

AN ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION OF

Daniel T Ferguson for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Adult and Higher Education presented on May 1, 2020

Title: The Impact of Geo-Political Trends on US Higher Education Cross-Border Partnerships with Non-US Educational Institutions.

Abstract approved: _____

Larry D. Roper

This study investigated three questions: how, what kind of, and why were cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions developed at two public four-year US universities; how, what kind of, and why will cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions develop and/or change at US universities if nationalistic geo-political trends reflective of xenophobic/nativist sentiments in the US and around the world continue; and how might cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions at two public four-year US universities differ from each other in the future if nationalistic geo-political trends reflective of xenophobic/nativist sentiments in the US and around the world continue and what will be the basis for the differences? Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 19 administrators, faculty, and staff from two US public universities who are involved in cross-border partnerships. In this study, both universities were assigned a pseudonym. Data were coded using process coding for the first cycle and pattern coding for the second. Based on a review of the literature of cross-border partnerships, and globalization, cross-border management, and resource dependency theories, an interview protocol was developed. Administration of the protocol and a description of the overall goals of the research were provided to the two US public university Senior International Officers for involvement in the study. Ten participants from Middle System University and nine from West University were selected via purposive sampling through the

assistance of the Senior International Officer at each university. Findings demonstrated that participants were concerned how nation-state policies might impact their university's cross-border partnerships. Participants also suggested that their university's policies would have to change as a result of changes in US and non-US national policies regarding cross-border collaboration between US and non-US educational institutions. Findings also implied that US universities are highly dependent on the resources within their university and that of the partner university to develop partnerships, that higher educational comprehensive internationalization efforts are being challenged through national policies, and that management of cross-border partnerships require high levels of coordination for them to succeed.

©Copyright by Daniel T Ferguson
May 1, 2020
All Rights Reserved

The Impact of Geo-Political Trends on US Higher Education Cross-Border Partnerships with
Non-US Educational Institutions

by
Daniel T. Ferguson

A DISSERTATION

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Presented May 1, 2020
Commencement June 2020

Doctor of Philosophy dissertation of Daniel T. Ferguson presented on May 1, 2020

APPROVED:

Major Professor, representing Adult and Higher Education

Dean of the College of Education

Dean of the Graduate School

I understand that my dissertation will become part of the permanent collection of Oregon State University libraries. My signature below authorizes release of my dissertation to any reader upon request.

Daniel T. Ferguson, Author

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to first thank the faculty at Oregon State University and Boston College who served as members of my dissertation committee at various times during this process: Dr. Larry Roper, Dr. Bruce Clemetsen, Dr. Hans de Wit, Dr. Mark Hoffman, and Dr. Andrew Valls. Your guidance, thoughtful comments, challenging questions, probing insight, and endless encouragement throughout this process were invaluable. Special thanks also to Dr. Kimberley Brown, my MA thesis advisor at Portland State university, who gave me the impetus to pursue the PhD and to not give up.

I would also like to thank my wife Tomoko Ferguson, sons Ian Ferguson and Kerry Ferguson, daughter Aubrey Ferguson, and Obbie (the super dog) for supporting me through this journey. There were many days where I did not think I could complete this program and each one of you provided me support and love throughout the process.

Finally, I would like to thank those who have inspired me through this journey regarding cross-border partnerships, from my colleagues in Japan and the United States, to the students I have taught, and the people who have inspired me knowing that:

“There will always be a reason why you meet people. Either you need them to change your life or you’re the one that will change theirs.”

- Angel Flonis Harefa

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Chapter 1: Focus and Significance	1
Problem Statement	3
Cross-Border Partnerships	4
Research Purpose and Questions	7
Theoretical Frameworks	10
Audience	11
Overview of the Dissertation	11
Chapter Summary	12
Chapter 2: Literature Review	14
Literature Review Purpose.....	14
Approach to the Literature Review	14
Review of Literature	15
Key Themes and Operational Definitions.....	15
Internationalization and Comprehensive Internationalization	15
Institutions as Global Citizens	19
Nativism, Xenophobia, and Nationalism	20
Cross-Border Partnerships	21
Typology of Cross-Border Partnerships	22
US Cross-Border Partnerships	23

US and Non-US Government Policies on International Education and Cross-border Partnerships.....	27
US University Policies and Strategies for Internationalization and Cross-Border Partnerships.....	28
Organizational Factors	29
Financial Factors	29
Individual Factors	30
Context Factors	31
Past Research on Cross-border Partnerships.....	32
Criteria for Inclusion and Exclusion	36
Theoretical Constructs	38
Resource Dependency Theory	39
Cross-Border Management Theory.....	41
Globalization Theory	42
Chapter Summary	44
Chapter 3: Methods.....	46
Restatement of the Problem	46
Organization of Methods Section	46
Role and Philosophical Approach of the Researcher.....	47
Research Design.....	49
Research Questions	51
Participant Selection	52
Inclusion Criterion	53

Sample Size.....	55
Accessing Sites and Subjects	55
Data Collection	57
Semi-Structured Interviews	57
Data Collection Principles	59
Data Analysis	60
Validity and Trustworthiness.....	62
Limitations	63
Chapter Summary	64
Chapter 4: Findings.....	66
Participant Demographics	67
Participant Descriptions	69
Data Analysis	75
Evidence of Trustworthiness.....	78
Credibility	79
Consistency	79
Transferability.....	79
Confirmability.....	79
Study Findings	80
Research Question One Findings.....	80
How Cross-Border Partnerships Developed	80
Faculty/Academic Connections	83
Kinds of Cross-Border Partnerships Developed	84

Challenges in Developing Cross-Border Partnerships.....	86
Two Types of Challenges	86
Why Cross-border Partnerships Were Developed	92
Summary of RQ1 Findings	95
Research Question Two Findings	97
Participant Descriptions of How Cross-Border Partnerships Will Change	97
Kinds of Future Cross-Border Partnerships Reflective of Nationalistic Policy	
Trends	102
Reason for US Universities' Change in Cross-Border Partnerships.....	106
Role of National Policy Changes	109
Summary of RQ2 Findings	115
Research Question Three Findings	118
Summary of RQ3 Findings	120
Chapter Summary	122
Chapter 5: Discussion	125
Research Questions	125
Discussion of Findings.....	126
RQ1 Findings Discussion	126
RQ2 Findings Discussion	137
RQ3 Findings Discussion	144
Implications for Future Practice.....	145
Suggestions for Future Research	146
Limitations to the Study	148

Final Reflections	150
Conclusion	152
References.....	155
Appendices.....	177

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Participant Demographics (MSU).....	67
2. Participant Demographics (WU).....	68
3. Member Check Participation	75
4. Language Used to Describe how Cross-border Partnerships were Developed (MSU)	82
5. Language Used to Describe how Cross-border Partnerships were Developed (WU)	75
6. Language Used to Describe Kinds of Cross-border Partnerships (MSU)	85
7. Language Used to Describe Kinds of Cross-border Partnerships (WU)	86
8. Perspectives on Challenges Developing Cross-Border Partnerships (MSU)	87
9. Perspectives on Challenges Developing Cross-Border Partnerships (WU)	90
10. Cross-Border Partnership Philosophy (MSU)	93
11. Cross-Border Partnership Philosophy (WU)	94
12. Nationalistic Political Trends and How They Impact Cross-Border Partnerships (MSU)	98
13. Nationalistic Political Trends and How They Impact Cross-Border Partnerships (WU)	101
14. Nationalistic Political Trends and Kinds of Future Cross-Border Partnerships MSU)	103
15. Nationalistic Political Trends and Kinds of Future Cross-border Partnerships (WU).....	105
16. Nationalistic Political Trends and Future Cross-Border Partnerships- Basis for Change (MSU).....	106
17. Nationalistic Political Trends and Future Cross-border Partnerships-Basis for Change (WU).....	108
18. Perspectives on National Policy Impact on Cross-Border Partnerships (MSU).....	110
19. Perspectives on National Policy Impact on Cross-Border Partnerships (WU).....	112

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Page
A. Email to Potential Study Participants.....	177
B. Explanation of Research.....	179
C. Semi-Structured Interview Protocol.....	181

Chapter 1: Focus and Significance

In light of recent nativist sentiments expressed by politicians and elections that have pushed countries toward a “my country first” nationalism (Lee, 2019), it must be pointed out that opposing forces within education (i.e., globalization and nationalism) are not new (Coulby & Zambeta, 2005). Over the past 20 to 30 years, higher education has become more interconnected globally (Altbach, 2016; Altbach & Knight, 2007; Barnett & Jacobson, 2010). Further, US higher education institutions embrace campus internationalization as an important part of their strategic mission (Hudzik, 2015a). And yet globalization, according to some, weakens nations; with integrated financial systems, nations have relinquished elements of their own sovereignty (Bresser-Pereira, 2008; Coulby & Zambeta, 2005; Mann, 1997). Zambeta (2005) suggested that anti-globalization efforts and the implementation of insular policies that reflect these efforts is to be expected, as “globalization is not a force that meets with no resistance” (p. 79).

Since the 2016 US presidential election, the Brexit vote in the UK, and isolationist and nativist movements around the world, international higher education professionals have wondered how US and non-US government policies may impact US higher education internationalization efforts, including their cross-border partnerships with non-US partner educational institutions. Xenophobic, nativist, and/or nationalist sentiments may have already led to national policies that limit and/or restrict cross-border academic interaction, exchange, student and faculty mobility, and research collaboration (Dennis, 2019; Lee, 2019). Examples of this have included national restrictions such as the 2018 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) that have led to increasing numbers of US universities closing their campus Confucius Institutes (CI) in the past year (Redden, 2019). According to the Hanban (2007, para. 1)

Confucius Institute is a public educational organization to enhancing understanding of the Chinese language and culture by these peoples, to strengthening educational and cultural

exchange and cooperation between China and other countries, to deepening friendly relationships with other nations, to promoting the development of multi-culturalism, and to construct a harmonious world

Words like “xenophobia” and “nativism” are commonly used to describe the prevalence of an “us vs. them” dichotomy, with the focus on protecting the interests of natives against those of immigrants (Ashwill, 2017). How these anti-immigrant and anti-globalization sentiments impact cross-border higher education institutional collaboration can be revealed in changing national public policies (Barrow; 2017; Young, 2017). Such nativist sentiments reflected in national policies involving academic collaboration could be long-term and impact multiple nation-states, but should not be unexpected (Barrow, 2017). Barrow pointed out that anti-immigrant rhetoric is not limited to the US but is something happening around the world as nation-states isolate themselves “in response to economic, political, and social issues, such as increased refugee immigration” (p. 163).

Further, national policies impacting education are not developed in isolation in a specific time in history but are developed in context and played out differently in different nations (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). According to Rizvi and Lingard, in an era of globalization where enhanced migration across the various national borders exists, events such as the 2016 US presidential election and Brexit could create “some interruption to such flows and more state intervention around them, in an attempt at strengthening national borders” (p. 17). Since public policy creation is a state activity, such anti-immigrant or nativist rhetoric may have already negatively impacted one aspect of US higher education internationalization efforts, i.e., inbound student mobility, since 2016 (Altbach & de Wit, 2017; Ghemawat & Bastian, 2017).

If national policies are impacting other higher education internationalization efforts like US university cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions, limits on cross-

border collaborations could reverse past US higher education efforts to work collaboratively with cross-border partners and impact internationalization efforts on US campuses. While past institutional cross-border partnerships have been impacted by interdependent global economic, political, military, social, and cultural environments (Ramirez et al., 2016), the effects of heightened policy restrictions could negatively impact these efforts (Rizvi, 2017). Rizvi used the term “policyscape,” and noted that current geopolitical trends reflecting a nativist agenda in the US and the world have the potential for negatively changing and destabilizing the established higher education cross-border policyscape, thus impacting the interdependence of US and non-US higher education institutions.

Problem Statement

Geo-political trends that support anti-globalization, anti-immigrant, and nativist movements in the US and abroad have existed before (Young, 2017). Nonetheless, trends that are reflective of national policies that restrict collaborative efforts between US and non-US educational institutions, anti-immigrant sentiments, and anti-globalization movements has international higher education professionals wondering how government policies may impact US higher education internationalization efforts, including their cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions (Ashwill, 2017; de Wit & Altbach, 2018; Peterson, 2017; Redden, 2019). Concerns over student spying, academic freedoms abroad, and US policy restrictions at home could substantiate the concerns of US higher education administrators, faculty, and staff about the immediate and long-term health of their university’s cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions (“League of nationalists,” 2016; Lee, 2019).

Over the past 30 years, cross-border education has grown in capacity and impact (Knight, 2011). Researchers have found that national policies and geo-political trends can impact how

higher education cross-border partnerships have been developed in the past, how they are developed in the future, and how swings in geopolitical and social sentiment can impact them (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Rizvi, 2017; Ziguras & McBurnie, 2015). A review of the literature on US University cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions reveals that important interrelated themes have not been fully explored. These themes include how anti-immigrant and nativist sentiment, that are often expressed in national policies that limit and/or restrict collaboration with non-US educational institutions, are impacting cross-border partnerships (Rizvi, 2017). The findings of this current study address these gaps by providing insight into how anti-immigrant and nativist sentiments that impact national policies may affect US higher education cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. The findings of this study could help higher education administrators, faculty, and staff address strategic planning issues regarding who to partner with in the future as well as mission goals that impact collaborative research, curriculum, study abroad programs, and learning.

Cross-Border Partnerships

It is important to provide insight into the history, motivations for, and the kinds of cross-border partnerships US public universities have engaged in with non-US educational institutions. It is also important to investigate any changes to cross-border partnerships that US international administrators and faculty at two four-year public universities are currently implementing and the future challenges they might face in the current geo-political environment where national policy restrictions are placed on cross-border collaboration.

To understand how partnerships were implemented, the kinds of partnerships, and the motivations for cross-border partnerships at each university, it is important to establish a framework for them. US higher education cross-border partnerships with non-US educational

institutions vary from institution to institution but a common legal framework impacts each of them. Klasek (1992) first documented the various kinds of legal engagements at the university level (i.e., standardized agreements or memoranda of understanding (MOU)). Earlier discussions of US university cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions focused on regularizing these partnerships with set timeframes and legal obligations that impact each partner (Klasek, 1992). In order to implement these standardized memoranda of understanding (MOU), it is important to establish who is involved in them (i.e., stakeholders), the types of programs that fall under a cross-border partnership, and what projects and policies are part of their implementation (Knight, 2012; Tubbeh & Williams, 2010).

According to Knight (2012), cross-border education refers to “the movement of people, programs, providers, policies, knowledge, ideas, projects across national boundaries” (p. 36). Programs vary and delivery modes can be face-to-face or virtual and can include, for example, articulation agreements, joint and/or dual degree programs, study abroad programs, international branch campuses in other countries, collaborative research, and faculty exchanges (Knight, 2012; Tubbeh & Williams, 2010). According to Koromi (2020), articulation agreements “are signed legal contracts. These documents go into great detail regarding guaranteed admission, transfer credits, scholarships, and academic and course requirements” (para 3). The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education (2020) defines an international branch campus as an

off-shore entity of a higher education institution operated by the institution or through a joint venture in which the institution is a partner (some countries require foreign providers to partner with a local organization) in the name of the foreign institution. Upon successful completion of the course program, which is fully undertaken at the unit abroad, students are awarded a degree from the foreign institution.

To develop and implement the various elements of cross-border education, complicated cross-border partnerships involve various stakeholders (i.e., administrators, faculty champions,

students, and staff) that are often connected with the non-US educational institution and often negotiated and implemented over many years (Amey, 2010; Arrowood & Hitch, 2016; Tubbeh & Williams, 2010). Further, cross-border partnerships have the potential to impact a US university's organizational structure, strategic focus, mission identity, global reputation, and economic standing (Altbach, 2016; Knight, 2011; Sakamoto & Chapman, 2011; Sutton et al., 2012).

Mutual benefit, costs, accountability, and quality assurance are also a concern, and shared values are often involved when deciding to develop cross-border partnerships (Hudzik, 2015; Lane et al., 2018; Stella, 2006; Sutton, 2010). Further, national sovereignty (i.e., the role of national policies impacting cross-border partnerships) is foundational to any successful cross-border partnership when a university seeks to provide educational opportunities such as dual degree programs or branch campuses in another country (Lane, 2011; Lane et al., 2018). As US universities become multinational, with locations outside of the home campus, the partnerships may be viewed as a public institution in the home country but are seen as private institutions in the host nation thus fostering concerns about governance, quality assurance, and intergovernmental associations (Lane, 2011). This could impact concerns related to academic freedom in countries that may not have a tradition of academic freedom and the role such freedoms have in branch campus classrooms (Altbach, 2013).

