considered. After removal of those four outliers the coefficient of multiple determination improved considerably \( R^2 = .49, p < .001 \). So then nearly 49% of the variation in the dependent variable can be accounted for by the variation in the set of predictors after excluding the outliers, and the overall model is statistically significant with a \( p \)-value well under .01. In this case, the adjusted coefficient of multiple determination was .41, which is still much better than the model that contained the outliers.

As discussed in Chapter Three, several of the measured demographic variables were not used to create the models used to address Research Questions Three and Four. When creating mean Role scores for the subgroups identified by the excluded demographic variables, the differences between groups did not differ with statistical significance for any of the excluded variables. Also, as discussed in Chapter Three, some of the demographic variables were excluded because multicollinearity was present. The means of the Role composite variable for each of the excluded and included demographic variables for those participants whose responses were included in the models used to address Research Questions Three and Four are summarized in Table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic item</th>
<th>( n )</th>
<th>( M )</th>
<th>( SD )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not included in model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in the United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak a language other than English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 10 (continued)

*Composite Means for Role by Demographic Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic item</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger than 40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 or older</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in academic advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included in model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years in higher education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest degree earned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than Master’s</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least Master’s</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At most 6 weeks</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 6 weeks</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience with international student exchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalization in college mission statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The coefficients for the multiple regression model were statistically significant at $\alpha = .05$ for four of the five independent variables. Some observations were readily apparent from the coefficients in the final model: advisors with more years of experience in higher education ($\beta = .56, p < .001$) and those who had more experience with student exchange programs either as a participant or host ($\beta = .39, p < .05$) tended to have higher composite scores for their perception of their role in internationalizing their colleges, whereas those who had higher degrees ($\beta = - .31, p < .05$) were likely to have lower composite scores for their role.

Interestingly, advisors who came from colleges that included some component of globalization or internationalization in their mission statements ($\beta = - .43, p < .01$) also were likely to have
lower composite role scores than those who came from colleges that made no mention of either globalization or internationalization in their mission statements.

The inclusion of a global or international component in the college mission statement was the only institutional characteristic included in this analysis. This is partly because the small sample size for this study did not allow for other characteristics, such as college setting (urban, suburban, or rural) and size to be adequately considered. Responses were provided by only one academic advisor from some colleges, and many colleges were not represented at all in the sample, so any attempt to draw conclusions about other institutional characteristics would not easily yield generalizable results. Table 11 gives the relevant results for the multiple regression model for role based on certain advisor and institutional characteristics.

| Variable                                      | Parameter estimate | SE  | t    | p>|t| | Standardized estimate |
|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------|-----|------|-----|-----------------------|
| Intercept                                     | 5.03               | 0.82| 6.16 | <.001| 0                     |
| Number of years in higher education           | 0.07               | 0.02| 3.77 | <.001| 0.56                 |
| Highest degree earned                         | -0.40              | 0.17| -2.40| 0.02 | -0.31                |
| International experience                      | -0.03              | 0.06| -0.47| 0.64 | -0.07                |
| Experience with international student exchange| 0.33               | 0.13| 2.54 | 0.02 | 0.39                 |
| Internationalization in college mission statement | -0.64             | 0.21| -3.09| <0.01| -0.43               |

**Research Question Four.** How are the perceptions that academic advisors within the FCS hold on globalization and internationalization related to their perceptions of the role of academic advisors in internationalizing the college, controlling for advisor and institutional characteristics?

The model for the relationship between advisors’ perceptions concerning globalization and internationalization and their perceptions concerning their role in internationalizing their colleges indicated a high degree of multicollinearity ($N = 45$, $r = .62$, condition index 2.72, proportion of variation in Globalization composite .72, proportion of variation in
Internationalization composite .86) between the separate composite scores for the Globalization and Internationalization sections of the survey. For that reason it was necessary to combine those separate composite scores into a single composite, calculated as the arithmetic mean of all responses to the first eighteen questions in the survey, as discussed in Chapter Three. Cronbach’s alpha for each of the separate Globalization (α = .81) and Internationalization (α = .73) composites was lower than the value for this new composite (α = .85), indicating that the new, combined composite is at least as reliable as the two separate composite scores it replaced. After the removal of four outliers, and with the combined composite score, the model was significant (N = 41, p < .001), and the adjusted coefficient of multiple determination was .49, after accounting for the number of variables in the model.

The standardized parameter estimate (see Table 12) for the contribution of the Globalization and Internationalization composite score to the variation in the Role composite score was positive and was different from zero with statistical significance (β = .26, p < .05). The partial correlation (see Table 13) of the Globalization and Internationalization composite variable with the Role composite variable was positive (ρ = 0.31), also corroborating that an increase in the Globalization and Internationalization composite score would accompany an increase in the Role composite score. That is, advisors who indicated more agreement with the items in the Globalization and Internationalization sections of the survey were also more likely to have more agreement with the items in the Role section of the survey. Thus, if all other variables are held constant, a one standard deviation increase in the Globalization and Internationalization composite score would correspond to a .26 standard deviation increase in the Role composite score in the model.
All but one of the control variables was negatively correlated to the Role composite variable (see Table 13), and all of the statistically significant standardized parameter estimates had greater magnitude than that of the Globalization and Internationalization composite variable (see Table 12). One result of this is that advisors who worked at colleges with some component of globalization or internationalization in the mission statement typically expressed less agreement with the items in the Role section of the survey than advisors who worked at colleges without such mission statements ($\beta = -0.44, p < .001$). This is consistent with the results of the multiple regression used in addressing Research Question Three. Similarly, those who had higher degrees ($\beta = -0.49, p < .001$) also tended to have lower composite scores for their role in internationalizing their college. However, in contrast to these control variables, advisors who had worked in higher education longer ($\beta = 0.35, p < .01$) tended to score higher on the role composite. However, in this model the variable for experience with international student exchange was not a significant predictor ($p = .75$) of the Role composite, whereas in the model used to address Research Question Three it was ($p < .05$). Table 12 gives the results for the multiple regression model for role based on the combined Globalization and Internationalization composite score ($N = 41, p < .0001$), controlling for advisor and institutional characteristics.

Table 12

| Variable                                | Parameter estimate | SE  | t     | $p>|t|$ | Standardized estimate |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------------|-----|-------|--------|-----------------------|
| Intercept                               | 5.33              | 1.17| 4.56  | <.001  | 0                     |
| Number of years in higher education     | 0.04              | 0.01| 2.96  | 0.01   | 0.35                  |
| Highest degree earned                   | -0.68             | 0.17| -4.11 | <.001  | -0.49                 |
| International experience               | -0.09             | 0.05| -1.85 | 0.07   | -0.24                 |
| Experience with international student exchange | 0.01            | 0.04| 0.33  | 0.75   | 0.04                  |
| Internationalization in college mission statement | -0.63           | 0.17| -3.68 | <.001  | -0.44                 |
| Globalization and Internationalization composite | 0.44           | 0.21| 2.12  | 0.04   | 0.26                  |
Table 13 lists the partial correlations for multiple regression for Role based on Globalization and Internationalization, controlling for certain advisor and institutional characteristics. There were statistically significant correlations between the Role composite score and all but two of the independent variables. The only significant interaction between the independent variables themselves was between advisors’ international experience and the combined Globalization and Internationalization composite score. The negative nature of that correlation ($\rho = -0.37$, $p < 0.05$) indicated that an increase in advisors’ international experience would generally accompany a decrease in the Globalization and Internationalization composite score, and an increase in the Globalization and Internationalization composite score would accompany a decrease in advisors’ international experience. The coefficient for international experience was not statistically significant in the models used to address either of Research Questions Three or Four, however, so although a relationship existed between international experience and the Globalization and Internationalization composite score, it did not affect the models used to show the relationships between the chosen independent variables and the Role composite score.