Further, cultural differences, combined with political policy challenges, and divergent financial motivation, appear in all cross-cultural activities where confrontations sometimes exist between people that think, feel, and act differently from one another based on culture (Hofstede et al., 2010). Basic diverse cross-cultural activities that vary across cultures and social and geopolitical constructs can impact cross-border education policies (Sakamoto & Chapman,

2011). According to Sakamoto and Chapman, US higher education cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions “operate within a complex political, financial, and educational context, made more complicated by the likelihood that factors within each of these streams is viewed differently by the partner institution” (p. 7). Because of the cultural, socio-economic, and political trends in the US and the world, the topic of cross-border education becomes more timely as national policies regarding international trade change, especially with President Trump’s proclamation to ignore the World Trade Organization regarding international trade agreements and to promote “America First” policies (Paletta & Swanson, 2017).

With such national policies in place, elements that make cross-border partnerships successful are dependent on each university’s capacity to mesh the organizational, financial, individual, and context issues into a consistent and interconnected strategic plan (Chapman & Sakamoto; Nolan & Hunter, 2012). It is important to understand that organizational factors, such as administrative leadership and policy support, influence financial investment, collaboration sustainability, faculty engagement, and the ability to weather context factors such as political and cultural issues that might otherwise derail the partnership (Chapman & Sakamoto, 2011; Nolan & Hunter, 2012).

Research Purpose and Questions

US university cross-border education partnerships with non-US educational institutions have been growing and evolving over the past 30 years (Knight, 2014). Numerous stakeholders are involved in an educational institution’s efforts to build comprehensive internationalization, including diverse government and non-government entities (Hudzik, 2015a; Lane, 2011; Regulska & Burrola, 2016; Ryan, 2013; Sakamoto & Chapman, 2011; Wilson, 2012). There is also indication that the socio-political environment and subsequent government policies can

impact cross-border collaboration and engagement (Ziguras & McBurnie, 2015) and that there is increased worldwide interdependence on economic, political, military, social, and cultural fronts (Ramirez et al., 2016). Therefore, how the current worldwide political environment may impact cross-border higher education partnerships makes this research timely.

In addition to political, cultural, economic, military, and social factors that can impact policy, there are several common factors within the university that can impact institutional policy (Chapman & Sakamoto, 2011; Lane, 2011). These include: (a) organizational factors (e.g., arrangements at both the US and the partner institution that include faculty, curriculum changes, and staff); (b) financial factors (e.g., return on investment, shared commitment to the sustainability of the program); (c) individual factors (e.g., faculty champions, but also other individuals who play a part in the partnerships); and (d) context factors (i.e., political and cultural issues that impact quality control, regulation, and size of the programs).

With both university and political factors in mind, this research was based on the following three research questions:

- How, what kind of, and why were cross-border partnerships with non-US higher educational institutions developed at two public four-year US universities?

The rationale for this research question was based on how US universities have initiated, developed, created, and maintained past cross-border partnerships. It was important to establish the basic framework the US universities I researched have used to create past cross-border partnerships and the factors that were involved in the creation of the partnerships. This enabled me not only to see what factors were involved in the creation of the agreements, but also what changes in the partnerships may have occurred over time.

- How, what kind of, and why will cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions develop and/or change at US universities if nationalistic geo-political trends reflective of xenophobic/nativist sentiments in the US and around the world continue?

The rationale for considering this research question is based on new political realities that might impact US universities, their policies, challenges, and future risks as they consider either new or established cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. Nativist political trends around the world are moving toward a more insular perspective regarding how US institutions, organizations, and businesses engage in cross-border relationships. What has happened politically not only in the US, but in other countries such as France, the Netherlands, and the UK, provide the impetus to research what is happening and how US governmental policies might be impacting US universities and their cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions.

- How might cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions at two public four-year US universities differ from each other in the future if nationalistic geo-political trends reflective of xenophobic/nativist sentiments in the US and around the world continue and what will be the basis for the differences?

The rationale for considering this research question is based on trying to better understand the differences in how two US public universities are dealing with current xenophobic and nativist geo-political trends when developing cross-border partnerships in the future. For the past 15 years, many US universities have developed strategic partnerships that include working in tandem with consortia or in close alliance with government and non-government agencies (NGOs), as well as other multi-lateral sources of support (Cucu et al., 2016; Regulska & Burrola, 2016). Cross-border partnerships have changed over the past two to

three decades and how universities move forward may help provide further insights on how different activities can further best practices in cross-border partnership development (Altbach & de Wit (2017).

Theoretical Frameworks

In qualitative research, theoretical constructs are used to determine research design (Creswell, 2013; Yin, 2014). Theory helps researchers with issues related to data collection, data analysis, and research design (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015; Yin, 2014). Researchers can also use theoretical constructs to increase confidence in the conclusions when analytical tools like theoretical triangulation and member checking are used to make sense in the findings (Yin, 2014). To inform this study, I utilized several management and resource theories related to process management and globalization: Resource Dependency Theory (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978), Cross-border Management Theory (Guo, 2015), and Globalization Theory (Guttal, 2007; Levin, 2001; Maringe, 2010;; Robertson, 1992).

Resource Dependency Theory (RDT) focuses on how organizational environments impact and limit organizations and how these organizations respond to external limitations. Cross-border Management Theory focuses on how borders, whether physical or socio-politically constructed, might impact organizational alliances. Finally, one element of Globalization Theory focuses on global economic forces that, in the case of cross-border partnership development, drive educational institutions to develop partnerships as part of the market economy. Each theory contributed to the overall perspective that formed the basis for this research (i.e., the socio-political trends that might impact higher education cross-border partnerships) and added specific elements important to developing an understanding of related contexts and in the interpretation of findings of the study.

Audience

Different groups will find this research significant. For example, university administrators who develop, create, maintain, and promote cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions will be able to see how other universities are dealing with the challenges, policy issues, and risks that a nativist socio-political agenda might have on future partnerships. In addition, international education researchers who are studying the impact of nativist sentiments on national policies will find this study useful when investigating ways higher education is being impacted by geo-political constraints that they may have not previously considered. Finally, as a result of my research, government officials that create political policy might see the significance of political policy in the interchange of ideas, student mobility, and higher education organizational structure.

Another result of my research is that it could help US higher education administrators, faculty, and staff reflect on their past partnership agreements and determine how they want to develop future cross-border partnerships with non-US partner educational institutions given worldwide political and social nativist trends. Nativist ideology, and changes in political policy related to trade and cross-border exchange, as expressed by US national and international policymakers, may or may not be a long-term trend. However, it is possible that current political and social trends are impacting US higher education and their cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions and could have lasting impact on their cross-border partnerships in the future.

Overview of the Dissertation

The first chapter presents the focus and significance of this research which was on: (a) past development, creation, and implementation of US university cross-border partnerships with

non-US educational institutions as found at two US four-year public universities, and (b) current geo-political trends and their impact on these same two US four-year public universities. The second chapter provides a review of the literature that covers past research in higher education cross-border partnerships and relevant issues related to cross-border partnerships. The third chapter provides the methodology that was used in the research. Chapter four will provide focus on how past development of cross-border partnerships at two US four-year public universities have been accomplished over the years since they have developed cross-border partnerships with counterparts in other countries. Chapter five will reveal how current geo-political trends may be impacting current and future cross-border partnerships as found at the two US four-year universities. The final chapter will also provide an overall conclusion.

Chapter Summary

Given that US universities are susceptible to the emergence of political trends that could impact cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions, international administrators, faculty, and staff that work with cross-border partners need to possess the knowledge and skills to lead their cross-border education programs through policy changes that could impact relationships with non-US educational institutions. Failure to consider current worldwide geo-political trends reflective of insular nativist sentiments can have long-term consequences to their cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions.

Will higher education leaders need to adjust how they approach cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions? Considering current nativist sentiments, as expressed by US national, as well as international leaders, there is the possibility that US university leaders will need to adjust policies and strategies and consider the challenges and risks as they currently engage with non-US educational institutions. Geo-political trends reflecting anti-globalization,

anti-immigrant, and xenophobic sentiments could further impact each university's future global initiatives as it considers the risks and responsibilities that exist with changes in national policies.

According to Sakamoto and Chapman (2011), past cross-border engagement between US higher education institutions and their cross-border partners have been built under entirely different circumstances. US higher education administrators, faculty, and staff have a vested interest in seeing how future US university cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions will be built under the current anti-immigrant, nativist climate. The impact on the field of international education and US higher education policy and practice could be extensive. As a part of the research, the similarities and differences between the two universities in their policies and practices of cross-border partnerships will be a result of the comparisons made. It is important to explore how two public, four-year universities with different historical backgrounds in developing cross-border partnerships might develop and/or change their cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions in light of current global anti-globalization and nationalist geo-political trends and what the basis for those changes will be. Not only will it inform administrators, faculty, and staff involved in cross-border partnerships, but it can add to the growing scholarship involving strategic planning as international higher education moves forward in the next few years.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Many US higher education institutions have been involved in internationalization efforts that include engaging in cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. Because current US and worldwide political trends can potentially impact US higher educational institution cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions, it is important to review current and past research regarding these partnerships.

Literature Review Purpose

This literature review examines the research involving US higher education cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions over the past 30 years. The purpose of the literature review is to explore research completed on past US higher education cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. This chapter covers the following: the approach to the literature review, operational definitions, criteria for inclusion and exclusions for this research, what literature has been included, and finally the review of the literature. The literature review has four major themes: (a) the theoretical constructs involved in the research; (b) US and non-US government impact on cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions; (c) US cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions as a part of comprehensive internationalization; and (d) factors within US higher education impacted by cross-border partnerships.

Approach to the Literature Review

The literature for this review was gathered from several sources. Primary sources include databases such as EBSCO, Education Resources Information Center (ERIC), JSTOR, and ProQuest. I accessed these and other resources including books, journals, and newspaper articles through the Oregon State University library, the University of Hawaii at Manoa library, local and

Oregon state libraries, or that I purchased. Key words associated with my search included: nationalism, nativism, populism, cross-border, educational partnerships, educational collaboration, twinning, articulation agreements, educational engagement, international, comprehensive internationalization, globalization, resource dependency, US universities, higher education, and global citizenship.

Review of Literature

Key Themes and Operational Definitions

Operational definitions and recognition of key themes from the international education and cross-border partnership development discussion are needed to more clearly distinguish the partnerships that are the focal point of this research. Many terms are used in slightly different ways from resource to resource. Therefore, this section will clarify how select terms are defined and used for purposes of this study. In this section, I will elaborate further regarding the following terms and themes: internationalization, including comprehensive internationalization; globalization; global citizenship; nativism and nationalism; institutions as global citizens; cross-border partnerships; a typology of cross-border partnerships; US cross-border partnerships; US national policy on international education and cross-border partnership; and US institutional policies and strategies for internationalization, in particular at 4-year public institutions.

Internationalization and Comprehensive Internationalization

Altbach (1998) referred to the modern university as “the center of an international knowledge system that encompasses technology, communications, and culture” (p. 347). Internationalization is a term associated for centuries with political science and international relations (Howlett & Ramesh, 2002; Knight 2015). It is not a new term, but it has taken greater significance in education since the early 1980s (Knight, 2015). From that time, the term

international education has often been used to distinguish it from the terms “comparative education,” “global education,” and “multicultural education.” Since 2000, other terms associated with internationalization became more common and included “transnational education,” “borderless education,” and “cross-border education,” reflecting the movement of education across typical borders (Knight, 2015).

Over the past 20 years, internationalization in education has become part of a university’s activities to clarify their focus on initiatives that impact their global efforts. In the 1980s, the term was viewed as something institutions did as a set of activities (Knight, 2004). Arum and van de Water (1992) defined internationalization as “the multiple activities, programs and services that fall within international studies, international educational exchange and technical cooperation” (p. 202).

Operationally, Knight (1994) later defined internationalization as the “process of integrating an international and intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution” (p. 3). From activities to process, Van Der Wende (1997) later defined internationalization as a response to the globalization of society and as “any systematic effort aimed at making higher education responsive to the requirements and challenges related to the globalization of societies, economy and labor markets” (p. 18). Soderqvist (2002) focused on internationalization as

a change process from a national higher education institution to an international higher education institution leading to the inclusion of an international dimension in all aspects of its holistic management in order to enhance the quality of teaching and learning and to achieve the desired competencies. (p. 29)

Knight (2004) further broadened the definition of internationalization to involve various levels (i.e., national/sector/institutional) as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary

education” (p. 11). Hudzik (2011) explained that internationalization is something more “comprehensive” (and added that to the definition) in its impact on the institution itself and all its constituents, including cross-border partners as a commitment toward action that impacts its teaching, research, and service missions.

Knight’s (2015) reformulated definition reflected previous definitions and, like Hudzik’s (2011) definition, focused on the comprehensive nature of internationalization. International education would have to be viewed as something comprehensive, impacting all of the university’s efforts and reflect 21st century trends. Knight’s definition encapsulated what had been mentioned before, but also included all aspects of education’s role in society and not just that of the university itself.

To Knight (2015), internationalization is meant as a term that denotes intercultural relationships between and among the rich diversity of nations, communities, cultures, or countries. As a process, internationalization is not static; rather internationalization is intentional, developmental, and evolving. Internationalization is also global as it provides worldwide scope. Therefore, as a working definition of internationalization, Knight (2015) proposed the following: “Internationalization at the national, sector, and institutional levels is defined as the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education” (p. 2).

At the institutional level, Knight’s (2015) definition enables researchers and practitioners to view internationalization as a multifunctional process that impacts stakeholders both within the US university and that of their cross-border partners. Knight’s definition can be used to build a map that articulates institutional commitment, provides leadership, staffing, and structure,

develops clear curricular and learning outcomes, develops faculty policies and practices, promotes student mobility, and builds on collaboration and partnerships.

Collaboration and partnerships are key components of the American Council on Education's (ACE) Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE) Model for Comprehensive Internationalization (CI) (Helms et al., 2017). The CIGE Model and the six pillars that define comprehensive internationalization is represented in Figure 1.

Figure 1

Comprehensive Internationalization Framework.



Note: American Council on Education (2017). Reprinted with permission.

The “mapping” study structured its co-equal and integrated pillars of CI around a specific definition of CI: “a strategic, coordinated process that seeks to align and integrate international policies, programs, and initiatives, and positions colleges and universities as more globally oriented and internationally connected institutions” (p. 2). As a part of that structure, Helms et al. (2017) claimed that collaboration and partnerships are a key component of any higher education institution’s efforts to make comprehensive internationalization a part of their identity.

The key findings of the 2017 edition of the CIGE report, compared to previous editions of the mapping study, suggested key changes: a) internationalization is becoming more administrative-intensive, b) student mobility is becoming more important and the level of support on campus

remains a concern, c) institutions are increasingly implementing on-campus academic and co-curricular global learning activities, and d) more institutions offer internationally-focused professional development opportunities for faculty.

For this research I used Knight's (2015) definition of internationalization that encompasses the international, intercultural, and global elements that impact US university cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. Further, ACE's CIGE (Helms et al., 2017) definition of the co-equal and integrated pillars of comprehensive internationalization (CI) gives an understanding of cross-border partnerships as an integral part of a US higher education institution's efforts to achieve CI.

Institutions as Global Citizens

Global citizenship, as an emerging theme in international higher education, is an important issue for many higher education institutions. Many higher education institutions have incorporated global themes as a part of their core values, stating how important it is for their students to become global citizens. Nonetheless, higher education institutional leaders need to address their institution's global citizenship footprint (Deardorff et al., 2012). As Deardorff et al. pointed out, institutional leaders need to ask themselves a key question: what responsibilities will educational institutions have within the larger global context as it pertains to partnership, collaboration, and authentic dialogue with the focus of mutual benefit, global engagement, and action?

Sutton and Deardorff (2012) saw this effort to collaborate as a process of "increasing synergies among scholars, deepening student and institutional engagement in the world, and creating larger networks of discovery, transforming the very nature of higher education" (p. 17). Part of institutional collaboration with non-US educational institutions would determine

institutional focus. Will institutions become more global-centric? Will global efforts align with institutional missions? If so, how can institutions work closely together in global efforts and how will partners be identified (Deardorff et al., 2012)? A part of this, according to Deardorff et al., is the importance of measuring institutional global competencies and the ethical standards that guide global engagement. Specifically, as educational institutions become engaged globally, how might the institution function as a member within a global system of higher education? Instead of an institution functioning within its own silo, the focus on integration, mutual development of resources, and strategic planning allows higher education institutions to engage more broadly (Deardorff et al., 2012).