Table 13
Partial Correlations for Multiple Regression for Role Based on Globalization and Internationalization, Controlling for Advisor and College Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of years in higher education</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Highest degree earned</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.34*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. International experience</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.37*</td>
<td>-0.35*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Experience with international student exchange</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Internationalization in college mission statement</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Globalization and Internationalization composite</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Role</td>
<td>–</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.
Research Question Five. What is the relationship between the perceptions of academic advisors within the FCS about globalization and internationalization and their self-perceived level of personal participation in international activity and success of their institution in maintaining an international focus?

At the $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance it is possible to conclude that there is a relatively modest positive correlation ($r = 0.31$, $p < 0.05$, $N = 42$) between advisors’ composite score for the internationalization portion of the survey and their perception of their own personal involvement in international activity as compared to the majority of their peers, but with $p$-values of .21, .74, and .97, respectively, and small correlation sizes, the other three relationships under consideration for this research question are not going to be considered noteworthy based on the results obtained from this sample (refer to Table 14). There very well could be significant correlations between these variables, but a larger sample would be needed to investigate this possibility further, especially the almost noteworthy Pearson’s $r$ correlation for the relationship between advisors’ composite score for the internationalization portion of the survey and their perception of institutional involvement in internationalization at their colleges ($r = -0.20$, $p > .10$, $N = 42$). That is, with the current sample size, there is no statistical reason to deduce that advisors’ perceptions concerning globalization are correlated to their perceptions of either personal or institutional involvement in internationalization, but the size of the sample leads to some uncertainty concerning that conclusion. The same result was evident concerning the relationship between advisors’ perceptions concerning internationalization and their perceptions of institutional involvement in internationalization at their colleges. Thus it seems that the connection between what advisors perceive about internationalization and globalization and how
that translates into practice in their personal and professional lives was not as evident as some could expect that it would be.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Globalization and personal international involvement</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalization and institutional progress in internationalization</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalization and personal international involvement</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalization and institutional progress in internationalization</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The positive correlation between advisors’ composite score for the internationalization portion of the survey and their perception of their own personal involvement in international activity as compared to the majority of their peers would indicate that more agreement with the items in the internationalization section of the survey would accompany a higher perception of personal international involvement, though the relative weakness of that correlation would indicate that some caution is warranted before general conclusions are proposed.

Summary

In conclusion, the sample consisted mainly of female participants with master’s degrees who have worked in a higher education setting for less than thirteen years. They generally seemed to agree that globalization is prevalent and increasing, and that it will impact students. They also appeared to see some role for themselves in the process of internationalization, but they did not agree as readily that their role is essential to the same degree that globalization and internationalization are inevitable. Many of the participants also indicated a significant personal commitment to internationalization and international activities, but overall the responses to that issue did not correlate to the responses concerning globalization and internationalization generally. There were a few areas of disagreement, particularly with regard to advisors’ role in
helping students understand how globalism will affect their lives, the need for the college to have a broad definition of “multicultural affairs” to include diversity, and the need for advisors to encourage students to take additional foreign language classes. Participants also did not seem to be enthusiastic about the need for colleges to actively recruit foreign exchange students, and generally did not show strong support for the idea that colleges will have to make major changes in the way students are educated.

The results of the study agreed in many ways with expectations developed in the literature, but also diverged from those expectations in other ways. As a general rule, advisors appeared to agree with the theory, but not as much with the practice, concerning globalization and internationalization. The overall trends and conclusions will be the subject of the discussion in Chapter Five.
Chapter Five

Summary

In this study I investigated the perceptions of academic advisors in the colleges of the Florida College System (FCS) regarding what role they should have in internationalizing their colleges. That investigation included an exploration of the perceptions of the advisors concerning globalization and internationalization as related to the country, community colleges, academic advisors, and them personally. Information about certain demographic variables was also collected to see what relationship might exist between those variables and the perceptions of the participants. In this research study I addressed the following questions:

1. What are the perceptions of academic advisors within the FCS about globalization and internationalization?

2. What are the perceptions of academic advisors within the FCS about how internationalization should be a part of their job responsibilities?

3. How are certain advisor and institutional characteristics related to advisors’ perceptions about the role of academic advisors in internationalizing the community/state college?

4. How are the perceptions that academic advisors within the FCS hold on globalization and internationalization related to their perceptions of the role of academic advisors in internationalizing the college, controlling for advisor and institutional characteristics?

5. What is the relationship between the perceptions of academic advisors within the FCS about globalization and internationalization and their self-perceived level of personal
participation in international activity and success of their institution in maintaining an international focus?

Data Collection and Analysis

The target population consists of all academic advisors at all twenty-eight state and community colleges in the Florida College System (FCS). I constructed a list of e-mail addresses for the academic advisors at each of the state and community colleges in the FCS, and, after approval from the Institutional Review Board at the University of South Florida (Appendix C), I used e-mail to contact the advisors from all those colleges. The e-mail included a letter of informed consent along with the invitation to participate in the study. Prospective participants were informed that by clicking the link in the e-mail to access the online survey they were giving their informed consent to participate (Appendix D). It was clear that the survey was sent by me for the purpose of conducting research for my dissertation, and was not from the respective colleges nor from any person who exercises authority over the participants (Appendix F).

The survey used for this study was designed to measure the advisors’ viewpoints concerning the importance of globalization and internationalization to the country, to their academic institutions, and to them personally. Additionally, the survey focused on whether advisors think globalization and internationalization will be inevitable in the future, and what role the advisors understand themselves to have in internationalizing their respective colleges. The survey was adapted from a previously administered instrument, and both the previous survey and this adapted version were tested for reliability and validity. All academic advisors who chose to participate completed the survey online utilizing the Qualtrics survey tool, and responses were anonymous. Follow-up e-mails were sent after the first and second weeks of the data collection process to thank those who had already participated and
encourage the others to participate in a timely manner. The survey had to be completed in a single sitting, but it was relatively short and only two respondents required more than eleven minutes to complete the survey. I used a nonexperimental quantitative design employing descriptive statistics, Pearson’s r correlation between variables, and multiple regression analysis (Johnson & Christensen, 2014). Next I will discuss the analyses in the frame of each of the research questions.

I addressed the research questions by an analysis of the data in the following manner:

Research Question One (perceptions about globalization and internationalization) was answered by an analysis of survey questions 1-18 (Globalization and Internationalization sections). Those survey questions asked participants to indicate their level of agreement with statements about the impact of globalization on the country (survey question 1: “Overall, I think globalization is a good thing for the United States economy.”), themselves (survey question 2: “Overall, I think globalization is a good thing for me.”), and their colleges (survey question 6: “Globalization will require major changes in how my college educates students.”). Questions in the second section asked participants to indicate their level of agreement with statements about the impact of internationalization on how colleges serve and educate their students (such as survey question 9: “My college should have a plan designed to increase international/global understanding among students.” and survey question 10: “My college should encourage faculty to provide study abroad opportunities for students to travel/study in other countries.”).