Nativism, Xenophobia, and Nationalism

Ashwill (2017) suggested that it is important to distinguish between nationalism and nativism in the broader context of the current political situation. Ashwill maintained that nationalism is defined as: "loyalty and devotion to a nation; especially a sense of national consciousness exalting one nation above all others and placing primary emphasis on promotion of its culture and interests as opposed to those of other nations or supranational groups" (para 8). Some people equate nationalism with patriotism, but the two are not identical. According to Ashwill (2017), patriotism is a "loyalty and devotion to a nation." Nationalism is believing one nation is better than another, and nativism is not just believing a nation is better than another, but "actively *protecting* the interests of native-born or established inhabitants against those of immigrants and is more closely related to xenophobia" (Ashwill, 2017, para 8). According to Lee (2020), xenophobia is an "irrational fear, hatred, and hostility toward immigrants, refugees, or others considered 'foreign' as threats" (p. 5).

Hu and Spence (2017) claimed that the 2016 US election for president, along with Brexit and other political trends in other countries, was a victory for nativism, anti-globalism, and nationalism. Turning back decades of open cross-border trade, public sentiment has reflected frustration over how developed countries have failed to implement policies that could withstand “the negative side effects of (twenty years of) international trade and rapid technological change” (Hu & Spence, 2017, para. 6). In the post-Cold War period, the emphasis has been on economic development and competitiveness, rather than the previous emphasis on promoting mutual understanding and world peace (de Wit & Merckx, 2012). According to de Wit and Merckx, it was this competitiveness that would become the popular rationale for continued cross-border engagement, added to previous rationales that focused on foreign policy and national security.

However, with current nativist social and political trends, cross-border cooperation programs between educational institutions, the emergence of a “Fortress Europe” or a “Fortress America” reflects what nativist political leaders feel is wrong with efforts to internationalize (May, 2017; Miroff, 2020). The increase of cross-border exchange agreements in international education over the past 15 years had supported mutual cross-border engagement (e.g., Erasmus Mundus) (de Wit & Merckx, 2012). According to previous champions of global engagement such as the US, UK, and France, public support for economic openness fell precipitously (Hu & Spence, 2017). In November 2016, a YouGov/Economist poll found “that less than half of Americans, Britons, and French believed that globalization was a force for good” (p. 55).

Cross-Border Partnerships

Knight (2007) refers to cross-border education as the “movement of people, knowledge, programs, providers, policies, ideas, curricula, projects, research and services across national or regional jurisdictional borders” (p. 24). Knight (2014) also recognized two closely linked pillars

in the internationalization process: “internationalization at home” and “cross-border education.” While both are important aspects of internationalization, my research focused on the aspect of cross-border education in its many different forms.

Typology of Cross-Border Partnerships

A typology of cross-border partnerships, i.e., the elements of a framework for cross-border partnerships, was important for this study. Within that framework, cross-border education varies from country to country, but it always involves people, programs, providers, and projects/services/new knowledge and reflects the importance of internationalization (Knight, 2011). Youssef (2014) defined this more broadly to include cross-border mobility of people, of individual education programs, and of providers. Knight (2011) suggested that it is important to consider what elements in education move, where it is happening, who is funding it, who is awarding the qualification, and what body is regulating it.

Included within those elements, de Wit and Hunter (2015) further suggested that internationalization is “driven by a dynamic and constantly evolving combination of political, economic, sociocultural, and academic rationales” (p. 2) that diverges depending upon the country, region, and culture. Therefore, cross-border partnerships reflect their particular country, region, and culture. What cross-border partnerships look like in the US, therefore, do not look the same, for example, in Europe, Africa, or Asia. Within the European Union, a common approach to internationalization started with the European Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students (ERASMUS) program and was strengthened by the Bologna Process (Breznik et al., 2013; de Wit & Hunter, 2015).

In the US, the types of programs universities participate in depends on the motivation of each university, its willingness to participate in cross-border partnerships, the kind of university

it is, and the partners with whom it collaborates (Hawawini, 2016). Hawawini narrowed these to economic and academic motivations to collaborate. Unlike ERASMUS, there is no common approach to the program model to follow, nor is there a national approach to cross-border partnerships. In addition, each university has a different definition of comprehensive internationalization while still supporting the American Council on Education's (ACE) Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE) Model for Comprehensive Internationalization CI (Helms et al., 2017). The motivations for engaging in cross-border partnerships often "include commercial advantage, knowledge and language acquisition, and enhancing the curriculum with international content" (p. 290) (Altbach & Knight, 2007).

Outside of Europe and the US, different approaches to cross-border partnerships prevail and the focus is no longer on a Westernized, unequal, and predominately English view of program delivery and relationships (de Wit et al., 2017; Hagenmeier, 2015; Wu & Zha, 2018). Further, equality or mutually beneficial cross-border partnerships, while perhaps more easily maintained when there is equality between institutions, is not necessarily equitable for institutions of unequal strength (Hagenmeier, 2015). Outside of the US and Europe, for example, key players in higher education have developed their own voices and must be heard (Egron-Polak & Marmolejo, 2017). Egron-Polak and Marmolejo suggested that "these voices do not only come from traditional sources, but the concept of 'emerging voices' in the new HE landscape should be comprehensive and inclusive in scope. It is not only one single, unified voice, nor does it always come from the same cluster of countries or from the same type of institutions" (p. 14).

US Higher Education Cross-Border Partnerships

With a more thorough understanding of the various views toward a global understanding toward partnerships, it is important to note that the extent of US higher education cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions has grown over the past 20 years in size, scope, and impact (Helms et al., 2017; Knight, 2011). The growing objectives cross-border partnerships address and the forms that are established reflect rising worldwide academic, institutional, and student interest in such programs (Gatewood & Sutton, 2016). Helms et al. (2017) also pointed out in their survey for the American Council on Education, that partnerships with institutions abroad ranks third among priority activities for internationalization on US campuses.

While cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions have grown, the goals, level of institutional engagement, the types of agreements, the partnering entities abroad, and impact varies from institution to institution (Deardorff et al., 2012; Gatewood & Sutton, 2016). According to Gatewood and Sutton, strategic planning that includes each institution's goals now span the whole academic enterprise, from student learning, teaching, research, funding, and institutional reputation. Part of that strategic planning involves the attention, support, and energy to develop, create, and maintain cross-border partnerships as well as the activities involved in the partnership (i.e., student and faculty mobility, capacity-building projects, collaborative research and training, cooperative and/or collaborative degrees, teaching, and academic operations). Senior International Officers (SIO) at US public universities are increasingly focused on building and maintaining cross-border partnerships; new university positions devoted to cross-border partnerships have been established at US universities, often with the focus on enhancing cross-border relationships in the name of "international engagement" (Deardorff et al., 2012; Helms et al., 2017).

International engagement via cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions can mean many things for each educational institution. For example, these could include efforts to enhance institutional efforts to win international grants with the focus of building capacity with partners in the developing world, improving institutional reputation in world rankings, working with peer educational partners, linking curriculum to study/service learning/internship opportunities, or offering dual degrees (Deardorff et al., 2012; Helms et al., 2017). It could also mean working with new partners, including companies that promote higher education programs pathways at partner US universities (e.g., INTO, Shorelight, and Navitas), as well as governments and non-government organizations (NGOs).

The creation of cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions could also mean building transnational programs such as branch campuses and international hubs where joint ventures are developed with local institutions (Coleman, 2003; Knight, 2014; Stella, 2006). Other examples include articulation agreements where courses students have taken in one country are granted credit toward completion of a certificate or degree in the partner country or study abroad and/or exchange programs.

US higher education international administrator and faculty roles are significant when determining the kinds of cross-border engagement with the goal of strengthening the institution's core global values and ethos (Deardorff et al., 2012). Strategic global institutional engagement should be mission driven and reflect the institution's core values and ethos (Sutton, 2010). Sutton (2010) viewed strategic institutional engagement as an outward process of the development of global networks based on earning, discovery, and engagement. Whereas, internationalization was often viewed as an inward process, Sutton believed that cross-border partnerships integrate international perspectives into the institution as an outward expression of the institution's

mission strategy. Sutton saw higher education reorganizing in a world in which boundaries that limited higher education previously were smashed and that, through cross-border partnership, “the global nature of science and scholarship, the emergence of excellent colleges and universities in all parts of the world, the power of postcolonial perspectives, and the globalization of the communities in which we are located” (p. 60) would prevail.

Knight (2002) was one of the first researchers who noted the connection between the General Agreement on Trade and Services (GATS) and internationalization in higher education. Knight suggested that cross-border education has changed from what was once a development cooperation model involving partnership and exchange to a commercial and competitiveness model, exemplified by the impact of the 1995 General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS). From a neo-liberal perspective, there is the sense then that cross-border partnerships require fiscal investment and an expected return on investment.

Altbach and Knight (2007) established the typical framework that comprises cross-border partnerships with international educational institutions. Since international academic mobility has increased to include cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions it is often viewed as a commodity. As a tradeable commodity, much of what is seen is viewed from the following perspective:

- Cross-border supply—includes distance education, franchising courses or degrees, and does not require neither the consumer (i.e., student) or provider (i.e., educational institution) physically moving.
- Consumption abroad—the consumer (i.e., the student) moves to the country of the provider (i.e., in this research, the US educational institution). This involves traditional student mobility.

- Commercial presence—the service provider (i.e., the US higher education institution) establishes and maintains facilities in another country (i.e., branch campuses and joint ventures with local institutions).
- Presence of natural persons—this includes people such as professors and researchers who temporarily travel to another country and provide educational services such as course content to students (OECD, 2004).

US and Non-US Government Policies on International Education and Cross-border

Partnerships

Researchers have noted the highly complex and variable character and form internationalization has taken over the years, across space and time (Howlett & Ramesh, 2002). The effects of the character and form of international influences varies, impacted by domestic institutions that differ across nations and policy levels (Brenner, 1999; Knight, 2008; Ohmae, 2005; Weiss, 1999).

Many colleges and universities that function across borders operate in multinational or binational policy arenas (Knight, 2008; Lane & Kinser, 2011). However, as Lane and Kinser pointed out, “there has yet to emerge a supranational education policy framework or organization, and the locus of power remains with the nation-state” (p. 79). Nonetheless, national, bilateral, sub-regional, regional, interregional, and international organizations, ministries, and agencies are examples of the actors involved in cross-border partnerships (Knight, 2008). According to Knight, these actors’ activities impact policies that determine, for example, student mobility, research and development, curriculum, scholarships, and quality assurance.

US and non-US government policies that involve regulatory, regulation, program size, quality assurance, and participant involvement in programs, played a significant role in this research. However, as Knight (2008) noted, other actors are involved in the internationalization of education and these include government departments or agencies, non-(or semi-) governmental organizations, professional associations, foundations, and educational institutions. For example, in the case of cross-border programs, such as international branch campuses (IBCs) or international education hubs, where a university or college has a presence in another country, the locus of power is with the nation-state and regulatory and policymaking responsibilities generally lie with those actors (Lane & Kinser, 2011). However, as Knight (2008) suggested, all levels of actors could influence the policy development and implementation. This would include policies where agencies in and outside of government, including the educational institutions, are involved. For example, student visa issuance is regulated by the government, yet the educational institution has a role in the implementation of those regulations.

US University Policies and Strategies for Internationalization and Cross-Border

Partnerships

Cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions have reflected social, political, and institutional governance and have impacted an institution's comprehensive internationalization policies (Hudzik, 2015a). Whereas government policies often impact the ability to continue developing cross-border partnerships, institutional policies toward cross-border partnerships are also important. US universities that want to continue developing cross-border partnerships typically have a defined strategic plan that includes them as part of their core mission. Part of that mission has included internal factors that have typically impacted cross-

border partnerships at US universities (Chapman and Sakamoto, 2011). These included (a) organizational factors, (b) financial factors, (c) individual factors, and (d) context factors.

Organizational Factors

Various researchers have pointed out that long term organizational change transformation took place in different categories (Bermingham & Ryan, 2013; Frost, 2011; Levin, 2001; Wilson, 2013). Levy and Merry (1986) suggested that these categories included: (a) paradigmatic change, (b) mission and purpose change, (c) cultural change, and (d) change in functional processes (including structures, management, technology, decision-making, and communication patterns) from large (Bermingham & Ryan, 2013; Levin, 2001) to small town higher education institutions (Frost, 2011).

Hudzik (2015a) suggested that US four-year public universities are made up of divisions or departments that either are, or could be, involved in determining the impact of a cross-border partnership on the institution. According to Hudzik, much of this impact is determined by organizational and governance culture at the institution which could be important to the initiation and development of cross-border partnerships. Austin and Foxcroft (2012) noted that, in a cross-border partnership between Michigan State University (MSU) and Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (NMMU) located in South Africa, a vital factor that determined success of the cross-border partnership was senior management support and buy-in at both institutions. Further, Austin and Foxcroft maintained that senior leadership was kept informed about the collaborative efforts between each institution and this helped to make the cross-border partnership an effective relationship.

Financial Factors

When considering cross-border partnerships, it has been my experience that US higher education officials often ask the same questions, i.e., does the partnership match our mission and does it match our policies? However, it has also been my experience that no initiative in higher education is pursued unless there is a financial return. On a strictly neo-liberal ideological level, according to Levin (2001), the focus is on cost and return on investment (ROI). ROI is also a significant element of Resource Dependency Theory (RDT) and describes that organizations are open and depend on their own organization and possibly other organizations to develop and grow economically (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). In my own experience as an international recruiter at various US higher education institutions, market driven terminology like ROI has become common in US higher education. Further, international education has become fundamentally driven by market forces and it is highly competitive.

Economically, organizations grow as they develop programs that impact return on investment. In the US, the importance of international education and incoming international student mobility has grown over the years. This is indicated by reports from 13 years ago when the focus was more on the domestic market than the international market (OECD (2004). Today, international students make up a greater percentage of overall student enrollment in US higher education. In 2015/2016, over 1 million international students matriculated at US higher education institutions, and this compares to approximately 560,000 international students matriculating at US higher education institutions in 2004 (Open Doors, 2017). If there is anything that can be said about cross-border education today it is that more people see it as a commodity than ever before (Chapman & Sakamoto, 2011).

Individual Factors

US higher education leadership has, in the past, depended on individual champions to develop, create, maintain, and promote cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions (Chapman & Sakamoto, 2011). Sakamoto and Chapman suggested that past cross-border partnerships that have depended on individual faculty champions needed sufficient resources, motivation, and international contacts to begin the relationship. However, recent research has shown that cross-border partnerships are becoming more integrated in the overall strategic plan and require broad-based support beyond individual effort with the goal of building an institutional culture centered on comprehensive internationalization (Austin & Foxcroft, 2011; Brewer, 2015; Pysarchik & Hudzik, 2015).

Tubbeh and Williams (2010) maintained that the challenge of a cross-border partnership is that it impacts the environment within the university in which it functions. The department tasked with developing, creating, maintaining, and promoting a cross-border partnership must also deal with conflicting partnership roles and the differing values in leadership, cultural norms, and the funding of such programs. These functions may need broader oversight and a more involved administrator to oversee the cross-border partnership going forward, especially as changes in national political policy regarding cross-border engagement with international partners could impact how cross-border partnerships are developed, created, maintained, and promoted.

Context Factors

Chapman and Sakamoto (2011) noted that context factors can both bolster and hinder cross-border partnerships. They suggested that technology has provided growth in cross-border partnerships and consultation between partners can be done quickly and efficiently. Further,

context matters as researchers have been able to use technology that engages other researchers in collaborative efforts regardless of location (Vincent-Lancrin, 2011). According to Vincent-Lancrin, international mobility of academics highlight how significant cross-border higher education can be for academic research. Vincent-Lancrin pointed out that the flow of international academics to the US increased by 77% between 1994 and 2007. It would be important to see if that is still the case and to see if current political trends in the US impact that number. Chapman and Sakamoto (2011) pointed out that many new cross-border collaborations raise questions about country political stability, legal issues, and levels of complexity not dealt with before.

Jooste (2015) called for the development of a higher education internationalization “global commons” taking collaboration and engagement through partnerships and networks to a level in which collaboration and cooperation are based on respect and equality and become the norm rather than the typical market-based approach. With these views in mind, it is important to look at past qualitative and quantitative research regarding comprehensive internationalization and specifically at research that focused on cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions.

Past Research on Cross-border Partnerships

Past research on US higher education and comprehensive internationalization suggested methods to achieve comprehensive internationalization that included cross-border partnerships (Hudzik, 2015a). When measuring comprehensive internationalization, Green and Siaya (2005) focused on measurable areas of internationalization from a survey that included six dimensions, including “articulated commitment, academic offerings, organizational infrastructure, external funding, institutional investment in faculty, and international students and student programs” (p. 22-23) on a five-point scale and the correlations between them. The research suggested that most

universities scored low (61%) on the overall level of internationalization and none scored high. Green and Siaya's analysis was basic, and while correlations were significant and important, the strength of their study could be improved with more detailed analyses that deal with an independent variable, such as governance, that might impact constituent buy-in. Green and Siaya (2005) also failed to include issues related to cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. While cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions might fall under the umbrella of organizational infrastructure and external funding, in Green and Siaya, it is not clear that it does.