Respondents answered the individual survey questions in these sections on a Likert-type scale with the following five levels: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree. I calculated descriptive statistics such as the mean, standard deviation, frequencies, and relative frequencies of the survey items.
Research Question Two (perceptions about the role of advisors) was answered by an analysis of survey questions 19-22 (Academic Advisors’ Role in Internationalization section). These questions gave advisors who responded to the survey an opportunity to indicate their level of agreement with certain roles they could have as they assist students who are primarily from the United States (survey question 21, “I think academic advisors should have a significant role in advising students to choose courses that will help them develop an international perspective.”), as well as students who come to study here from abroad (survey question 22, “I think academic advisors should have a significant role in assisting students from other countries to learn about U.S. higher education practices and procedures (e.g., plagiarism, academic integrity, and classroom etiquette).”). In a similar manner to Research Question One above, respondents answered the individual survey questions in this section using the same Likert-type scale with five levels. I calculated descriptive statistics such as the mean, standard deviation, frequencies, and relative frequencies of the survey items.

Research Question Three (relationship between the demographic characteristics and the perceived role of advisors) was answered by a multiple regression (ordinary least squares) model utilizing as the dependent variable the composite score for Role, and as independent variables the responses to five survey questions: “How many total years have you worked in higher education?” (survey question 26), “What is your highest degree earned?” (question 27), “What international experience (travel/study) outside of the United States have you had?” (question 30), “Please indicate what experience you have had with international student exchange programs” (question 33), and whether or not internationalization is included in the mission statement of the college. The data contained some outliers, so they were excluded from the calculation of the model.
Research Question Four (relationship between globalization/internationalization and role of academic advisors, controlling for advisor and institutional characteristics) was answered by multiple regression utilizing as independent variables the composite scores for Globalization and Internationalization (variables of interest) and advisor and institutional characteristics (control variables). The Globalization and Internationalization composite scores were combined into a single composite in order to mitigate the influence of multicollinearity between the separate composites. This aggregate score served as the independent variable of interest, and the demographic and institutional characteristic variables, chosen as above in addressing Research Question Three, were control variables. The composite score for the perceived role of academic advisors, calculated as the arithmetic mean of responses in the Role section of the survey (survey questions 19-22), served as the dependent variable. The data contained some outliers, so they were excluded from the calculation of the model.

Research Question Five (relationship between globalization/internationalization and international activity and success of the college in maintaining an international focus) was answered by an analysis of survey questions 1-18 (Globalization and Internationalization section) along with survey questions 34 and 35 from the Demographics section. I calculated correlations between the composite scores for Globalization and Internationalization with the responses to survey questions 34 (“How would you rate your own participation in any kind of international activity in comparison with that of the majority of your peers?”) and 35 (“How would you rate the success of your institution in maintaining an international focus for students?”).
Results Relevant to the Research Questions

The results of the study for the research questions will be the topic of this section. Results will be summarized and presented for each of the five research questions. Although many of the results were consistent across the research questions, there were a few findings that merit further investigation. In particular, participants’ responses to survey item 10 (“The concept of “multicultural affairs” at my college should include a broad international/global definition of diversity (to include language, customs, ethnicity, etc.).”) did not comport with many of their other responses, so a qualitative investigation could provide a more complete understanding of the perceptions of academic advisors in the Florida College System.

Research Question One. What are the perceptions of academic advisors within the Florida College System (FCS) about globalization and internationalization?

Overall, advisors seemed to consider globalization to be increasing and to have a generally positive impact. They also appeared to see internationalization as inevitable, but in some cases did not view community colleges in general or advisors in those colleges more specifically to have a significant role in the process of internationalization of higher education in the United States.

Advisors who participated in this study indicated their belief that after students enter the workforce they likely will have to work with people from other countries and cultures, and that the students will have to reinvent themselves in order to respond to the changing job market. In contrast to that result, however, advisors were not as likely to agree that colleges should actively recruit students from other countries or encourage students to take more than the minimum requirement in foreign languages. Many of them also did not think that colleges would have to change the way they educate their students. Finally, the participants overwhelmingly rejected the
idea that their college needed to define the concept of multicultural affairs in a broad or inclusive way.

**Research Question Two.** *What are the perceptions of academic advisors within the FCS about how internationalization should be a part of their job responsibilities?*

While they still tended to agree more than they disagreed, advisors who participated in this study were largely ambivalent about their role in helping students understand how globalism will impact their lives. They also indicated less agreement with items related to their role in internationalizing their colleges than items related to globalization and internationalization more generally. More than 90% of respondents indicated agreement with many of the items in the Globalization and Internationalization sections of the survey, but less than three-fourths of participants responded favorably to each of the questions concerning their role in internationalization. This leads to the conclusion that although they considered internationalization to be important, the participants did not as readily agree that they had a significant role in causing it to happen.

**Research Question Three.** *How are certain advisor and institutional characteristics related to advisors’ perceptions about the role of academic advisors in internationalizing the community/state college?*

Those who had more years working in higher education and those who had more experience with international student exchange programs tended to have higher scores on the Role composite score. That is, advisors who had more experience either working in higher education or with international student exchange programs perceived their role in the process of internationalization to be more significant. Also, the generally higher score on the Role composite for advisors who had more experience with international student exchange programs
indicates that advisors tend to agree with an existing study that suggests that one good strategy for promoting internationalization is student participation in study abroad programs, because they offer some of the best opportunities for students to gain a more global perspective and help their institutions make progress in the process of internationalization (Stevens, 2012).

In contrast to the finding that advisors’ perceived role in internationalization had a positive relationship with advisors’ years of experience in higher education and involvement in international student exchange programs, there were statistically significant negative relationships between advisors’ perceived role and both highest degree earned and working at a college with a global or international context for the mission statement. So then, advisors who had more formal education were more likely to have lower scores relative to their perceptions of their role in internationalizing their colleges. Similarly, advisors who worked at colleges with globalization or internationalization in the mission statement tended to have lower scores for their perceived role in internationalizing their colleges. This study did not address possible reasons for this response, but one can speculate that colleges with some global or international component in their mission statements might have staff dedicated solely to the process of internationalization, and that could lead academic advisors to have a lower perception of their personal role in promoting internationalization at their colleges. Additional research in this area could provide useful information as administrators and other policy makers consider possible options for promoting internationalization.

In addition to the two variables with positive relationships and the two variables with negative relationships to advisors’ perceived role in internationalizing their colleges, there was one other independent variable for the model used in addressing this research question. That
variable (advisors’ personal international experience) did not have a statistically significant relationship with advisors’ perceived role in internationalizing their colleges.

**Research Question Four.** How are the perceptions that academic advisors within the FCS hold on globalization and internationalization related to their perceptions of the role of academic advisors in internationalizing the college, controlling for advisor and institutional characteristics?

An increase in the Globalization and Internationalization composite score corresponded to an increase in the Role composite score, as revealed by the standardized parameter estimate for this variable in the multiple regression ($\beta = .26, p < .05$). In other words, advisors who indicated more agreement with the items in the Globalization and Internationalization sections of the survey were also more likely to have more agreement with the items in the Role section of the survey, as also shown by the positive partial correlation between these variables. This positive relationship was statistically significant, but not particularly strong ($\rho = .31, p < .05$). So then, if all other variables are held constant, a one standard deviation increase in the Globalization and Internationalization composite score would accompany a .26 standard deviation increase in the Role composite score in the model, but only about 31% of the variation in the Role composite score was accounted for by the variation in the set of predictors. Thus, although there is a positive relationship between the two composite scores, there is still much variation in the dependent variable that is not explained by the predictors.

Two of the statistically significant control variables (highest degree earned and internationalization in the college mission statement) were negatively correlated to the Role composite variable, and all of the statistically significant standardized parameter estimates had greater magnitude than that of the Globalization and Internationalization composite variable. As
was the case with the model used to address Research Question Three, advisors who worked at colleges with some component of globalization or internationalization in the mission statement typically expressed less agreement with the items in the Role section of the survey than advisors who worked at colleges without such mission statements. Similarly, those who had higher degrees and more personal international experience also tended to have lower composite scores for their role in internationalizing their college. Overall, the only control variable that correlated positively with advisors’ perceived role in internationalization was the number of years participants had worked in higher education. The variable of interest, advisors’ perceptions concerning globalization and internationalization, had a positive relationship with participants’ perceived role in internationalization of their colleges.

**Research Question Five.** What is the relationship between the perceptions of academic advisors within the FCS about globalization and internationalization and their self-perceived level of personal participation in international activity and success of their institution in maintaining an international focus?

There was no statistically significant correlation between participants’ perspectives concerning globalization and their assessment of their own participation in international activity. That is, a participant’s perspective concerning globalization provided no predictive information concerning that participant’s self-reported level of involvement in international activity. Similarly, the correlation between a participant’s perspective concerning globalization, as well as their perspective concerning internationalization, and their assessment of the level of success obtained by their college in the pursuit of internationalization were not statistically significant. Thus, the responses of the participants about their perspectives concerning globalization and internationalization had no statistically significant, discernible relationship to their assessment of
the level of success obtained by their colleges in the process of internationalization. While the small sample size does leave the possibility that these correlations could be significantly different from zero if this study were to be repeated with a larger sample, but the relatively small Pearson’s r values, barely negligible in two cases, do suggest the lack of a relationship. In this study there was a statistically significant positive correlation between participants’ internationalization composite score and their self-reported level of involvement in international activity as compared to that of the majority of their peers. That indicates that higher internationalization composite scores would generally accompany higher levels of self-reported international activity.

**Discussion of the Research Results**

Based on the responses of the participants to this study, advisors in the Florida College System appeared to have relatively strong support for the assertions that globalization and internationalization are important and will continue to increase in importance going forward. They also seemed to agree with the concept that academic advisors should be involved in the process of internationalization at their colleges, but their agreement in this instance did not seem to be as strong as it was when discussing globalization and internationalization more generally. Apparently, they did not as readily envision the role of academic advisors in the process of internationalization to be as important or necessary as the overall concept of progress in the areas of internationalization and globalization. That is, advisors in the Florida College System were likely to agree more with the theory, but not as much with the practice, of internationalization as it related to their job responsibilities. This is similar to the findings in Burton’s study that advisors did not see internationalization to be “a centerpiece of the work of the academic advisors” (Burton, 2012, p.106).
As observed in Chapter Four, the majority of advisors who participated indicated general agreement with the concepts that globalization is good, growing, and will require colleges to plan for changes that accompany increasing globalization. This supports the assertions of some researchers that globalization is not likely to disappear in the foreseeable future (Dodds, 2008; Scholte, 2008). The participants in this study also seemed to concur with the literature that says community colleges must reevaluate their stance with regard to globalization and internationalization, particularly as employers place new demands on the colleges to produce globally aware and competent graduates (Dellow, 2007; Robson, 2011). Together, these results lead to the conclusion that the advisors who participated in this study expect that increasing globalization will lead to the need for colleges to achieve more progress in internationalization.

In contrast to the result for all participants that increasing internationalization will be necessary for the foreseeable future, it seemed somewhat counterintuitive that advisors who worked at colleges that included some component of globalization or internationalization in the college mission statement would have a lower Role composite score, thus indicating that the advisors at those colleges had lower perceptions of their role in internationalization than did the advisors at other colleges. This finding is in contrast to the results of Donna Burdzinski’s 2014 study involving student affairs administrators in the Florida College System. In that study, administrators overwhelmingly responded positively (over 91% responded with either “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”) when asked whether or not they should take an active role in promoting a global perspective in the students and training staff to work effectively with a diverse student body (Burdzinski, 2014). Overall, the participants in this study did express more agreement than disagreement with the items in the Role section of the survey, but many of their responses were neutral, and some were negative. This indicates an apparent divergence between the perceptions
of some of these advisors concerning their role in the process of internationalizing their colleges and the findings of researchers that advisors are precisely the ones who can serve as an important connection between the students and the classes and resources that can help them to develop global awareness and competency (Drake, 2011; Vianden & Barlow, 2015; Vianden, 2016). It is possible that some colleges, particularly those emphasizing internationalization or global competency, could have staff dedicated specifically to promoting internationalization on campus, and that might offer some insight into the perceptions of some of the advisors who participated in this study who did not see their role in promoting internationalization to be significant.

As noted in Chapter Two, there could be many reasons for advisors to be reluctant to express support for some of the survey items. For example, the mean of all responses to the statement “My college should encourage students to take more than the minimum requirement in foreign language courses” (survey item 11) was the second lowest among all survey items. This corroborates the assertion from past literature that advisors feel students are already burdened with too much work, and could not be expected to include additional requirements, such as extra foreign language courses, in their already busy schedule (Finkel, 2017). Indeed, there are not many elective hours available to students in their first two years of undergraduate education in most cases, so expecting the students to use those hours on foreign language courses might be considered excessive (Crisp & Delgado, 2014; Finkel, 2017).

One possible solution to the dilemma of seeking ways to increase global awareness among students without increasing the educational burden and course load for them could be the inclusion of some online interaction between students from higher education institutions in different countries. This type of “virtual exchange” experience can be delivered as an integrated part of the existing curriculum, and this would not increase the number of courses students have
to take, and would not reduce the number of credits available for them to take as elective courses. Collaborative online learning can be both cost-effective and beneficial, but requires a significant amount of preparation on the part of the faculty who implement it (Buck Sutton, 2018). In order for such interactions to have the maximum effect on the process of internationalization at a college, the academic advisors also would have to be adequately informed about the courses that include such opportunities for interaction, and would then have to pass that information along to the students effectively.