Sipe (2014) noted, in a dissertation on community college internationalization, that there were environmental factors that impacted internationalization at community colleges. Sipe's research suggested that administrative actions and behaviors within community colleges reflected increasing attention to issues in internationalization and that there were environmental factors influencing internationalization. These environmental factors included: (a) the primary industry of each college's service area, (b) the population density of the service area, and (c) the student demographics at the community college. According to Sipe, each of these factors was related to a community college's level of internationalization. These findings suggested that rural community colleges would have lower levels of comprehensive internationalization. While Sipe noted that cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions were an indicator of comprehensive internationalization, it was not determined to be a significant factor.

A case study by Wilson (2012) on faculty perceptions of their university's partnerships with non-US educational institutions indicated that successful cross-border partnerships are based on constituent "buy-in" and engagement with the partnership through faculty discourse. Wilson found, in her study on Makerere University in Uganda, that most cross-border

partnerships were started by the outside partner, yet, regardless of how cross-border partnerships were developed, either by someone within the institution or outside of it, instructional faculty and administrators need to be fully engaged if the partnership with the non-US educational institution is to be successful. Wilson's research provides impetus for questions in the survey developed for this study regarding faculty and administrator motivation developing, creating, and maintaining cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions in times of political uncertainty.

In additional research involving comprehensive internationalization, Harder (2010) compared internationalization efforts at US universities located in urban, suburban, and rural locations. Harder was trying to determine the level of internationalization occurring at universities around the United States. Harder's expectation was that all undergraduate programs internationalize to prepare students for an increasing globalized, multicultural, and interdependent economy. Harder administered a survey to participants at 409 universities from a total of 1,376 universities he sent the survey to, which amount to a 30% response rate. The survey excluded privately-controlled institutions. Data was sorted by urban, suburban, and rural groups and these groups comprised the independent variable. Harder completed a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to analyze the differences between group means and found that rural institutions had an overall lower level of internationalization (the dependent variable) than their suburban and urban counterparts. While Harder completed research on university internationalization, the research did not include an analysis about the use of cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions and their impact on internationalization.

Ryan's (2011) case study research was on a partnership between a US-based university and a university in South Africa. Ryan's research explained how, with the new democracy

initiated by Nelson Mandela beginning in 1994, there was a change in educational policies in that country that began in 1997 with initial studies on institutions that would be impacted by such changes. The studies examined how the transformation affected universities and colleges in that country. Ryan's research further explained how the partnership was used to build capacity, similar to what Hudzik (2015a) suggested about multiple networks with specific goals and intellectual mobility. Ryan's study was limited to that one relationship, but it is an example of what one US higher education institution has done in the past regarding cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions in building the partner institution's instructional capacity.

Brewer (2015) provided the example of Beloit College and its use of cross-border exchange partners in developing comprehensive internationalization. It led to intentional strategic planning that would alter the institution's culture, be deep and pervasive, occur over time, and result in transformative change across the campus. The study revealed that Beloit College's comprehensive internationalization efforts reflected their missionary history and a 1960 commitment to bring "the world to Beloit College." By 1989, staffing supported a comprehensive internationalized imprint, and by 2001, international education became a core part of the college mission. What Brewer's comments suggested is that cross-border partnership is fundamentally ingrained in the strategic planning at some colleges that aspire to comprehensive internationalization.

Past research suggests that there are gaps in the literature. Current issues related to nativist political trends are not adequately addressed. While there are researchers that refer to contextual factors that impact US university cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions and transnational education, such as the political environment, much that has been

written could not account for trends that have developed over the past two years that could change how agreements are initiated, developed, created, and maintained. My research is meant to fill some of those gaps and give significant insight into what is happening with cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions in the current nationalist political environment. My research will give insight regarding policy changes that US international administrators at four-year universities are implementing, and the challenges and future risks they are facing in the current political environment.

Further, the literature suggests that US higher education partnerships are an important element of comprehensive internationalization (CI). Hudzik (2015a) maintained that comprehensive internationalization has become something to which many US higher education institutions have aspired and that there is a close relationship between cross-border partnerships, comprehensive internationalization, and how the partnerships impact the institutional environment. CI would become an important metric to determine if a US higher education institution had met the standards for the Senator Paul Simon Award for Campus Internationalization, an award given to US higher education institutions at the annual NAFSA convention since 2003 (NAFSA: Association of International Educators, 2017).

Criteria for Inclusion and Exclusion

The literature and resources reviewed for this research included the following: books, journal articles, studies, and addresses and/or papers given at comparative and international education conferences. Also included were quantitative and qualitative research studies, reports, and data that pertained to US higher education partnerships, specifically those related to public four-year university partnerships associated with non-US educational institutions. I also included resources that have impacted other areas of US and international higher education and cross-

border partnerships, such as partnerships developed by two-year community colleges and private four-year universities.

These resources were obtained due to Sakamoto and Chapman's (2011) belief, as previously mentioned in this chapter, that US and international higher educational institutions commonly deal with the organizational, financial, individual, and contextual factors that drive past research and practice. However, as the research questions indicate, this research sought to establish historical context and what administrators, faculty, and staff at US four-year public universities believe are possible future impacts on US higher education cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions as a result of current political trends. No other kinds of literature that dealt with educational cross-border partnerships, such as those between high schools or for-profit universities, were considered.

In addition, literature that pertained to the history of US higher education cross-border partnerships are included in this review. Therefore, the information gathered contains information relevant to this study since a historical basis for such relationships is important to establish. Other literature that pertains to the theoretical constructs (i.e., Resource Dependency Theory, Globalization Theory, and Cross-border Management Theory) that drive this study are also included in this literature review.

Other than literature that pertains to historical practice in this field, literature and resources that address current national and political trends, as mentioned in online news articles, speeches, and symposiums, are also included as they establish the current setting in which US higher education is placed regarding cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions.

It is important to consider the theoretical constructs and the issues involved in the development, creation, and maintenance of cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. The theoretical constructs for this research are Resource Dependency Theory, Globalization Theory, and Cross-Border Management Theory. This literature review also included past research of how cross-border partnerships impacted US higher education and provide sections with critiques of the research for each section: (a) US university cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions as a part of comprehensive internationalization, (b) US and non-US government impact on US university cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions, (c) US university cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions as a part of comprehensive internationalization, and (d) factors within US higher education impacted by cross-border partnerships.

Past research has provided good examples of how each of these factors have been addressed in specific settings. However, current nativist sociopolitical trends (which would impact all four sections listed above) would add to the research as there seems to be a shift in global cross-border engagement which is borne out in political shifts around the world. Further, the theoretical constructs for my research, while explaining how US four-year public universities fit within the constructs, will add to the literature by providing further support for what is happening in our current sociopolitical context.

Theoretical Constructs

It is important to establish the theoretical frameworks for this study. The theoretical frameworks have informed the three research questions for this study and are also the basis for the interview questions that were asked. Past research regarding cross-border partnerships and

alliances will also be introduced. Finally, past government and US four-year university policies with non-US educational institutions will be discussed.

Over the past 30 years, US universities have increasingly entered into cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. Past research indicates that the impact on US higher education could be significant, especially as a fundamental part of comprehensive internationalization (Hudzik, 2015a). Hudzik maintained that intellectual trade across borders is multidimensional and the patterns of intellectual mobility shift based on important global issues, interests, and needs, with endless partnership network combinations. Nonetheless, current nativist geo-political and social trends could lead to an impact on cross-border partnerships and thus affect comprehensive internationalization. Transnational cooperation is often rejected by nationalists whose policies and approaches to global issues mean withdrawal from multilateral cross-border agreements and collaboration for the sake of insular national policies (Aiginger & Handler, 2020; Pisani-Ferry, 2018; Weiss & Wilkinson, 2019).

To go into further detail regarding this topic, it is important to establish the theoretical constructs for the investigation. The theoretical constructs for this investigation are generated from Resource Dependency, Cross-border Management, and Globalization theories. Each theory contributes to the overall perspective that formed the basis for this research, the research questions, and adds specific elements important to developing an understanding of why this researcher was interested in investigating this topic.

Resource Dependency Theory

Resource Dependency Theory (RDT) focused on organizations in the context of their external environments and provides a framework in understanding organizational change (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). RDT is based on the idea that organizations are open and that they depend on

their own organization and possibly other organizations. To understand the disequilibrium and change that happens within an organization when considering the development of cross-border partnerships is to also understand the role the organizational environment and boundaries play in creating new relationships. To understand RDT, is to see “how organizational environments affect and constrain organizations and how organizations respond to external constraints” (p. xi). Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) recognized the value of the organizational environment and maintained that most organizational theorists look at the problem of using resources rather than the problem of acquiring resources. Pfeffer and Salancik suggested “the central goal of most (organizational) theories is the maximization of output from given resources” (p. 3).

Scott and Davis (2007) pointed out that RDT depends on three basic ideas to explain how organizations coordinate and maintain relationships with other organizations. First, social context is important. Much of what happens between organizations does not happen without one affecting the other. Second, organizations strategically plan what benefits their own existence and autonomy. Finally, Scott and Davis say that power, and not just shrewdness or effectiveness, is important in comprehending what the organization does both inside the organization how it interfaces with the world.

This emphasis on power, according to Scott and Davis (2007), is what distinguishes resource dependency theory, and builds on Emerson’s (1962) view of personal power to extend to the organization. Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) claimed that organizations act as social instruments in society and wield great power, and it is a matter of who controls the energy and for what purpose that becomes important. The uncertainty of who holds this power holds great consequence as leaders can control strategy (Ryan, 2011).

Aldrich and Herker (1977) pointed out that uncertainty is built within the organizational milieu, and there is the need for organizations to build coalitions not only within, but to recognize the coalitional aspect of all organizations. According to Aldrich and Herker, these coalitions naturally create boundaries and the need to develop boundary-spanning activity that goes beyond the borders created by the organization, and which can lead to cross-border partnerships where partners are interdependent on one another. Per Aldrich and Herker, “the impact of interorganizational dependence on organizational structure, the place to begin is with its impact on boundary spanning roles in the immediate vicinity of the dependence relationship, rather than with the structure of the organization as a whole” (p. 228).

Cross-Border Management Theory

Guo (2015) proposed that Cross-Border Management Theory (CBMT) is a new approach to management theory that focused on intercultural difference, negotiation, and communication. Guo first provided a theoretical definition of borders as something that is: (a) natural, (b) institutional, (c) functional, and (d) mixed. According to Guo, natural borders are those elements that separate people (i.e., oceans, mountains, rivers, lakes, seas, etc.) and in many respects often serve to separate us politically.

Guo (2015) suggested that institutional borders are composed of formal and informal boundaries. These borders are both based on laws formally enforced by the government and those that are not enforced by the government (e.g., existing customs, traditions, rules of conduct, and beliefs). Functional borders are those borders formed between organizations or similar entities as established by that entity (e.g., company bylaws, policies, etc.). Finally, Guo maintained that most existing borders are mixed (i.e., they can be natural and institutional and that most can be found in an international border).

Borders affect the world in both good and bad ways (Guo, 2015). Bad borders can be considered arbitrary or even imposed. History is replete with examples of borders dividing nations and peoples via race, ethnicity, language, and religious differences. Good borders, on the other hand, are something that can be boundary-spanning (Aldrich & Herker, 1997) and can be something that practitioners can work with by crossing borders. Crossing borders means that people endeavor to understand diverse cultures and have an obligation not to cause harm (Guo, 2015). Guo maintained that organizations that are involved in cross-border management show active support and long-term commitment at the highest levels of the organization. Guo further suggested that the organization mobilizes its available resources (i.e., legal, social, expertise, etc.) toward successful cross-border relations and that there needs to be domestic governmental support for effective international cooperation and collaboration. Guo pointed out that cross-border agreements should contain items that address the objects, subjects, parties involved, the territorial scope, and the intensity of the cooperation.

Globalization Theory

Globalization Theory is the third and final theoretical construct that informs this study. The American Council on Education, when describing globalization, suggested that “while descriptive of the contemporary flow of ideas, goods, and world issues—has become a loaded term; for many, globalization is associated with the hegemony of the capitalist system and the domination of rich nations over poor” (p. viii) (Olson et al., 2007). Turner (2019) defined “globalization (as) the movement of people, ideas, goods, capital, services, pollution, and diseases across borders. Internationalization is higher education’s engagement with that reality” (p. 25).

Maringe (2010) surveyed usage of globalization theory in business, politics, and international relations and tried to apply it to higher education. One theory he pointed to (i.e., neo-liberal theory of globalization) is similar to what Levin (2001) and Rhoades and Slaughter (1997) viewed as providing one framework for understanding the competitive behaviors apparent in US higher education that would lead to creating international partnerships with educational institutions abroad. Further, Scott (1995) suggested that to survive, organizations need to align with the rules and belief systems prevailing in an increasingly global environment. This would also impact organizational management as the organization and the impact organizational culture plays in achieving comprehensive internationalization are also important functions in achieving globalization (Levin, 2001; Robertson & Lechner, 1985; Smircich, 1983; Teeple, 1995).

Economic prosperity is often a key element in why US higher education institutions partner with non-US educational institutions and seems to reflect a neo-liberal focus (Levin, 2001). Neoliberal ideology is a fundamental part of globalization and, according to Saad-Fiho and Johnston (2005), “we live in the age of neoliberalism. It is the dominant ideology shaping our world today” (p. 1). Neoliberalism is a market-based philosophy that involves a liberal democracy and is enabled by the formation of a neo-liberal government and policies that allow globalization to succeed (Guttal, 2007; Levin, 2001). For this study, I used Maringe’s (2010) definition of globalization theory.

Globalization is a multidimensional concept that relates to creating a world in which the social, cultural, technological, political, and ideological aspects of life become increasingly homogeneous and in which economic interdependence and growth are driven by the principles of the free market. (p. 24)

Levin (2001) viewed higher education in general, as practicing in the higher education marketplace and, with funding from various governmental sources diminishing, more US colleges and universities are motivated to seek private revenue sources from outside normal

pathways. Levin (2001) maintained that this could include funding sources for cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. Pressure to compete has explained how US higher education institutions deal with internal and external forces and how the internal structure of the institution is affected to implement some form of change (Cameron, 1984; Morgan, 1997). Comprehensive internationalization and the role of creating cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions makes globalization theory an important element in understanding how organizations function. It further sensitizes us to the diverse interpretations of organizational behaviors that occur in working both within and outside of the institution (Smircich, 1983). Smircich suggested this includes the presence of organizational cultures or subcultures in the university that would impact how various stakeholders at the university would view working with cultures other than their own.

Chapter Summary

This literature review surveyed past research on cross-border partnerships. Cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions have grown over the years and the challenges US universities have faced developing them has grown with organizational, financial, personal, and contextual factors impacting both the US and the country of the proposed partner (Sakamoto & Chapman, 2011). The specific theoretical structures that were the focus of my research (i.e., Resource Development Theory, Cross-Border Management Theory, and Globalization Theory) were described in this chapter and provided support for how this research proceeded.

The literature over the past 30 years has indicated that US higher education institutions are focusing on institutional comprehensive internationalization (Hudzik, 2015a). Hudzik (2015b) further mentioned that part of institutional comprehensive internationalization includes strategic development of cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions and

suggested that “by its nature comprehensive internationalization is a catalyst of more complex and comprehensive partnership formation” (p. 25). Knight (2014) added to this by focusing on the changing nature of transnational partnerships as more institutions move toward international education hubs. As a part of increasing comprehensive internationalization, cross-border partnerships are key components of the American Council on Education’s (ACE) Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE) Model for Comprehensive Internationalization CI) (Helms et al., 2017). Further, cross-border partnership development would include facets that impact many areas of the US and partner university campus (Sakamoto & Chapman, 2011),

What is missing from previous research is how current geo-political trends, possibly reflective of anti-immigrant and nativist sentiment, could impact future cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. This includes the impact of national policies reflective of anti-immigrant and nativist sentiments on the following factors that constitute the framework for US higher education institutional cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions: (a) organizational factors (e.g., arrangements at both the US and the partner institution that include faculty, curriculum changes, and staff); (b) financial factors (e.g., internal financial viability, availability of external funding, and sustainability of funding); (c) individual factors (e.g., faculty who play a part in the partnerships); and (d) context factors (e.g., national political, legal, and regulatory issues that impact quality control, regulation, and size of the programs).

Chapter 3: Methods

Restatement of the Problem

Over the past 30 years, US public universities have become more deeply involved in cross-border partnerships with non-US partner educational institutions. These partnerships have the potential to impact each university's comprehensive internationalization efforts (Hudzik, 2015a). Recent geo-political trends reflective of anti-immigrant and nativist sentiments could impact US public university cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions, affect university comprehensive internationalization efforts, and destabilize a global integrated educational policyscape (Rizvi, 2017). However, there is little research on the topic of how these trends might impact current and future US public university cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. This is concerning since there is evidence that cross-border partnerships have become significant in the strategic planning of most US higher education institutions that seek to engage with international partners (Sakamoto & Chapman, 2011; Knight, 2011). Therefore, this exploratory, multi-site case study on US public universities contributes to filling this gap in the literature on the impact of global political trends on US higher education cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. It also provides practical knowledge for administrators, faculty, and staff who are involved in cross-border partnerships.

Organization of Methods Section

The purpose of this section is to describe the methods used to conduct this multi-site case study. It includes the following sections: the role and philosophical approach of the researcher, research design, research questions, population sample, case criteria, data collection, analysis of data, validity and trustworthiness, confidentiality, and limitations.

Role and Philosophical Approach of the Researcher

Merriam and Tisdell (2016) suggested that qualitative researchers should position their research on what they believe about the nature of reality (their ontology) and how they make meaning and the nature of knowledge (their epistemology). Such positioning is required to make meaning and generate knowledge about the external world (Pernecky, 2016) and is necessary as I work with people from diverse cultural backgrounds and belief systems. As a researcher, interculturalist, educator, and administrator, my reality and how I make meaning is based on post-modern social constructivism, both of which influenced this qualitative study.

Some of my philosophical viewpoints come from a diverse background that includes experience and training in ministry, as well as intercultural competence research and application as a teacher in Japan and the US for over 30 years. My previous graduate degrees include a Master of Divinity, with an emphasis on world religions and cultures, and a Master of Arts in Applied Linguistics, with an emphasis on intercultural competence and pre-departure training. Both disciplines are foundational to my worldview of looking at multiple, subjective lenses to make meaning of what people view as their understanding of what is true within their culture and system of belief.

As it pertains to this study, I have also been involved in the development of cross-border relationships between US universities and non-US educational institutions. As an assistant professor of English in Japan at a junior college and a university, I developed education abroad programs to the US and advised numerous students on studying for advanced degrees in the US. In the US, I developed and wrote articulation and exchange agreements between US institutions and cross-border institutions at a small private university; in my current position I work on cross-border partnerships with non-US universities. To determine the viability of the partnerships, I

have had to consider the organizational, political, social, and economic issues that surrounded the implementation of the agreements.

To appreciate my postmodern world view that informs not only my work, but also my research, it is important to understand the various modernist ontological perspectives that have dominated Western thought for the past several hundred years (Raskin, 2002). Sexton (1997) divided human history into three periods: premodern, modern, and postmodern. According to Sexton, premodern thought focused on dualism, idealism, and rationalism, with faith, prayer, and religious belief playing central roles. The Modernist era, beginning during the Renaissance and up to and including the current age, focused on empirical thought, logic, scientific proof, objective truths, and validity (Raskin, 2002). Quantitative research focuses on a more modernist viewpoint.

Sexton (1997) labeled the third era as postmodern/constructivist with the focus on creation, discovery, and human participation in constructing knowledge. As Raskin (2002) claimed, the postmodern ontological perspective “stresses the viability, as opposed to the validity of knowledge claims” (p. 2). Further, as Raskin pointed out, postmodernist thought also focuses on epistemological issues (i.e., how people know). The locus of knowledge is not just with the individual, but as elements of artifacts of knowledge present in language and communal relationships (Prawat, 1996). A postmodern ontological philosophy then sees multiple realities and enlists people from diverse, subjective experiences in order to create viable understanding. Further, as I learn how people know (i.e., an epistemology), it becomes evident that all meanings reflect constructed points of view.

Merriam and Tisdale (2016) suggested qualitative researchers “are interested in understanding the meaning people have constructed” (p. 15). With social constructivism, the

focus on meaning is intrinsically tied with how people interpret their lives and how they communicate those exchanges with others (Merriam & Tisdale, 2016). My embrace of a social constructivist epistemological viewpoint, therefore, points to the importance of understanding the participants' perspectives and reporting first-hand accounts. Because of my focus on a postmodern ontological worldview and social constructivist epistemology, the results of my study will reveal the subjectivity of each participants' viewpoints, the construction of meaning through social interaction, and negotiation of meaning through methods that emphasize a shared reality.

Research Design

There are many qualitative research methods, according to Creswell (2013). My ontological and epistemological tendencies, along with my rationale for conducting an exploratory multi-site case-study, are informed by my investigation of the literature and professional experience in the field involving this topic. The rationale behind the decision to focus on case study methodology as the basis for this study was based on the qualities inherent in the scope and features of a case study. Case study is, as Creswell (2013) suggested, “ a qualitative approach in which the investigator explores a bounded system (a case) or multiple bounded systems (cases) over time, through detailed in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information (e.g., observations, interviews, audio-visual material, and documents and reports) and reports a case description and case-based themes” (p. 97).

Case study is often referred to as an in-depth empirical inquiry that examines a current phenomenon within a realistic situation that relies on multiple variables of interest and sources of evidence where it's not clear if the boundaries between the phenomenon are not readily apparent (Noor, 2008; Yin, 2014). Because it relies on multiple variables and sources of evidence, with

data converging to triangulate and support propositions, case study benefits from previous theoretical propositions that can guide data collection and analysis (Yin, 2104).

Multiple variables of interest address the complexity of the case and make the case the only data point (Yin, 2014). However, this does not make case studies variable-based, according to Yin. Rather, case studies focus on the holistic nature of case study methodology as a means to explain the phenomenon's impact on the sources of evidence (i.e., the phenomenon's impact on participant current and future practice). This phenomenon is intrinsically bound in time, space, and in the number of participants involved, making it a bounded study and fulfilling a requirement necessary for a case study (Creswell, 2013). In addition, the collection of data includes using the data as a specific illustration of a larger issue.

For interviews with participants, rather than focus on single interviews, I conducted multiple interviews with people representing each group (i.e., administrators, faculty, and staff) at two sites. The strength of a multi-site case study is that it can either augment the single case or fill a gap left by the first case where there is some shortcoming of the first case (Yin, 2014). Having two cases can blunt the criticisms about the uniqueness or artificial conditions that surround a single site case study, according to Yin. Further, by comparing and contrasting findings from multiple participants, I was able to identify generalizable themes that could then be categorized to focus on specific themes emanating from all participant interviews (Yin, 2014).

Finally, I chose to use an exploratory approach to this case study since research is limited that focuses on current geo-political trends reflective of nationalist, anti-global, anti-immigrant, and nativist sentiments involving US public university cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. An exploratory case study method helped to develop knowledge, hypotheses, and suggestions that can be studied in the future by other researchers. Finally, based

on my inquiry into qualitative research methods, I believe an exploratory multi-site case study that includes interviewing participants from the two sites selected, observations during the interviews, and a review of reports and online materials, is the most useful approach to answer my research questions.

Research Questions

Creating specific research questions can help the researcher narrow their investigative approach and guide the selection of questions, sites, and participants involved in the study. The research questions I used in this study were created with the goal of narrowing the research scope and the kinds of participants I was interested in interviewing.

The first task in conducting a qualitative study is to raise a question about a topic that challenges and perplexes people (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Case study research requires the ability to take that perplexing topic and develop research questions that address the issues under consideration. Yin (2014) suggested using words like “how” or “why” because these kinds of questions would elicit answers that reveal the link between the given situational context, the role each person plays in it, and how they feel about the given situation impacting their university. This would further strengthen the exploratory nature of this study and allow for me to more easily reach generalizability (Yin, 2014).

Three research questions were created for this study that used “how,” “what,” and “why” questions. Participants in the research included university administrators, faculty, and staff involved in the development, creation, and administration of cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions at their university. It was their impressions and beliefs about the issues involved in cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions at their university that informed the research.

Themes that emanate from the interviews helped me understand the issues administrators, faculty, and staff may have faced in the initial development and creation of cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions at their university. Participants provided their impressions and beliefs on how their university's cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions might develop and/or change if global anti-immigrant/nativist sentiments and nationalistic policy trends continue.

As a result of these interviews, I was able to compare how administrators, faculty, and staff at two different US four-year public universities plan to approach cross-border partnerships in the future if anti-immigrant and nativist sentiments, and the implementation of nationalist policies continue. These issues were investigated with the following three research questions:

- How, what kind of, and why were cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions developed at two public four-year US universities?
- How, what kind of, and why will cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions develop and/or change at US universities if nationalistic geo-political trends reflective of xenophobic/nativist sentiments in the US and around the world continue?
- How might cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions at two public four-year US universities differ from each other in the future if nationalistic geo-political trends reflective of xenophobic/nativist sentiments in the US and around the world continue and what will be the basis for the differences?

Participant Selection

To properly select participants for this study, I reflected on the literature regarding qualitative research methods to identify sites and approach potential participants for inclusion. Merriam (2002) pointed out that the unit of analysis, not the topic of investigation, is the most

important consideration when designing a case study. Further, Yin (2014) suggested that a way to determine whether a case is bounded or not is to focus on a social group, a time period, or a geographic region.

For this multi-site case study, I bounded the cases based on the social group of participants. Guided by the research questions, I chose to ask administrators, faculty, and staff at two US public universities to participate in this study. The rationale for including these groups was that they were all involved in the development and creation of cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. Further, these groups were chosen because the groups address the need for a sample that characterizes parties of a larger representative group of similar actors found at other US universities in the development and creation of such partnerships.

Inclusion Criterion

The type of sampling is important in recruiting study participants. For this exploratory multi-site case study, I used purposive sampling. Purposive sampling is useful when a researcher wants to study trends as they relate to what are considered "typical" members of the effected population (Merriam & Tisdale, 2016). Further, the sampling technique should not only be representative, but the data collected replicable, thus sustaining reliability of the study (Yin, 2014). It should also be generalizable and relevant in order to sustain external validity (Tongco, 2007; Yin, 2014).

Seawright and Gerring (2008) mentioned that choosing good cases is challenging because good cases require significant representation in order to “elucidate the features of a broader population” (p. 294). Any particular case “must represent a greater population of the world and performs ‘a heroic role’ in representing something much larger than itself” (Seawright & Gerring, 2008, p. 294). My choice of sites focused on accessibility and how representative “of a broader

population” each US university was in international education and cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. Only those universities that had cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions were considered for this study.

Since I wanted to understand how issues related to specific environmental factors were impacting individuals involved in specific social contexts (Yin, 2014), I believe it was significant that I interview experts in the field who develop and create cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. Because of this, participants in this study needed to meet the following criteria. First, participants needed to have significant knowledge of cross-border partnerships and their implementation at a US public university. Second, they had to either be senior administrative leaders (Vice Presidents, Vice Provosts, or Senior International Officers), faculty with direct involvement in cross-border partnership development and leadership, or administrative staff with intimate knowledge regarding development and creation of cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions.

University selection was important and followed a specific criterion. First, the geographic location of the university did not factor into my selection criteria, nor did their ranking, standing, or type of US university (e.g., research university, teaching university, liberal arts university). The universities chosen as sites for the study did have to be public universities since these universities are more often impacted by nation-state policies related to research and accessibility.

Other factors in the selection of participating universities included the availability of documents and reports regarding each university’s focus on cross-border partnerships and the functional aspect of these documents when determining the university’s approach toward cross-border partnerships. These documents would help enforce the historical nature of each university’s focus on cross-border partnerships.

Sample Size

When conducting qualitative research, the frequent question researchers ask is, “how many interviews is enough?” Yin (2014) stated that the number of cases used in any exploratory study is discretionary and is not set, unlike quantitative data where sampling requirements determine validity. The criteria for judging the quality of research designs is based on certain logical tests and whether there is enough data to be confident that saturation is met and researchers can make generalizable findings (Yin, 2014). Charmaz (2006) pointed out that saturation determines the majority of qualitative sample size, but there are other issues to consider. These include, for example, the aims of the study (Charmaz, 2006), the heterogeneity of the population, the groups investigated, the number of samples in each case, and the budget (Ritchie, et al., 2003). It could also include issues related to participant expertise on the chosen topic (Jette et al., 2003).

My goal was to conduct interviews with 10 participants from each US public university. Each SIO had the option to choose which administrators, faculty, and staff would be asked to participate from their university as long as they followed the selection criteria. I used pseudonyms to protect the identities of each university, Middle System University and West University. I ended up interviewing 19 participants from two US public universities (MSU=10; West University=9). This included university administrators, staff, and faculty involved in the development, creation, and administration of cross-border partnerships. The number of participants helped to ensure that any conclusions could be generalized across situations, environments, people, and the issue under investigation (Yin, 2014).

Accessing Sites and Subjects

When designing this research project, I assumed that I would be able to identify and recruit sites and participants by professional association with organizations like the Association of International Educators (NAFSA) and the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA). For this study, I needed two separate public universities. I approached Senior International Officers (SIOs) at each university by looking at the membership of the Association of International Education Administrators (AIRC) and sending interest emails for the study to all members on the AIRC listserv. I received about 5-6 responses from university SIOs from the emails I sent. I was able to eliminate some of them because of lack of accessibility to participants and lack of interest when learning of the interview requirements. My association with NAFSA proved unfruitful, but my relationships with AIEA helped to produce the two sites that fit the criteria necessary for this research.

When a potential participating Senior International Officer (SIO) responded to my request for possible inclusion in the study, I sent them the Oregon State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) email letter inviting them to participate in the study. The letter discussed the parameters of the study. Subsequent emails included other IRB forms, the research questions, and a request for the SIO to recruit administrators, faculty, and staff at their university. After learning that the SIO had selected 10 potential participants, I sent each potential participant an email describing the study in full, with an Oregon State University IRB-approved participation form. Once consent was given via email to participate in the study, I was able to schedule a date and time for the interviews. Since all participants lived in another state, it was not feasible to conduct interviews in person, so I gave the participants the option of conducting the interview

over the phone or by using the internet application Zoom. Zoom allowed me to record and have visual connection with each participant.

Data Collection

Semi-Structured Interviews

Semi-structured interviews with selected participants were the basis for the data collected for this research. I used an interview protocol that was approved by the Oregon State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) (see appendix A). The interview protocol comprised 12 questions that were designed to encourage participants to reflect on the historical nature of their university's cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions, the impact of the current anti-immigrant nativist geo-political environment on their cross-border partnerships, and the potential impact the current and ongoing anti-immigrant geo-political environment might have on future cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. Each interview lasted from 40 minutes to 1 hour and 10 minutes depending on how quickly participants answered the questions.

With their permission, I recorded the participants using the Zoom online application to adequately record the entire conversation audiovisually, including an accessible url link specific to each participant and available to them in the invitation email via the online Zoom application. I also had my phone available and the online Skype application as a backup in case participants could not connect via Zoom. After the interviews, I transcribed them using the online aid Simon Says, a multi-lingual transcription website that utilizes Google speech to text speech recognition and exports the transcription to Microsoft Word, Excel and/or audio/video editing software. I then reviewed each recording for accuracy and edited the transcripts before sending them to each participant for confirmation of accuracy within two weeks of the actual interview. I did a

subsequent round of member checking by providing participants the opportunity to review the findings chapter.

When conducting the semi-structured interviews, I followed Yin's (2014) and Merriam's (2009) principles of data collection. Interviews, while a common part of case study research, should not be rigid, but fluid in form, enabling me to operate on two levels at the same time as I asked my questions. Merriam (2009) suggested the interviews should include: (a) a mix of more and less structured interview questions; (b) flexible questions; (c) specific data; (d) the largest part of the interview guided by a list of questions or issues to be explored; and (e) no predetermined wording or order.

Yin (2014) also differentiated between levels of questions in case study protocol as a framework for the interviews. Yin suggested to consider two levels of inquiry, so my study consisted of both level one and level two questions. Level one questions consisted of scripted and improvised *verbal* questions asked of the interviewees, while level two questions consisted of the *mental* line of inquiry and attached more clearly to the research questions I was asking. My interview protocol provided a framework for the interviews, however in some cases the participant delved deeper into certain aspects of the topic that were important to them. While some participants diverged and spoke on subjects germane to the topic, their contributions often came back to the specific questions I was asking and they answered some parts of level two questions that pertained to the research questions.

The kinds of interview questions and the interview atmosphere was important. I focused on the participants' own words when confirming for accuracy and posed questions that emphasized "how" things were accomplished at their university and the reasons for them. Instead of focusing on why a participant thought a certain way, I asked them how they came to that

decision. This would satisfy the needs of my inquiry, while maintaining adaptability and a “friendly” and “nonthreatening” approach.

Data Collection Principles

Yin (2014) recommended following principles of data collection that would greatly enhance construct validity and reliability of the evidence. These include “using multiple sources of evidence, creating a case study database, maintaining a ev of evidence, and exercising care when using data from electronic sources” (p. 105).

During the course of this investigation, I followed Yin’s (2014) recommendation to obtain and converge multiple sources of evidence in an effort to triangulate the data, confirm the findings, and strengthen the construct validity of the case study. The converged data helps to ensure that I rendered each participant’s viewpoint correctly. I used interviews to gain first-hand knowledge of past and present issues impacting each university’s cross-border partnerships, archival records, and documentary evidence to find further historical information about the kinds of partnerships each university had.