With regard to the effects of the demographic characteristics on the advisors’ perceptions of their role in internationalizing their colleges, it was interesting to discover that advisors who have higher degrees tended to have lower Role composite scores. That is, advisors who had higher degrees placed less importance on taking an active role in the process of internationalization at their colleges than advisors who did not have as much formal education. If this trend generalizes to the population of advisors in the FCS, then a case could be made that some advisors do not readily envision their contribution to the process of internationalization to be integral to the efforts of the college as a whole. This result would stand in stark contrast to the findings of some researchers that advisors should have a significant role in critical higher education outcomes, including internationalization (Pellegrino, Snyder, Crutchfield, Curtis, & Pringle, 2015). The possibility exists, though, that advisors with higher degrees are more likely to work at larger or more urban colleges, and those colleges could have a director or department dedicated solely to internationalization. The existence of such a director or department could partially explain the reluctance of some advisors to view their role in the process of internationalization to be important.
Academic advisors serve a crucial role in connecting students with every aspect of their college or university, and student retention, persistence, and success are directly linked to the quality of the relationships between students and academic advisors (Drake, 2011; LaRocca, 2017; Vianden, 2015; Vianden, 2016). One aspect of student success would be success in developing global competence. However, participants in this study who have higher levels of education and those who work at a college that has internationalization in the mission statement tended to have a lower perception of their role in the internationalization of their college. This is consistent with the fact that participants expressed less enthusiastic support for assuming responsibility to take an active role in the process of internationalization at their colleges than they did for the concepts of globalization and internationalization generally, thus indicating that although the participants think globalization and internationalization are important, they don’t necessarily think they have a significant task in the process of internationalization. This could be true in part due to the possible existence of departments or staff dedicated to internationalization at those colleges that have a global or international focus in their mission statements. The inclusion of a global or international component in the college mission statement was the only institutional characteristic included in this analysis, partly because the small sample size for this study did not allow for other characteristics, such as college setting (urban, suburban, or rural) and size to be adequately considered. Responses were provided by only one academic advisor from some colleges, and many colleges were not represented at all in the sample, so any attempt to draw conclusions about other institutional characteristics would not easily yield generalizable results. However, a future study with a larger sample size could allow for a more complete analysis based on college size and setting, as well as allowing for a comprehensive look at the curriculum at colleges that emphasize international or global issues, along with the curriculum at
colleges without such an emphasis. A consideration of the curriculum along with the perceptions of the academic advisors might yield a more complete understanding of the responses of the participants with regard to the number and type of classes students should take.

By far the most negative responses, and also the lowest mean, occurred for “The concept of “multicultural affairs” at my college should include a broad international/global definition of diversity (to include language, customs, ethnicity, etc.)” (survey item 10). This question was rejected by 66% of all respondents, and an additional 6.4% of respondents were neutral. Additional research into the perceptions of academic advisors concerning multiculturalism, diversity, and the appropriate place of language, customs, and ethnicity in the community college setting could prove to be enlightening. In particular, a qualitative study of this topic could shed some light on the experiences and perceptions of academic advisors, and could lead to a better understanding of why they responded as they did to this question. It is also possible that the race or ethnicity of the respondents could have affected responses to this survey item, but since that demographic category was not measured, a future study would have to uncover any relationship that may exist.

Although there appeared to be a slight connection between the responses of the participants to the items in the internationalization section of the survey and their self-reported level of international activity as compared to that of their peers, it did not seem that the participants were particularly convinced that they should have a major role in the process of internationalization at their respective institutions. Additionally, there was no apparent connection between the perceptions of the participants concerning the concepts of globalization and internationalization and their assessment of the level of success obtained by their institutions in the process of internationalization. That is, the advisors’ perceptions concerning globalization
and internationalization apparently were not related to their perceptions concerning institutional success in the process of internationalization, but the small sample size for this study leaves open the possibility that significant correlations may exist.

**Limitations of the Study**

The small sample size ($N = 54$) for this study indicates that caution would be warranted before excessive generalization. One possible reason for the paucity of responses could be the fact that the survey was administered during the summer term, and advisors might be on vacation or busy advising students as they prepare for the fall term, but any assertion concerning that or another reason for the poor response rate would be speculative at best. A further limitation is the lack of representation from many of the colleges in the Florida College System (FCS). There were responses from advisors working at only 15 of the 28 colleges in the FCS, so the perceptions of advisors at the other 13 colleges were not addressed. Also, some of the 15 colleges had responses from only one or two individuals, so their responses might not necessarily be representative of their whole department. Overall respondents indicated a high level of agreement with the concepts of globalization and internationalization, and more than half of the respondents viewed the role of advisors in pursuing internationalization to be important, so the low response rate is not likely to stem from any perceived unimportance of these topics on the part of the advisors in the FCS, though the perceptions of those who did not respond remain unknown.

Additionally, there were a few other limitations as well. This study did not include any responses from advisors at technical colleges, private colleges, liberal arts institutions, or research universities, so the results of this study cannot address issues concerning advisors’ perceptions in those settings. This study also did not include any qualitative analysis of advisors’ perceptions,
and therefore cannot address advisors’ lived experiences or motivations for choosing certain responses. Finally, the study is accurate only to the extent that participants understood the survey questions and responded completely and truthfully to them. There is, however, a reasonable expectation that this final limitation will not be a factor in this study since the pilot study and the QUAID tool both lead to the conclusion that the survey possesses response process validity.

Although these limitations seem to be daunting, they are not necessarily debilitating. The lack of response from advisors in many of the institutions in the Florida College System (FCS) does give reason to exercise caution in generalizing the results, but the composition of the sample largely reflected that of the population to the extent that the information was available, and the colleges represented in the sample covered the various sizes, locations, and settings of the colleges in the FCS. There is a reasonable expectation that this study provides an accurate glimpse into the perceptions of advisors in the FCS. Additionally, this study is worthwhile as a snapshot of the perceptions of academic advisors concerning globalization, internationalization, and their perceived role in the process of internationalization at their colleges. Advisors who work in a context that is similar to the Florida College System could be expected to hold similar views, and administrators and policy makers who are interested in promoting internationalization on their college campuses could benefit from the knowledge gained from this study.

**Implications for Practice**

As noted in Chapter Two, all stakeholders and all departments of the college must be involved if significant progress is to be made in the process of internationalization of a college. If stakeholders are not convinced that internationalization is a worthy goal, then they will not expend the effort necessary to make progress in it. In this case, academic advisors who participated in this study did indicate a high level of agreement that globalization and
internationalization were continuing and positive, so that indicates that there is a proper foundation from which to work in convincing them to participate in the internationalization of their colleges. However, since the responses of the participants concerning their role in internationalization were less enthusiastic, there remains much work to be done in convincing advisors in the FCS to assist students and coworkers to make progress in developing a more international perspective.

Advisors who participated in this study agreed that workers would have to work with people from other countries and cultures, and would have to reinvent themselves so they can compete in the changing job market, but they did not as readily agree that colleges would have to change the way they educate their students. Also, participants overwhelmingly agreed that colleges should have a plan to increase global awareness or understanding among the students, and indicated very strong support for international exchanges of faculty and staff, as well as study abroad opportunities for students, but fewer than half of them thought colleges should actively recruit students from other countries. Therefore it seems that advisors agree in principle to the need and benefit of internationalization, but do not agree as readily with some of the expectations as developed in the literature concerning how to accomplish internationalization at their colleges. They do not support active recruitment of foreign students or encouraging students to take extra foreign language classes. They also do not think it is important to define “diversity” to include a global or international component. More frequent communication between administrators and advisors concerning the need for a more comprehensive approach to internationalization could help the advisors to participate more deliberately in the internationalization of their colleges.
However, along with support for international exchanges of faculty and staff, study abroad opportunities for students, and the development of collaborative relationships with institutions in other countries, participants also agreed that colleges should devise a plan to increase international and global understanding among students. These advisors also appeared to agree with faculty in Oredein’s 2016 study who thought students should be required to take at least one class that has an international or global focus. That perception could provide a link between the theoretical agreement expressed by advisors to international/global principles and a practical way for them to contribute to the internationalization of their college as they advise students to take such courses. In the case that a college does not have classes available to meet that need, it might be necessary for faculty to incorporate internationalization into the existing curriculum. Although the addition of such classes could require much time and effort, there are some efficient, and relatively inexpensive, alternatives such as virtual exchanges that can offer global or international experiences to students within the existing curriculum (Buck Sutton, 2018).

There appears to be a fairly strong foundation upon which to build a plan for academic advisors within the FCS to contribute to the internationalization of their colleges, and the advisors who participated in this study generally agreed that internationalization is good and necessary, so efforts to incorporate deliberate components that should achieve progress in internationalization into the job responsibilities of the academic advisors could be embraced by the advisors, as long as those efforts do not impose an unreasonable burden on them. One obstacle to this, though, is the overwhelming amount of work already being performed by the advisors. Significant portions of the work responsibilities of the advisors often are comprised of administrative or other tasks that are not directly related to advising students, so advisors do not
always have adequate time to devote to advising, and certainly do not have room in their busy schedules to incorporate new responsibilities. If the college could hire more administrative staff to complete many of the ancillary tasks currently required of the advisors, then that might enable the advisors to concentrate more on advising, and also could provide the opportunity for them to contribute more to the pursuit of internationalization at their colleges. Other ways to encourage more participation by the advisors in pursuing internationalization could include providing professional development opportunities for advisors or sending them a memorandum or newsletter on a regular basis that could inform them about classes and activities on campus that could lead to increased internationalization for the advisors themselves as well as the students. Regular communication between administrators, faculty, and advisors could facilitate the development of a culture of internationalization that fosters understanding and promotes activities that lead to increased internationalization of the college. Those activities could include seminars, symposia, specific classes with an international focus or component, study abroad opportunities, and much more. Additionally, information concerning international events in the local community such as festivals, celebrations of holidays by people from other cultures, expos, fine arts performances, and other events could be given to the advisors on a regular basis so they could inform students about those opportunities. If the advisors are well-informed, then they can better inform the students. In that case, the advisors and students could both benefit and make progress in internationalization, while simultaneously contributing to the overall internationalization of their colleges.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

Participants expressed less enthusiastic support for their responsibility to take an active role in the process of internationalization at their colleges than they did for the concepts of
globalization and internationalization generally. This indicates that although the participants think globalization and internationalization are important, they don’t necessarily think they have a significant task in the process of internationalization. For example, the mean of responses to the statement “I think academic advisors should have a significant role in helping students to understand how globalism will impact their lives” (survey item 19) was lower than all but two of the other means in the first three sections of the survey. Qualitative research into the reasons why the participants responded as they did to this item (as well as others) might help to enhance the understanding of the academy with regard to what steps might be productive in encouraging future progress in the area of internationalization.

Prior research indicates an expansion of the definition of diversity to include a global perspective is necessary for an institution to make meaningful progress in the area of internationalization (Bissonette & Woodin, 2013), but the participants in this study responded negatively to survey item 10 (“The concept of “multicultural affairs” at my college should include a broad international/global definition of diversity (to include language, customs, ethnicity, etc.).”) in much greater numbers than they did to any other item. A more detailed investigation of the perceptions of advisors concerning this topic is warranted, and could prove to be informative.

A more comprehensive study that included participants from other institutional contexts would be useful. For example, this study was limited to advisors at state and community colleges in the Florida College System (FCS), so research including advisors at community colleges in other states is warranted. Additional research involving advisors at technical colleges, private colleges, liberal arts colleges, and both public and private universities could also be informative. Furthermore, the perceptions of college employees in other co-curricular departments also should
be investigated. In particular, a study into the perspectives of academic advisors that also included an investigation of whether or not the college has a department or an administrator dedicated to internationalization could help researchers to ascertain whether that might affect the perspectives of the advisors.

Additionally, this study did not address the lived experiences of advisors, and did not allow for any free-response feedback. A qualitative study of advisors’ perceptions could fill in important details concerning why participants responded as they did, as well as opening new avenues of future research. Researchers could form a more complete picture of the state of internationalization at institutions of higher education in the United States as they consider qualitative and quantitative results together.

Future studies should include an investigation of whether colleges have specific courses emphasizing internationalization, how many foreign languages are offered by the colleges, what opportunities exist for students at the college to participate in international exchange programs, and whether the colleges have any program or policy in place that allows or encourages international exchanges of faculty or staff. An analysis of advisor workloads and non-advising responsibilities could also be useful.

Additional studies, whether quantitative, qualitative, or a combination of both, could also explore in more detail what perceptions advisors have concerning what they think are the expectations of their supervisors and administrators, and further investigation into what administrators think they have communicated to the advisors in their college concerning the need for internationalization could create a more comprehensive understanding of this issue. This research could lead to specific recommendations for avenues of communication that could help
both advisors and administrators contribute more effectively to the internationalization of their institutions.

Finally, further study of the perceptions of other stakeholders such as students, faculty, and the board of trustees concerning the role of advisors in the process of internationalization could be informative, particularly as those perceptions are compared with those of the advisors themselves. If advisors are made aware of the importance of their contributions to internationalization, they might more readily participate in the process. At the same time, if other stakeholders become more conscious of the contributions of academic advisors, they could more easily appreciate efforts made by the advisors. A potential added benefit would be increased opportunities for the other stakeholders to encourage the academic advisors not only to make progress in developing a more global perspective personally, but also to make a more deliberate effort to contribute to the internationalization of their colleges.

Conclusion

The participants in this study indicated relatively strong support for the assertions that globalization and internationalization were important, and would continue to increase in importance going forward. They also generally agreed with the concept that academic advisors should be involved in the process of internationalization at their colleges, but their agreement in this instance was not as strong as it was when discussing globalization and internationalization more generally. They did not as readily envision the role of academic advisors in the process of internationalization to be as important or necessary as the overall concept of progress in the areas of internationalization and globalization. That is, the responses of the participants in this study indicated more agreement with the theory, but not as much agreement with the practice, of internationalization as it relates to their job responsibilities.
It seems that advisors agreed in principle to the need and benefit of internationalization, but did not agree as readily with some of the expectations as developed in the literature concerning how to accomplish internationalization at their colleges. They did not seem to support active recruitment of foreign students or encouraging students to take extra foreign language classes. They also did not seem to think it is important to define “diversity” to include a global or international component.

However, advisors did express support for international exchanges of faculty and staff, study abroad opportunities for students, and the development of collaborative relationships with institutions in other countries. They also apparently agreed that colleges should devise a plan to increase international and global understanding among students. Additionally, advisors seemed to think students should be required to take at least one class that has an international or global focus. That perception could provide a link between the theoretical agreement expressed by advisors to international/global principles and a practical way for them to contribute to the internationalization of their college as they advise students to take such courses.

In conclusion, advisors seemed to be amenable to internationalization efforts on college campuses, but might need some education or encouragement concerning best practices to achieve more widespread internationalization at their institutions. They indicated moderate to strong support for many of those best practices, such as international exchanges of faculty and staff, study abroad opportunities for students, and international partnerships between their college and institutions abroad, but at the same time they did not respond as positively when they were asked about their role in bringing an international or global understanding to the students or the college. They also did not as readily support recruiting foreign students to study at their colleges or encouraging their students to take extra classes in foreign language. There is a good
foundation from which advisors can be encouraged to begin contributing meaningfully to the pursuit of internationalization of their colleges, but much work also remains to be done as these advisors, who serve as a key link between students and their college experience, can be urged to become more active in that process.