To organize and document the data collected, and yield patterns and themes that are rich in representative inquiry, it helps to build a study database to separate and compile orderly data stemming from the case study (Patton, 2005; Yin, 2014). I constructed a study database which consisted of the raw data from the data including interview recordings, transcripts, and field notes. I preserved data via the coding process in the database and maintained field notes throughout the research process. I wrote notes during each interview and summarized the notes after each interview noting themes beginning to emerge as a result of the interview. I was able to reflect on these insights and compare and contrast findings between participants. All of the raw data were archived in password protected files.

A third principle important for case study research, that serves to enhance reliability, is to maintain a chain of evidence (Yin, 2014). A chain of evidence benefits qualitative research analysis and enhances the reliability of information obtained in a case study (Yin, 2014). It helps an outside observer trace the steps in the research process and further enhances construct validity as a researcher's steps are more clearly delineated (Yin, 2014).

Data Analysis

The strategy I used for the analysis of the interviews in this study followed Saldaña's (2016) recommendation to conduct two cycles of coding. For the first coding cycle, I used process coding. Saldaña (2016) defined process coding as a method in which the researcher uses gerunds ("-ing) to exclusively focus on human action that is either observable or conceptual. Further, processes imply action in time and that things that emerge, change, occur in particular sequences, etc., through time. For second cycle coding, I used pattern coding to categorize the coded data obtained through process coding by synthesizing the most frequent and significant codes to generate my findings. Pattern codes explain or infer emergent themes, configurations, or explanations by pulling together material from first cycle coding into something more meaningful and defined units of analysis (Saldaña, 2016).

To start searching for patterns, insights, and concepts that came from the data, it was important to "play" or manipulate the data (Yin, 2014). Yin described that a good starting point was to put information into different arrays by juxtaposing data from two different interviewees into a matrix of categories, creating flowcharts, charting the regularity of dissimilar events, or putting information into sequential order. Analyzing the data in different forms gave me significant insights and allowed me to identify common patterns among participants.

Yin (2014) also described the importance of developing an analytic strategy that incorporates techniques that help the researcher make initial tentative connections. Yin suggested that these then lead to deeper analysis of the data. What emerges follows the cycle that involves the original research questions, the data, the interpretation of the data, and the ability to state some findings and draw some conclusions.

One recommended general strategy that fit the dimensions of my multi-site case study was to follow the theoretical propositions that led to my case study with the original objectives and design of the case study (Yin, 2014). These in turn helped me develop a set of research questions, focused the review of the literature, and connected the propositions into my overall data collection plan. It also helped to prioritize my analysis and organize the relevant contextual conditions, as Yin (2014) suggested.

I also utilized other analytical strategies to dig deeper into the data. One such strategy involved using data triangulation. Yin (2014) described how the convergence of multiple sources of evidence increases construct validity. More than that, however, triangulation does not necessarily confirm findings nor “that the findings generated by those different methods will automatically come together to produce some nicely integrated whole” (Patton, p. 331). More frequently we end up with data that are often inconsistent and even contradictory, but nonetheless provides a fuller, more holistic view of the social phenomenon with plausible suggested explanations (Mathison, 1988).

Finally, I used explanation building, a special type of pattern matching that analyzes case study data by trying to build an explanation regarding the case (Yin, 2014). In this type of analysis, narratives form the basis for the explanation and while narratives cannot be precise, Yin pointed out that better case studies reflect theoretically significant propositions and are especially

relevant in explaining causal links about why something happened, especially in public policy processes. This kind of analysis is especially fitting since most of the narratives provided by the participants allude to public policy changes that reflect an ongoing cultural phenomenon and the public policy recommendations that might impact future policy decisions.

Validity and Trustworthiness

It is important in qualitative research to develop strategies that establish the validity and trustworthiness of a study (Korstjens & Moser, 2018; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Merriam and Tisdell pointed out that to increase validity and trustworthiness in qualitative studies, it is important to consider the different criteria for addressing the concerns of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability in the study. To increase credibility, I asked participants to check the transcripts and chapter four, maintained a study database, and kept notes of interviews in real time and immediately after the interview. I increased transferability by providing demographic information about the participants, recruiting diverse participants from across the campus, and using their experiences as the focus of the study. Rich, thick descriptions of their experiences would determine if their situations matched the research context (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

To increase dependability (i.e., transparency describing research steps), I kept password protected records of the interviews and kept records of the research path throughout the study (i.e., an audit trail) (Korstjens & Moser, 2018). I also focused on interview questions that emanated from the theoretical frameworks and cross-checked the test instrument with international education experts who have knowledge of the issues involved in cross-border partnerships. These experts included people who have been involved in the initiation, development, creation, and maintenance of cross-border partnerships and would know if the

questions were appropriate and adequate for the research. Part of this included practice interviews with individuals not included in the study. This ensured the quality of the questions and the trustworthiness of the instrument.

Dependability also helps to address aspects of researcher bias. Member checking in my study helped to strengthen confirmability and limited researcher bias. The notes I took and clarifying questions that were asked helped to limit bias since the preferences and viewpoints were grounded in the interview data obtained from the participants.

Limitations

Limitations for this research included access to individuals at the site and access to proprietary documents. I requested sample documents, but access was at the discretion of each university's Senior International Officer (SIO). Further, anonymity and confidentiality could present problems when presenting findings. Therefore, while I asked participants permission to identify themselves and their university for the study, I ended up choosing to maintain anonymity at the request of one of the universities. Since one university requested it, I decided to keep all information and data confidential.

In addition, I limited study data to salaried professional administrators, faculty, and staff members at two separate US public universities who have experience in either initiating, developing, creating, or maintaining cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. I also did not interview university personnel outside of that group of individuals as it is not anticipated that there will be people outside of that group that have experience with cross-border partnerships. I did not include private US universities or their administrators, faculty, or staff as part of my data collection. Enlargement of the data pool could be achieved if a comparison study was made of private and non-private US universities and would be the focus of

another study. In addition, because I did not ask for more than an initial data pool of 10 universities, the two sites ended up being from a similar geographic area. By excluding other sites and individuals from universities in other regions of the US, limitations could include people having different political and sociocultural views regarding cross-border partnerships based on their geographic region.

Chapter Summary

Because of my interest in the topic and current cultural phenomena involving geopolitical trends, I chose to focus on a qualitative study for this research. I focused my multi-site, exploratory case study based on an ontological and epistemological philosophical approach toward postmodernism and social constructivism. Participants for this study were selected via purposive sampling using the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA, www.aieaworld.org) listserv email system. The participants needed to be administrators, faculty, or staff from US public universities and had to be involved in the development, creation, and/or maintenance of cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. The inquiry and/or methodology involved collecting data from multiple sources within a bounded system—a particular place and time—with the information from the participants providing a specific illustration of a larger issue.

For data collection, I used semi-structured interviews that were conducted using the online platform, Zoom. Interviews and the research protocol were approved by the Oregon State University Institutional Review Board (IRB). To maintain validity and reliability in an ethical manner, I kept a study database, maintained notes of each interview, and had participants engage in member checking to confirm the data. Both rounds of member checking involved a review of the transcripts and a review of the findings chapter.

Data analysis involved using process coding for the first cycle of coding and pattern coding for the second. I also analyzed the written archival and online materials for historical confirmation of the data provided by each participant. In addition, I put data into charts and developing frequencies of codes from the data collected. To confirm findings, I used explanation building, a form of pattern matching, and data triangulation as analytic tools to develop my findings for this research.

Chapter 4: Findings

This study explored first, historical information related to how administrators, faculty, and staff at two US public universities developed their cross-border partnerships, the kind of cross-border partnerships that were developed, and why they were developed; and second, how each university's cross-border partnerships will develop and/or change if nationalist geo-political trends reflective of anti-immigrant and nativist sentiments in the US and around the world continue.

Each university Senior International Officer (SIO) requested anonymity, so I assigned a pseudonym to identify each one. Both universities are public research universities. Middle System University is one university campus that is part of a system, with campuses located statewide, while West University is not part of a statewide system. To investigate these issues, I conducted semi-structured interviews with 19 participants from two US public universities (Middle System University=10; West University=9) to answer the following research questions:

- How, what kind of, and why were cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions developed at two public four-year US universities?
- How, what kind of, and why will cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions develop and/or change at US universities if nationalistic geo-political trends reflective of xenophobic/nativist sentiments in the US and around the world continue?
- How might cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions at two public four-year US universities differ from each other in the future if nationalistic geo-political trends reflective of xenophobic/nativist sentiments in the US and around the world continue and what will be the basis for the differences?

Participant Demographics

This section provides demographic information on the participants and the institutions where they served as an administrator, faculty, or staff. Table 1 and 2 provide demographic information on the participants in the study and included their role and the years of experience in that role. It is important to note the exact role each participant plays in developing cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. I determined the number of years that participants had served in their current position from LinkedIn accounts or CV information on the university website. I also determined the roles they play in their university's cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions during the interview process.

Participants included university administrators, faculty, and staff involved in the development, creation, and administration of cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. Participant narrative accounts led the discussion with semi-structured Zoom interviews taking place from August 2018 to January 2019, with each interview lasting 45-60 minutes. The interview protocol covered areas found in the research questions and participants were given the opportunity to view and edit transcribed interviews. Pattern coding, using the interviews, led to categorization and the development of prevalent themes.

Table 1

Participant Demographics (Middle System University)

Role	Years in Role
Associate Vice President of International Affairs (SIO)	7 years
Director of International Partnerships	15 years
Executive Director/International Affairs	6 years

Role	Years in Role
Associate Dean for Global Engagement & Professor	5 years
Dean and Professor of Engineering	9 years
Former Associate VP of International Affairs	11 years
Associate Director/International Programs	5 years
Associate Professor of Social Work	5 years
Associate Dean for Global Health at MSU's School of Medicine	31 years
Associate Dean of Global Health/Professor	4 years

Table 2*Participant Demographics (West University)*

Role	Years in Role
Associate Provost for Global Education (SIO)	2 years
International Partnerships Specialist	4 years
Director/Study Abroad	3 years
Director/Asian Initiatives	3 years
Dean/College of Education, Human Development	6 years
Professor/Economics and Global Studies	37 years
Executive Director/Global Education	9 years
Professor/Political Science	19 years
Associate Director/International Admission	4 years

In addition to the demographic data provided in the Tables 1 and 2, nine of the participants from Middle System University (MSU) hold a PhD in a variety of fields, with the

Manager of International Programs currently working on a PhD. Seven of nine participants at West University (WU) hold a PhD; the two exceptions are the International Partnerships Specialist, and the Associate Director of International Admissions. The Associate Director of International Admissions is working on their PhD. Participants at both universities have worked in international education, with many coming to their present position either as a faculty member or as administration staff. For those who have gone into administration, the journey to their various appointments is quite different, with many starting as faculty and then going into administration, while two participants at WU have never been faculty.

Participant Descriptions

This section provides descriptions of each participant in the study. To promote validity and reliability, as Merriam and Tisdell (2016) suggested, it is important to provide evidence of variation or diversity in the sample selection. This demonstrates maximum variation among participants and provides trustworthiness of the data sample. Each participant is listed at the university where they work and their role there, beginning with Middle System University (MSU), followed by West University (WU).

Associate Vice President of International Affairs (SIO) (MSU). The Associate Vice President of International Affairs at Middle System University (MSU) has served in a number of positions that reflect a long history in international education, as researcher, educator, and administrator. Reflecting their role as an SIO in the MSU system, as well as campus-specific responsibilities, they said, “I have campus-specific responsibilities here and I have systemwide responsibilities through my reporting role as Associate Vice President.” Further, “it will appear to you that MSU is much more centralized and as an example, there are two committees I sit on.”

Director of International Partnerships (MSU). The Director of International Partnerships at MSU has been in a role that has evolved over the years. Their role began as a part-time position, but it has grown to where they are now focused primarily on core strategic partnership projects, while facilitating academic partnerships that campus stakeholders might want to develop.

Executive Director of International Affairs (MSU). The Executive Director of the International Affairs office oversees international admissions and services at the MSU campus, in conjunction with shared international services within the university system. “I have responsibilities for aligning service and efforts with the university because (the university system) operates as an enterprise. We’re all on the same ship, going in the same direction.” The Executive Director also supervises the International Affairs business office.

Associate Dean for Global Engagement/Professor (MSU). The Associate Dean for Global Engagement/Professor fulfills three roles as an administrator and professor in one of the colleges at MSU. They have been directly involved in developing some research-based collaborative partnerships with countries in the Middle East and Central Asia, including some partnerships that are in countries on the US sanctions list. “I have a lifetime, a career lifetime working in research across borders.” So, I came here (to MSU, and) established again some international collaborative arrangements focused on research.”

Dean and Professor of Engineering (MSU). The Dean and Professor of Engineering is involved in strategic building on the infrastructure and success of the School of Engineering at MSU. “Most of my efforts have been around trying to enhance existing partnerships and build new international partnerships.” As a part of that it is their role to “continue to improve on a

welcoming environment for our international students and show we're dedicated to their success."

Former Associate Vice President for International Affairs (MSU). The Former Associate Vice President for International Affairs established the MSU and the System University (SU) focus on core strategic partnerships. Their role in international education has been established from years in the field of anthropology as a professor and researcher. They got more involved in partnerships around the year 2000. They were aware of partnerships before, but "that's when I really became involved in taking stock of all the partnerships, of understanding what they were doing, and managing them fundamentally." "I care about the global system of higher education as much as I care about the American, but I may be peculiar in that."

Associate Director/International Programs (MSU). The Associate Director for International Programs at MSU is an administrative staff member in a college at MSU. Their role has been largely supportive where the "cross-border partnerships have been, at times, directed by a faculty member who has a very specific research agenda with a partner overseas." Their support is often of a broader university or campus initiative, "such as a partnership with a campus-level strategic partner."

Associate Professor of Social Work (MSU). The Associate Professor of Social Work at MSU grew up in Africa and Canada and has subsequently moved to the US, where they recently became a US citizen. Their efforts have largely been in building cross-border partnerships in Africa, Australia, Argentina, and Canada. Muslim women and human rights have been the focus of their research.

Associate Dean of Global Health/Professor (MSU). The Associate Dean of Global Health is an administrator and professor at MSU and has led their school's efforts in developing

a capacity building project with a core partner in Africa for over 30 years. “We were keen to create a partnership between our institution and an institution somewhere in the so-called developing world that would enable other faculty members to engage in a meaningful relationship.” It was through the efforts of the Associate Dean of Global Health, their global health colleagues, and the Director of International Partnerships at MSU that would later establish the partnership as one segment of MSU’s mission focus on core strategic partnerships.

Associate Dean of Global Health (MSU). The Associate Dean of Global Health/Professor is a practitioner and faculty member. “I’m involved in identifying and nurturing these cross-border partnerships on behalf of the faculty with whom I collaborate at the university on the campus level, as well as within my school.” “I have some of these relationships myself, but I also nurture them and try to expand those partnerships for the inclusion of faculty that I work with around campus.”

Associate Provost for Global Education (SIO) (WU). The Senior International Officer at West University (WU) serves as the Associate Provost for Global Education at WU overseeing all cross-border collaborations with non-US educational institutions. “My role is to identify gaps, in terms of geographic and cultural representation.” Potential cross-border partnerships are important “because of the importance of that country or their culture” and “I identify them and help establish those partnerships, negotiate those partnerships.”

International Partnerships Specialist (WU). The International Partnerships Specialist at WU views the position as central to the study abroad, exchange program, and articulation of courses for credit transfer. “I oversee the sort of articulation process of courses, and then also the actual agreement process as liaison with our partners, but also with an internal unit.” This includes “the Office of Legal Counsel and lots of other offices on campus that have to submit

their approval before we can get things signed. So, I'm really in the sort of paperwork, detail agreement stuff, it's kind of what I'm doing on a day to day basis."

Director of Study Abroad (WU). The Director of Study Abroad at WU has done some travel to meet representatives at a non-US educational partner institution "to talk about the types of programs and the numbers of students that we would be able to have in exchange programs." However, they work mostly with on-campus study abroad initiatives and "to find sufficient students to fill 30 exchange programs that we have between WU and international partners."

Director of Asian Initiatives (WU). As the Director of Asian Initiatives, "I help to facilitate partnerships in Asia." Asian initiatives are a part of a greater focus on global initiatives; they related that "it's in our DNA." As a part of WU's focus on China, the Director of Asian Initiatives is also the Director of the Confucius Institute (CI) at WU.

Dean/College of Education, Human Development (WU). According to the Dean of the College of Education and Human Development, their role is to initiate cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. "I can be an initiator because of my international connections and experiences." "But I am also a supporter and we have faculty members who are very globally-minded. They have their own initiative and basically I support, facilitate, and make those initiatives happen." Collaboration with the Associate Provost's office is to "hook up with some of the international partner institutions."