Ideally, for the most effective progress to be made in internationalizing community colleges in the Florida College System, all stakeholders will have to participate in that process. To begin, administrators will have to prioritize internationalization both in policy decisions and budgeting. Faculty will have to infuse the curriculum with components that foster more global competence and a more international perspective. Students will have to work on improving their global understanding. And, as a key link in the chain connecting students with the internationalized curriculum created by the faculty and the overall college culture of internationalization promoted by the policies and budgets of the administrators, the academic advisors will have to prioritize internationalization in their interactions with the students. Not only can the advisors recommend courses that have significant international or global components to the students, but they also can inform the students about relevant co-curricular opportunities and college events that could help enhance their global perspectives and understanding.
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Appendix A

Permission to Use Survey Questions: Donna Burdzinski

Hi Tony, thank you for your inquiry. You have my permission to use a modified version of my survey instrument for your doctoral research. Once you have your approved version, I would appreciate your sending me a copy.

Best wishes to you in your research!
Donna

Donna Burdzinski, Ed.D.
Provost
North Campus
Pasco-Hernando State College
11415 Ponce de Leon Blvd.
Brooksville, FL 34601
352-797-5001
352-797-5133 (Fax)

Please note that Pasco-Hernando Community College is now Pasco-Hernando State College and my email address is now burdzid@phsc.edu, please update your address book and send all email to my new address.

>>> Tony Long <twlong@mail.usf.edu> 3/17/2016 2:40 PM >>>

Dear Dr. Burdzinski,

I am currently writing my dissertation investigating the role of academic advisors in helping community and state colleges pursue internationalization, and my committee chair, Dr. Donald Dellow, suggested I look at your research. I would like to request permission to use a modified version of your survey instrument for my own research. I would, of course, provide appropriate credit to you in my dissertation. Thank you for your consideration.

Best Regards,
Tony

Tony W. Long
Instructor of Mathematics
St. Petersburg College
6605 5th Avenue North
St. Petersburg, FL 33710
(727) 341-4618 (Office)
(727) 444-6160 (Fax)
Appendix B

Survey Instrument

*Perceived Roles of Academic Advisors in Pursuing Internationalization at Florida Colleges*

**Section I: Globalization**

For purposes of this study, globalization is defined as “the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, and ideas … across borders”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall, I think globalization is a good thing for the United States economy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Overall, I think globalization is a good thing for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A global economy will require workers in my community to have the ability to work with people from other countries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A global economy will require workers in my community to have the ability to work with people from other cultures.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A global economy will require workers in my community to have the ability to respond to a changing job market by reinventing themselves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Globalization will require major changes in how my college educates students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Overall, globalization is something we must accept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. We must find ways to successfully respond to any challenges globalization will create.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section II: Internationalization

For purposes of this study, internationalization is defined as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions, or delivery of post-secondary education”.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. My college should have a plan designed to increase international/global understanding among students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The concept of “multicultural affairs” at my college should include a broad international/global definition of diversity (to include language, customs, ethnicity, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My college should encourage students to take more than the minimum requirement in foreign language courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. International exchange opportunities should be available to faculty and staff at my college.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My college would benefit from having a collaborative relationship with an institution in another country.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. All associate degree students at my college should be required to complete at least one course with an international/global focus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. All bachelor’s degree students at my college (if any) should be required to complete at least one course with an international/global focus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My college should create a campuswide task force to examine how the college can better prepare students for a global economy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. My college should actively recruit students from other countries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My college should encourage faculty to provide study abroad opportunities for students to travel/study in other countries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section III: Academic Advisors’ Role in Internationalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I think academic advisors should have a significant role in</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. …helping students to understand how globalism will impact their lives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. …helping students celebrate the growing diversity of ethnicities, religions, and cultures on campus.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. …advising students to choose courses that will help them develop an international perspective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. …assisting students from other countries to learn about U.S. higher education practices and procedures (e.g., plagiarism, academic integrity, and classroom etiquette).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section IV: Demographic Information

23. What is your gender?
   - Female
   - Male
   - Transgender
   - Other

24. In what year were you born? (Please type the four digit year.)

25. How many years have you worked at a community college in an academic advising position? (Please enter the answer to the nearest whole number.)

26. How many total years have you worked in higher education? (Please enter the answer to the nearest whole number.)

27. What is your highest degree earned?
   - None
   - High school diploma
   - Associate
   - Bachelor
   - Masters
   - Doctorate
   - Other – please specify what degree ____________________________
28. Were you born outside the 50 states of the United States?
   - Yes (Please answer question 29)
   - No (Please proceed to question 30)

29. If you answered “yes” to question 28, please enter your place of birth ____________ and indicate how many years you have been in the United States. (Please enter the number.)

30. What international experience (travel/study) outside of the United States have you had? My total time abroad (travel or studying) is
   - more than one year
   - at least 6 months but less than one year
   - longer than 6 weeks but less than 6 months
   - 3 to 6 weeks
   - up to 3 weeks
   - None

31. Do you speak a language other than English?
   - Yes – please specify what language(s)______________________________
   - No

32. If yes to question 31, how fluent would you rate your abilities in that language? (If you speak more than one other language, please respond regarding the language in which you are most proficient.)
   - Like a native speaker
   - Excellent
   - Intermediate
   - Good
   - Basic

33. Please indicate what experience you have had with international student exchange programs (check all that apply)?
   - Hosted an exchange student
   - Was an exchange student
   - Informal host for individual from another country (length of stay at least 2 weeks)
   - Informal stay abroad with a family in that country (length of stay at least 2 weeks)
   - No experience with international student exchange programs
   - Other (please describe) ________________________

34. How would you rate your own participation in any kind of international activity in comparison with that of the majority of your peers?
   - Nominal
   - Minimal
   - Fair
   - Very good
   - Extensive
   - Don’t know
35. How would you rate the success of your institution in maintaining an international focus for students?
   - Very Poor
   - Poor
   - Fair
   - Good
   - Very Good

36. At which institution do you work? (If more than one, give your primary institution.)
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Tony Long
L-CACHE  Leadership, Counseling, Adult, Career & Higher Education
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RE:  Exempt Certification
IRB#: Pro00030023
Title: Perceived Roles of Academic Advisors in Pursuing Internationalization at Public State and Community Colleges in Florida

Dear Mr. Long:

On 3/29/2017, the Institutional Review Board (IRB) determined that your research meets criteria for exemption from the federal regulations as outlined by 45CFR46.101(b):

(2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless:
(i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and (ii) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

As the principal investigator for this study, it is your responsibility to ensure that this research is conducted as outlined in your application and consistent with the ethical principles outlined in the Belmont Report and with USF HRPP policies and procedures.

Please note, as per USF HRPP Policy, once the Exempt determination is made, the application is closed in ARC. Any proposed or anticipated changes to the study design that was previously
declared exempt from IRB review must be submitted to the IRB as a new study prior to initiation of the change. However, administrative changes, including changes in research personnel, do not warrant an amendment or new application.

Given the determination of exemption, this application is being closed in ARC. This does not limit your ability to conduct your research project.

We appreciate your dedication to the ethical conduct of human subject research at the University of South Florida and your continued commitment to human research protections. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please call 813-974-5638.

Sincerely,

Kristen Salomon, Ph.D., Vice Chairperson
USF Institutional Review Board
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Letter of Informed Consent

Informed Consent to Participate in Research
Information to Consider Before Taking Part in this Research Study

Pro # 00030023

Researchers at the University of South Florida (USF) study many topics. To do this, we need the help of people who agree to take part in a research study. This form tells you about this research study. We are asking you to take part in a research study that is called: “Perceived Roles of Academic Advisors in Pursuing Internationalization at Public State and Community Colleges in Florida”. The person who is in charge of this research study is Tony Long. This person is called the Principal Investigator.