Professor of Economics/Director of Global and International Studies (WU). The Professor of Economics and Director of Global and International Studies wears two hats, but both as a faculty member. "I'm actually not an administrator." "I'm actually, my appointment is as a faculty. I'm half in economics and then half of my assigned time is to global studies, which is an interdisciplinary program." They have focused on study abroad programs, short-term study

abroad programs, and faculty-led programs. They now help other faculty develop their own short-term faculty-led programs.

Executive Director/Global Education (WU). The Executive Director of Global Education has a long career in international education and is an administrator at WU. At WU, they have also been the Director of Study Abroad and Global Program Development. “I was really involved in developing partnerships, maintaining partnerships.” “And that’s different from the Director of Study Abroad’s role now because at the time I didn’t have, we didn’t have an Executive Director who oversaw all partnerships.” In this role, while working collaboratively with other stakeholders, the Executive Director for Global Education has a significant role in approving or rejecting global partnerships and “there are not any partnerships or any agreements or any anything going on without my knowledge.”

Professor/Political Science (WU). The Professor of Political Science has been involved in international education for the past 19 years. In the past, they have supervised the study abroad office and the study abroad director. More specifically, (as a faculty member) “I was not the study abroad director, but my responsibility was in program creation.” “So, I spent a lot of time working, not just on semester-based and language-based programs, but all sorts of programs. Mostly bringing or taking our students, letting our students go abroad.”

Associate Director/International Admissions (WU). The Associate Director of International Admissions was an employee at the institution that had a twinning arrangement with WU. They are familiar with the admissions processes, especially regarding partnerships at WU and their twinning and dual degree programs with non-US educational institutions. This role also includes interacting with students from partner institutions. “I do a lot of admissions for

students from Malaysia, and therefore I do a lot of direct admissions with these students, and I interact a lot with these students.”

Data Analysis

Data analysis began with transcribing participant interviews. I chose to transcribe interviews myself with the aid of an online tool (i.e., Simon Says, <https://simonsays.ai/>), which uses Google voice to text recognition technology to generate interview transcripts. The rough transcriptions were then uploaded to a Word document with time stamps. This allowed me to listen to the audio recordings of the interviews multiple times and correct errors I found in the transcript. I used QuickTime Player 7 and adjusted the speed of the recording to make it easier to transcribe each interview. During the interview transcription process, I was able to begin analyzing each section of the interview. This allowed me to observe trends and think about possible codes and coding processes that might be included in a more thorough analysis of the interviews.

After I transcribed each interview, I sent the transcription to each participant and asked them to check the transcript for accuracy, thus increasing the validity of the data. Table 3 summarizes the number of member checks of interview transcripts and of the findings chapter.

Table 3

Member Check Participation

Member Checks	Number
Member Check of Interview Transcripts	19
Member Check of Findings Chapter	14

For first cycle coding I used process coding. Process coding involves what Saldaña (2016) defined as a method in which the researcher uses gerunds (“-ing) to exclusively focus on

human action that is either observable or conceptual. Further, processes imply action in time and that things emerge, change, occur in particular sequences, etc., through time. First stage codes were created by taking each interview question and focusing on the conceptual or observable human action inherent in participant responses. Then, to track codes in the data, I created an Excel workbook and put the titles for each participant in cells horizontally and separated each sheet by the interview questions I asked. I then moved the codes that were created from each interview and for each question onto the Excel spreadsheet under each participant's title. This allowed me to compare each participant's codes that were created from the interviews side by side.

For second cycle coding, I used pattern coding to categorize the coded data obtained through process coding by synthesizing the most frequent and significant codes. As mentioned in chapter three, pattern codes explain or infer emergent themes, configurations, or explanations by pulling together material from first cycle coding into something more meaningful and defined units of analysis (Saldaña, 2016). Yin (2014) suggested using explanation building to build and synthesize the codes into categories. From second cycle coding, I created two additional sheets in the workbook to collect codes and supporting data that aligned with my research questions. Once categorized, I tracked the frequency of codes used, noting the location and the number of passages in the interview.

For each research question, I was then able to align categories from the codes created and the frequency for each code among the 10 participants at Middle System University (MSU) and the nine participants at West University (WU). This provided the basis for the comparisons between each university and helped to answer the third research question: how might the cross-border partnerships of two public four-year US universities differ from each other in the future if

nationalistic geo-political trends reflective of xenophobic/nativist sentiments in the US and around the world continue and what will be the basis for the differences?

It was important to maintain an unbiased perspective throughout the interview and coding processes. The interview questions were closely modeled after the research questions themselves and it was not difficult to determine the coding frequencies to answer the question regarding how cross-border partnerships were created at each university, the kinds of programs that were developed via the cross-border partnerships, and why they were created (i.e., research question one). This research question focused primarily on historical detail. Some participants had different understandings on how and why their university was involved in cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions, but there was general agreement regarding the development, creation, and maintenance of each partnership.

Further, to minimize researcher bias, I returned often to the transcripts after each coding cycle and closely analyzed responses to each question. Participant responses from the following interview protocol questions provided the comparisons between past and present university practice and also provided a contrast between both universities in this study, helping me to address the three parts of the third research question:

- How have US governmental policies, affected your university's involvement in cross-border partnerships?
- How have cross-border partnerships at your university been impacted by the rise of nativism in the US and around the world?
- What challenges and new opportunities will you face as an administrator, faculty member, or staff member in developing cross-border partnerships if current nativist geo-political trends continue?

- How will your university's cross-border partnerships change as a result of current nativist trends in the US and around the world?

I used the codes generated from participant responses to create diagrams that highlighted the connections between aspects of participants' understanding of current geo-political trends and how those trends may impact changes in their university's practice. I created analytic notes to document my thoughts and observations of each participant, noting their physical responses when asked each question.

Evidence of Trustworthiness

In qualitative research, reliability (also referred to as trustworthiness) of the data and findings is helped by establishing credibility, consistency, transferability, and confirmability (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). In the following section, I will describe how these criteria for reliability were established in this research.

Credibility

Credibility deals with the issue of how close findings are to reality; credibility helps establish internal validity of the findings (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Ratcliffe (1983) reminded us that it is important to remember that "data do not speak for themselves; there is always an interpreter or translator" (p. 149). To maintain participants' voice in the research and to minimize this it is important to view this research as holistic, multidimensional, and ever-changing. Participants were involved via member checks of the interview transcripts and had the opportunity to make edits and provide clarification as needed. I provided my initial findings chapter to all participants, sending them a copy of the fourth chapter and encouraged them to provide feedback. This would provide evidence of their experience in my interpretation and an opportunity to provide adjustments to better capture their intentions (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

Consistency

Consistency or dependability is focused on the extent research findings can be repeated (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). One way to accomplish this is to develop an audit trail. An audit trail provides detail on how data were collected, categories created, and how decisions were made during the investigation (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). I kept research memos during the research process, including ideas, reflections, and follow-up questions. The audit trail provided information on my study, how it was conducted, and how I analyzed the data, thus providing confidence in the data and possible replication given the same information.

Transferability

Transferability or external validity focuses on how findings of a study can be applied in other studies or contexts (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). To accomplish this, I provided thick descriptions of the study participants and the settings in which they work, along with evidentiary findings based on participant quotes, notes taken during the interviews, and documents provided by the participants. Another method I used was to provide maximum variation in the sample. Participants came from a wide range of academic backgrounds and from two US public universities that had many years' experience in developing, creating, and maintaining cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. The participants would mirror the personnel found at many other universities in the US who deal with such partnerships, whether they are representative of administration, faculty, or staff at those universities.

Confirmability

Critical self-reflection regarding my assumptions, worldview, biases, and relationship to the study are important to ensure the credibility of this research. My own experience, training, and intellectual rigor would help to confirm the credibility of the research (Merriam & Tisdell,

2016) and that the data were collected and analyzed dispassionately (Shenton, 2004).

Recognition of bias is important and impacts ethical treatment of the data and participants involved in the study (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

Study Findings

Research Question One Findings

Research question one (RQ1) asked: how, what kind of, and why were past cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions developed at two public four-year US universities? This section will scrutinize the themes revealed during participant interviews to help understand how participants in this study view the historical nature of their university's past cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. This question provides a historical connection of how universities typically develop and create cross-border partnerships, the kinds of partnerships developed, and why they were implemented at each university that served as sites for this study.

It was important to present an historical basis for the study that not only detailed how each university developed partnerships, the kinds of partnership developed, but perhaps most significantly the philosophical basis for developing cross-border partnerships at each university. By providing the historical basis for each university's reason for engaging in cross-border partnerships, I was able to see how current anti-immigrant and nationalistic trends and national policy changes were impacting the nature of each university's cross-border partnerships.

How Cross-Border Partnerships Developed

From my own experience creating articulation agreements and representing universities abroad, cross-border partnerships have often been initiated and developed via a variety of ways: university administrative connections, conferences, university administrative visits, faculty

relationships with a faculty member at a potential partner university, recruiting trips, and via emails. Based on the language participants used in describing cross-border partnerships at their university, a common understanding of how cross-border partnerships were developed at their university emerged. Yet participants often differed on how these cross-border partnerships were developed and the kinds of partnerships developed within their universities, as well as why their university engaged in them.

Common among all participants at Middle System University (MSU) and West University (WU) was the importance of how their university's cross-border partnerships were developed. However, of all of the modes used in initiating contact, the common belief among MSU's participants was the move from creating multiple cross-border partnerships (common practice at MSU prior to 2000), to creating comprehensive "core strategic partnerships." At MSU, core partnerships are full-bodied, research-based, and mutually beneficial comprehensive partnerships that involve multiple colleges and units at MSU and the partner institution in an effort to build transformational partnership activities. According to the Former Associate Vice President of International Affairs

(would) in some way advance the mission of (MSU) and be mutually beneficial to the partner as well... We had this idea of having a couple of tiers of partnerships. There might be sort of individual school or college-level partnerships, that the schools would support, but they still would have to be approved. But they would be a direct benefit to that school. And then there would be strategic partnerships, and these would have the most resources put into them and they would be designated as long-term partnerships that had to be brought in front of the Council of Deans to be approved.

At WU, the focus was also on "strategic partnerships." However, the definition of comprehensive strategic partnerships was somewhat different than that of MSU. At WU, the Associate Provost for Global Education mentioned that the focus was on separating research and enrollment partnerships.

You have international enrollment, you have research, you have study abroad. Some partnerships can be strategic in terms of study abroad; others can be strategic in terms of research. Others can be strategic in terms of international enrollment. If you have one or several that are on all the lists, then congratulations, you found yourself a strategic partnership for the entire university.

The Associate Provost for Global Education said that the effort was to build mutually beneficial comprehensive partnerships that aligned with their outcomes and strategic goals. The Executive Director of Global Education at WU mentioned that they also focus on identifying strategic partners.

While partnerships prior to 2009 were very much developed in a variety of ways, the most common being a faculty member's connection to someone at the partner university, or a group of administrators traveling to X country (Japan for example) and meeting with universities to try to see how many partners they could add to the portfolio, the current practice of identifying "strategic partners" started about six or seven years ago and has continued.

Table 4 provides data on the language used to describe how cross-border partnerships were developed at MSU and Table 5 provides data on the language used to describe how cross-border partnerships were developed at WU.

Table 4

Language Used to Describe How Cross-Border Partnerships Were Developed (MSU)

Language Used	Number of Participants
Faculty/Academic Connections	9
Students/Researchers	7
Alumni	5
Various Ways	2

Table 5*Language Used to Describe How Cross-Border Partnerships Were Developed (WU)*

Language Used	Number of Participants
Faculty/Academic Connections	9
Students/Alumni	2
Researchers/Fulbright	2
Tours/Via Conferences	1

Faculty/Academic Connections

The majority of participants at Middle System University (MSU) believed past and current cross-border partnerships were developed via faculty and or academic connections. According to the Associate Vice President for International Affairs at MSU, “successful partnerships are driven by faculty interest, and made more robust and enduring by the student interaction that follows.” Eight other participants agreed that faculty and/or academic connections are the most common and that administration-directed cross-border partnership development has largely been unsuccessful, with an effort in Mexico mentioned as an example of a failed strategic partnership. According to the Former Associate Vice President of International Affairs, the partnership in Mexico had drawn interest from faculty in a number of colleges and in the local Mexican community but was “only shut down when the president of (the system) determined that the university in Mexico was not sufficiently prestigious at the same time that travel restrictions came to include that part of Mexico.”

While administration-led cross-border partnership initiatives were not considered the best method used at MSU, the role administration plays was still significant, according to participants who play an administrative role there. It would appear that administration plays a facilitative role

at MSU. Nonetheless, one participant who has a limited administrative role at MSU, and would be considered faculty, still believed that there are still too many roadblocks to potential agreements. They saw partnerships growing faster without delegation visits and working more directly via faculty and doctoral students.

The majority of participants at West University (WU) indicated that most cross-border partnerships are created through faculty connections. All nine participants mentioned the significant role faculty play in developing collaborative efforts with non-US educational institutions. WU has an established institute for global initiatives, and it is through the International Partnerships Specialist that partnerships are maintained and updated. Faculty often bring their connections and collaborative requests to the international office at the institute, according to the Associate Provost for Global Education at WU. In other instances, institutional representatives from non-US universities come to the campus to initiate partnerships, but this is not as common.

Administrators do play a significant role in vetting potential cross-border partnerships at WU, with a number of processes in place that determine viability and alignment with university goals. Three significant members (the SIO, the Executive Director, and the International Partnerships Specialist) are directly involved in making sure the partnerships are completed according to WU guidelines.

Kinds of Cross-Border Partnerships Developed

As mentioned in chapter two of this dissertation, cross-border partnerships have been developed involving different modalities, including, for example, study abroad programs, exchange programs, articulation agreements, dual degree programs, research collaboration, branch campuses, and education hubs (Helms et al., 2017). The kinds of partnerships vary from

university to university, and as reflected by participant responses, often reflected a philosophy regarding each institution's stated mission goals about comprehensive internationalization. From their respective websites, it seemed clear that both universities in this study are significant actors in cross-border education. That being said, it is also important to note that each university approaches cross-border partnerships differently and this can be reflected in the kinds of cross-border partnerships developed at each university. Table 6 provides data on the language used to describe the kinds of cross-border partnerships that have been developed at MSU and Table 7 provides data on the language used to describe the kinds of cross-border partnerships that have been developed at WU.

Table 6

Language Used to Describe Kinds of Cross-Border Partnerships (MSU)

Language Used	Number of Participants
Core partnerships	5
Partner MOUs	3
Faculty research collaboration	2
Study abroad/faculty-led programs	2

Table 7*Language Used to Describe Kinds of Cross-Border Partnerships (WU)*

Language Used	Number of Participants
Dual/Joint Degrees/Twinning	5
Study Abroad/Exchange	5
Faculty Exchange	3
Articulation Agreements	2

Challenges in Developing Cross-Border Partnerships

To reflect the semi-structured aspect of the interviews, and the direction participant answers were leading me, I asked a follow-up question about challenges participants felt their university faced in developing cross-border partnerships. This section will go further into the issues that emerged from this question as it provided further detail about the third part of the question regarding the reasons for university engagement in cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. The following examples illustrate these types of challenges and how the participants involved drew on their international experiences to better explain the different kinds of challenges.

Two Types of Challenges

A perception emerged during the interviews that participants from both campuses focused on two types of challenges that created the most significant issues when developing cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. On one level, participants described internal challenges within the university that would impact the potential for buy-in and gaining campus-wide approval of the cross-border partner initiative. Conversely, external challenges, such as changes in government policies or visa issues in the country where the

partner institution exists created another set of challenges and how it affected their philosophy about cross-border partnerships. Tables 8 and 9 describe the dominant perspective participants had about the challenges their US university faced when developing cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions.

Internal and External Challenges (MSU). Participants at Middle System University (MSU) described internal and external challenges that focused on issues related to MSU and partner institution faculty involvement, financial concerns, political and cultural concerns, differing levels of engagement, what constitutes a “core partner,” and determining a philosophical and functional basis for their partnerships.

Table 8

Perspectives on Challenges Developing Cross-Border Partnerships (MSU)

Role	Dominant Perspective on Challenges in Creating Cross-Border Partnerships
Associate Vice President for International Affairs (SIO)	Challenges stemmed largely from maintaining MSU’s mutual benefit philosophical stance and its strategic functional focus on partnership development. “The partnerships strategy builds on faculty relations or identified universities in strategic world regions that align with faculty expertise and/or metropolitan governmental, business, or NGO priorities.”
Director of International Partnerships	Challenges stemmed from MSU’s determination of what defines “core partnerships.” Core partnerships center around rallying resources on campus around a central strategic goal with partnerships in ranked countries and with ranked universities. “This policy of working only with the top identified countries, and in those identified countries only the top five universities is a flawed policy and I’ve told them all this.”