Purpose of the Study
The purpose of this study is to find out what advisors at the colleges in the Florida College System think about internationalization, including your part in helping internationalization efforts at your college.

Why are you being asked to take part?
We are asking you to take part in this research study because you are an advisor at a college in the Florida College System.

Study Procedures
If you take part in this study, you will be asked to complete a brief, online survey related to your attitudes about globalization, internationalization, and the role you think academic advisors should have in internationalization efforts at your College. This anonymous online survey is brief (36 questions, all multiple choice), and should take no longer than 10-15 minutes to complete. No additional time will be requested from you for this research study.

Your responses to this research survey will be anonymous and strictly confidential. In order to further protect the anonymous nature of the responses, answers will be grouped in aggregate form with no personal identifiers attached. Additionally, the online survey software does not
provide researchers with the ability to track identification of participants. Certain individuals may review these records. These individuals include authorized research personnel, members of USF’s Institutional Review Board, the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) employees, and other individuals who provide oversight for USF.

**Alternatives / Voluntary Participation / Withdrawal**

You have the alternative to choose not to participate in this research study.

You should only take part in this study if you want to volunteer; you are free to participate in this research or withdraw at any time. There will be no penalty or loss of benefits you are entitled to receive if you stop taking part in this study.

**Benefits and Risks**

We are unsure if you will receive any benefits by taking part in this research study.

This research is considered to be minimal risk.

**Compensation**

We will not pay you for the time you volunteer while being in this study.

**Privacy and Confidentiality**

We must keep your study records as confidential as possible. It is possible, although unlikely, that unauthorized individuals could gain access to your responses because you are responding online.

Certain people may need to see your study records. By law, anyone who looks at your records must keep them completely confidential. The only people who will be allowed to see these records are:

The Principal Investigator,
The advising professor, and
The University of South Florida Institutional Review Board (IRB).

- It is possible, although unlikely, that unauthorized individuals could gain access to your responses. Confidentiality will be maintained to the degree permitted by the technology used. No guarantees can be made regarding the interception of data sent via the Internet. However, your participation in this online survey involves risks similar to a person’s everyday use of the Internet. If you complete and submit an anonymous survey and later request your data be withdrawn, this may or may not be possible as the researcher may be unable to extract anonymous data from the database.

**Contact Information**

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact the USF IRB at (813) 974-5638 or contact by email at RSCH-IRB@usf.edu. If you have questions regarding the research, please contact the Principal Investigator at twlong@mail.usf.edu.
We may publish what we learn from this study. If we do, we will not let anyone know your name. We will not publish anything else that would let people know who you are. You can print a copy of this consent form for your records.

I freely give my consent to take part in this study. I understand that by proceeding with this survey that I am agreeing to take part in research and I am 18 years of age or older.

Begin Survey
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Recruitment E-mail to Potential Participants

Dear Florida College Academic Advisor:

As a part of the research required for me to complete my Ph.D., I would appreciate your making the time to complete the attached brief online survey related to your perceptions about globalization, internationalization, and the role you think academic advisors should have in internationalization efforts at your College. This anonymous online survey is brief (36 questions, all multiple choice), and should take no longer than 10-15 minutes to complete. No additional time will be requested from you for this research study.

Your responses to this research survey will be anonymous and strictly confidential. In order to further protect the anonymous nature of the responses, answers will be grouped in aggregate form with no personal identifiers attached. Additionally, the online survey software does not provide researchers with the ability to track identification of participants. Certain individuals may review these records. These individuals include authorized research personnel, members of USF’s Institutional Review Board, the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) employees, and other individuals who provide oversight for USF.

Since each institution within the Florida College System (FCS) is different, your responses are critical to providing full and complete research. A limited number of responses are being recruited, so in order to accurately assess perceptions related to globalization and internationalization, and perceptions of the role academic advisors have in internationalizing the Florida College System colleges, your feedback is essential.

To complete the survey, please click on the URL link below. Your participation is voluntary, and should you decide not to participate, there will be no negative consequences to you. Clicking on the URL link will indicate that you are giving your consent to volunteer as a participant in this research study. Should you choose not to continue responding to the survey at any point, you may simply close the browser window. If you wish not to answer a particular question, you may skip that question and continue with the rest of the survey. To encourage a high response rate, two e-mail reminders will be sent to all possible participants at regular intervals.

Please direct any questions regarding this research to me at twlong@mail.usf.edu. Should you have concerns related to the research, or to request information about your rights as a research participant, contact the USF Institutional Review Board at 813-974-5638.

DIRECTIONS FOR THE SURVEY: Indicate your level of agreement with the statements in each of the categories by checking the appropriate box.
For the purpose of this study, globalization is defined as: “the flow of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, and ideas across borders” (Knight, 2003).

For the purpose of this study, internationalization is defined as: "the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education" (Knight, 2003).

For the purposes of this study “academic advisors” are operationally defined as: student affairs professionals who “stimulate learning, set high expectations, establish goals with adequate flexibility for individuals, provide support, get input, offer feedback, and facilitate a variety of interactions” (Shockley-Zalabak, 2012).

Survey URL: (Clicking on this link indicates your consent to volunteer as a participant in this research study – see the attached letter of informed consent.) (Begin Survey)

Thank you for taking the time to contribute to this critical research.
Tony Long
Ph.D. Candidate, University of South Florida
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Completion of Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI)

COLLABORATIVE INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING INITIATIVE (CITI PROGRAM)
COURSEWORK TRANSCRIPT REPORT**

** NOTE: Scores on this Transcript Report reflect the most current quiz completions, including quizzes on optional (supplemental) elements of the course. See list below for details. See separate Requirements Report for the reported scores at the time all requirements for the course were met.

- **Name:** Tony Long (ID: 0210131)
- **Email:** twlong@mail.ust.edu
- **Institution Affiliation:** University of South Florida (ID: 425)
- **Phone:** (727) 341-4618

- **Curriculum Group:** Human Research
- **Course Learner Group:** Social / Behavioral Investigators and Key Personnel
- **Stage:** Stage 1 - Basic Course

- **Report ID:** 17917549
- **Report Date:** 11/19/2015
- **Current Score:** 100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REQUIRED, ELECTIVE, AND SUPPLEMENTAL MODULES</th>
<th>MOST RECENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History and Ethical Principles - SBE (ID: 490)</td>
<td>11/15/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining Research with Human Subjects - SBE (ID: 491)</td>
<td>11/15/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont Report and CITI Course Introduction (ID: 1127)</td>
<td>11/15/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Federal Regulations - SBE (ID: 502)</td>
<td>11/15/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Risk - SBE (ID: 503)</td>
<td>11/15/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed Consent - SBE (ID: 504)</td>
<td>11/15/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy and Confidentiality - SBE (ID: 505)</td>
<td>11/15/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research with Prisoners - SBE (ID: 506)</td>
<td>11/15/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research with Children - SBE (ID: 507)</td>
<td>11/15/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools - SBE (ID: 508)</td>
<td>11/15/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Research - SBE (ID: 509)</td>
<td>11/15/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet-Based Research - SBE (ID: 510)</td>
<td>11/15/15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this Report to be valid, the learner identified above must have had a valid affiliation with the CITI Program subscribing institution identified above or have been a paid Independent Learner.

CITI Program
Email: citisupport@miami.edu
Phone: 305-243-7970
Web: https://www.citiprogram.org