Role	Dominant Perspective on Challenges in Creating Cross-Border Partnerships
Social Work Faculty	External challenges include issues such as partner country accreditation. “Basically, we had to go through some of the accreditation in Africa, some of the formal stuff there for the Bachelor of Social Work (BSW).”
Associate Dean/Global Engagement	Challenges stemmed from financial, legal, and cultural issues that inhibit participating with some core partners. Financially, “we have struggled to try and engage them in scholarly activity with us here. The consequence to that is if we want to do anything there at all, it is all going to have to be funded from here and we simply don’t have the resources.” Partner country bureaucracy can create issues where “they want to do things, that, for example, we say look you can’t do that according to our university rules, regulations, ethics, and so on.” “Also, the American way of business of just bam, bam, bam, let’s get on with business” can create problems.
Executive Director for the Office of International Affairs	Challenges stemmed from the disconnect that happens with “whoever the lead on it is for the school, what it’s hoping to accomplish and then the actual realities of implementation. I think sometimes people underestimate the amount of effort that’s needed for the care and tending of, of partnerships and, and keeping them active, and strong relations going.”
Former Associate VP for International Affairs	Challenges involved getting university stakeholders to look at cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions from a new perspective resulting in a campus-wide paradigm shift regarding cross-border partnerships. New challenges came as they worked to eliminate defunct agreements, create buy-in among stakeholders, and focus on agreements with a core group of non-US educational institutions.
Associate Dean of Global Health/Professor of Health Policy and Management	Challenges stemmed from administrative barriers when dealing with systems that work differently. There are “administrative barriers that strain the relationship.” Cultural differences contribute to barriers as “there are cultural differences in approaches to administration that create tension.”

Role	Dominant Perspective on Challenges in Creating Cross-Border Partnerships
Professor of Global Health/Director of MSU's Center for Global Health	The biggest challenge was "the inertia on the part of the university administration. The philosophy, if you will, of the traditionalists who are conservatives within the university and especially the risk aversion on the part of university administration."
Dean of School of Engineering and Technology/Professor of Engineering	Challenges have been in developing the relationship between MSU campus constituents and the partner institution. "The key challenge is ensuring you nurture the relationship." "Part of nurturing the relationship included sustaining the commitment toward the partner over time. You have to be patient, especially if you're building a partnership that's going to stand the test of time and really produce."
Associate Director of International Programs	Challenges have involved mostly logistical, legal, and promotional issues when implementing agreements. "We have a research project that involves working with individual researchers in 79 countries around the world, and the challenges that have been associated with that." Also, "export control is taking on an even greater role lately." There is also "the challenge about getting our students, many of whom have never left the state, to get excited about spending a year in Japan all of a sudden, as undergraduates."

Internal and External Challenges (WU). Participants at West University (WU) described internal challenges that focused on issues related to faculty engagement, getting university approvals, legal challenges, and getting senior leadership's attention. External challenges included getting community involvement, national political policy changes, cultural differences, creating mutually beneficial partnerships, financial issues involving exchanges, and non-US fiscal policies.

Table 9*Perspectives on Challenges Developing Cross-Border Partnerships (WU)*

Role	Dominant Perspective on Challenges in Creating Cross-Border Partnerships
Associate Provost for Global Education (SIO)	Challenges involved availability of fiscal and human resources on campus. Monetary incentives for faculty involvement and the motivation in developing and maintaining partnerships played a large role. "If there is no motivation. If there is no connection between the faculty of the college or department you're trying to connect with this partner university or if there's no motivation in interacting with that particular university because it's not an interesting country for them, because they're too busy, too focused. There's not the motivation to enter in partnership with this other university then."
Associate Director of International Admissions	Challenges involved the non-US educational institution's curriculum, especially when articulating dual degree credentials. "Education systems might differ a little bit." "We've had some dual degree programs not really map out because of differences in curriculum and the syllabi."
International Partnership Specialist	Challenges involved both internal (getting approvals from administration, staff and faculty turnover) and external (dealing with US and non-US policies) issues. "Internally we have challenges sometimes getting approval from different offices." Externally, national policies and WU's connection to a university in China through Confucius Institutes (CI) makes "stuff like that where I think we're facing more than I believe, more than we used to."
Professor of Economics/Director of Global and International Studies	Challenges have involved getting students and faculty interested in existing partnerships. "Everyone's interested in Europe and going to Europe. Security is often an issue." But "again it's just kind of a lack of familiarity and when I

Role	Dominant Perspective on Challenges in Creating Cross-Border Partnerships
	<p>talk about going to Uruguay, for example, everyone's worried about being kidnapped and there being terrorism." This challenge points to barriers and an insular approach. "When it comes to the United States, no one knows where anything else is, you know, we're so insular."</p>
Executive Director, Global Institute	<p>Challenges have involved sustaining one-for-one exchanges. "So we can't sustain a one for one exchange with a partner in South Korea except maybe one or two. But we don't need more than that. Most universities in Japan and Korea want exchange. They don't want to have their students come as fee paying students. So I'm constantly telling potential partners, it looks like you've got a great program, it will be a great experience for our students, if we could get them there."</p>
Professor, Political Science	<p>Challenges have included building mutually beneficial MOUs. "Taking an MOU in which there is good intent on both sides and then building it into something that's meaningful for both institutions." With that, WU stakeholders have to create buy-in internally at WU where the success of the partnership "preferably involves some faculty that are going to be critical for the exchange." Exchanges take time and they "take work and it takes investment over time." Other challenges have included getting senior leadership buy-in. "Some presidents like highly visible initiatives that don't in fact amount to more than a photo opportunity and may not be feasible from the get-go."</p>
Director of Study Abroad	<p>Internal challenges have been significant to the growth of cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. "Previous to the current method of working exclusively with the Global Institute, I would say that there was no centralized way to know if these exchange programs were in fact working,"</p>

Role	Dominant Perspective on Challenges in Creating Cross-Border Partnerships
Dean, College of Education	Challenges have included dealing with non-US government agencies and partner policies. “The policies of our partners in a country has affected the relationship. For example, the new policy in China, if we wanted to build a 3+1 program and ultimately, we want to start off 2+2 and they say, no, we’re no longer interested in 3+1 and then eventually they say 3+1 is no good, we want 4+0.”
Director of Asian Initiatives	Challenges have stemmed from government regulations that have increasingly played a part in how cross-border partnerships are implemented. Differences in curriculum design and the development of research collaboration have also impacted collaborations.

Why Cross-border Partnerships Were Developed

Tables 10 and 11 describe the cross-border partnership philosophy participants reported using to explain the reasons their university enters into cross-border partnerships. The cross-border partnership philosophy is a category of beliefs reported by participants to make sense of why their university went into cross-border partnerships. The description provides an outline of the cross-border partnership philosophy based on codes generated through first cycle process coding. Finally, the code frequency identifies the number of codes used to create the category.

Table 10*Cross-Border Partnership Philosophy (MSU)*

Basis for Cross-border Partnerships	Description	Code Frequencies
Connecting globally	Transforming land-locked university, removing silos, working globally, creating gateways	35
Bringing internationalizing strategy, mission, and philosophy together	Defining plans, mission, goals, funding, and benefits	27
Developing mutual benefit and interest	Impacting community, developing partner capacity, mutually benefitting partner	23
Creating transformative experience for students, alums, faculty, and community	Educating people, providing services, based on needs, shaping values, and building international research opportunities and exposure	19

Cross-border partnerships at both Middle System University (MSU) and West University (WU) have played a significant role in past efforts to internationalize the campus. MSU participants indicated that there has been a philosophical basis for cross-border partnerships that involves a blending of strategy and philosophical goals. This blend advances their mission, impacts their faculty and students, and enhances their efforts to build mutually beneficial cross-border partnerships. In addition, from archival material located on MSU's site, the focus on comprehensive internationalization follows specific elements of the American Council on Education's (Helms et al., 2017) rubric: "articulated institutional commitment; administrative

leadership, structure, and staffing; curriculum, co-curriculum, and learning outcomes; faculty policies and practices; student mobility; and collaboration and partnerships” (p. vii).

At Middle System University (MSU), the focus reflects what a number of participants referred to as “a core partnership strategic plan” around two specific countries in the world, with institutional relationships in other countries around the world. In addition, MSU has a network of what they refer to as physical gateway offices that are either regional or national in scope. These include: China, India, Germany (regional), Thailand (regional), Mexico, and South Africa, with South America pending. From information gathered from MSU’s website, gateway offices strengthen and broaden their global strategic efforts by facilitating engagement with alumni, businesses, and nongovernmental agencies, heighten student study abroad opportunities, and provide support for research, teaching, and professional development via conferences and workshops.

Table 11

Cross-Border Partnership Philosophy (WU)

Basis for Cross-border Partnerships	Description	Code Frequencies
Internationalization philosophy	Having strong internationalizing mindset, being globally-minded, reflecting educational pillars, part of university DNA	30
Financial>Increase enrollment	Sustaining programs via enrollment and benefitting both parties	28
Enriching student and faculty global experience	Expanding on-campus and off-campus opportunities	27

Basis for Cross-border Partnerships	Description	Code Frequencies
Expanding research opportunities	Incentivizing research, creating internationally-minded faculty	8

At West University (WU) cross-border partnerships (or international partnerships as they refer to them) are currently a reflection of their historical philosophy with a goal to enrich student and faculty's global experiences. Tied in with that is a focus that cross-border partnerships sustain programs and enrollment with an expectation that these programs are mutually beneficial dual degree programs, articulation agreements, and memoranda of understanding (MOU). WU's strategic plan has focused mostly on Southeast and Northeast Asia with historical relationships in Malaysia that started with a dual degree program at a specific university there and gradually moved to an articulation agreement. The final focus for cross-border programs has been to expand research opportunities, but this seems to not be as important as the other three categories.

Summary of RQ1 Findings

Research question one asked: how, what kind of, and why were past cross-border partnerships with non-US higher educational institutions developed at two public four-year US universities? Participants at both Middle System University (MSU) and West University (WU) in this study generally saw cross-border partnerships being developed through a variety of ways, with faculty connections being the primary method through which the partnerships were created.

The kinds of partnerships that were created at MSU and WU were different. This could reflect the philosophical basis for partnerships at each university as well as the participants involved in the interviews. MSU's cross-border partnerships over the past twenty years have

focused on a “core strategic partnership” strategy with research funds and support from administration placed on cross-border partnerships in specific countries (China, Kenya, and Mexico). Mexico, as mentioned before, no longer is a part of that partnership strategy. MSU’s goal has been to create mutually beneficial partnerships that stem from collaborative relationships that are based on faculty research and in regions where past involvement has brought together multiple colleges and schools, as well as community partners and consortia university members.

WU’s cross-border partnerships historically came from a variety of sources, with dual degree programs being a primary early focus. WU’s cross-border partnerships have also reflected their philosophical strategy, with a goal of internationalizing the school, hiring internationally minded faculty, seeking mutually beneficial collaboration, and providing students with opportunities to gain an internationalizing experience both on campus and abroad. The emphasis over time has been on agreements that enhance enrollment; the Associate Provost for Global Education at WU differentiated between enrollment and research-based partnerships with partnerships accounting for international enrollment increases over the last two years. The Associate Provost maintained that it is difficult achieving comprehensive partnerships and that it is important to align outcomes and strategic goals.

Specific emphasis on external and internal challenges that MSU and WU have in developing cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions were important to participants at MSU and WU. At MSU, internal challenges included developing buy-in from university stakeholders, targeting goals, rallying resources, and maintaining widespread campus support that could withstand challenges that might come from disengagement (as in the case of their Mexico partnership). External challenges included political issues that could impact

incoming and outgoing mobility, government policies, the motivations of the non-US partner institution, and fiscal support for agreements that required external involvement.

At WU, internal challenges involved fiscal concerns that involved sufficient resources for cross-border partnerships to prosper, creating buy-in from faculty and administration, dealing with WU legal issues that limit collaboration (i.e., export control), and promoting programs to WU students thinking of participating in cross-border programs. External challenges included problems with credit transfer and partner curriculum (in the case of dual degree and articulations), unequal exchanges for students studying away, government policies both in the US and the partner country that would limit mobility and research collaboration, and dealing with partner country education ministries and their demands involving engagement.

Research Question Two Findings

Research question two (RQ2) asked: how, what kind of, and why will cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions develop and/or change at US universities if nationalistic geo-political trends reflective of xenophobic/nativist sentiments in the US and around the world continue? This section examines the themes that emerged during interviews with participants regarding this question.

Participant Descriptions of How Cross-Border Partnerships Will Change

Tables 12 and 13 provide a summary of responses synthesized from over 150 codes identified during first cycle process coding and synthesized into categories using second cycle pattern coding. Pattern coding draws frequent and significant codes to generate patterns and explains or infers emergent themes, configurations, or explanations by pulling together material from first cycle coding into something more meaningful and defined units of analysis (Saldaña, 2016).

Table 12*Nationalistic Political Trends and How They Impact Cross-border Partnerships (MSU)*

Impact of Trends	Description	Code Frequencies
Decision-making	Government policies impact MSU's decision-making	27
Research collaboration	Research collaboration between MSU's researchers and partner institution researchers	26
University messaging	Messaging to constituents/partners about tolerance and educational partnerships as part of international diplomacy	20
Student experience and mobility	Changing students' experience, creating anxiety for potential students, families, and scholars as enrollment at MSU is declining and partners are raising concerns	15
No impact	Maintaining enrollments, not changing partnerships, nativism not existing as response	5

Of the five categories listed in the Table 12, two involve specific groups, including international students, student families, scholars, and faculty involved in partnerships, and point to environmental factors that might impact future cross-border partnerships and the people involved in them. Two categories reflect the university's involvement with non-US educational institutions, faculty research collaboration, and MSU administrative decisions that might prevail as a result of nationalistic trends. One category (i.e., not impacting cross-border partnerships

now) suggests that current nativist and nationalistic trends aren't impacting cross-border partnerships. From other participant responses, however, this still leaves room for possible impact in the future and simply suggests that it might be too soon to see intermediate or long-lasting impact to their cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions.

The primary impact of nationalistic policy trends on these three categories was the sense that academic diplomacy is central to MSU's strategy. The general feeling among some of the participants at Middle System University (MSU) was that it was too soon to suggest how their cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions might change or would change. The Former Associate Vice President of International Affairs noted in the editing phase of this chapter that the "geo-political headwinds have become much stronger since (the interviews) took place" and the Associate Vice President of International Affairs pointed out that "restrictive governmental policies have now made themselves felt."

While the impact on cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions could not be felt immediately there were still some participants who felt that students, faculty, and visiting scholars could be negatively impacted by current trends that restrict collaboration. Some participants associated this with current nativist and anti-globalization sentiments suggesting that these are currently impacting potential collaborative research and incoming international students, faculty, and scholars. While my interviews were conducted between August 2018 and January 2019, I was told in April 2019 that MSU closed its Confucius Institute under government pressure. Subsequent examples of anti-Chinese sentiment in the US Congress would also confirm MSU participants' earlier sentiments as the Senate's Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations turned its attention to China's Thousand Talent's Program (Threats to the U.S. Research Enterprise: China's Talent Recruitment Plans, 2019).

While possibly understood through the lens of nativism, some of the changes, according to the Associate Vice President for International Affairs at MSU, require sophisticated understanding by educational leaders. The Associate Vice President said, “I think it has to do with the pace of change. I think that we have to be understanding of the insecurities at the societal level that come with rapid change, a result of technological advancements such as mass communication, the impact of trade flows, (and) financial flows.” The AVP mentioned that “it is the social dislocation accompanying the pace of change that is important for (all of) us to be aware of and sensitive to.”

The Associate Vice President for International Affairs at MSU placed current trends in a historical context. They pointed out that, while many understand current geo-political trends via the lens of nativism, it is important to be attuned to the work MSU is doing in the international sphere, despite these trends. The Former Associate Vice President of International Affairs mentioned that “MSU has a role to play in helping its surrounding community and state understand the geo-political trends, as well as the value in international connections in navigating these trends.”

Table 13*Nationalistic Political Trends and How They Impact Cross-border Partnerships (WU)*

Impact of Trends	Description	Code Frequencies
University policy decisions	Putting more emphasis on compliance with government policies	21
No impact	Trends not impacting partnerships	14
Impacting student and researcher mobility	Students and scholar-researchers choosing different English-speaking countries for higher education as incoming mobility is impacted by current environment	14
Partnership development	Trends impacting partnership development, partnership interest, research, and perceptions	10
Campus climate	Messaging tolerance on- and off-campus in response to changing environment	5

Of the five impacts on cross-border partnerships at West University (WU) listed in Table 13, two involve specific groups, including current and potential international students, student families, scholars, and faculty involved in partnerships. The potential for outside environmental factors that might impact future cross-border partnerships and the people involved with them is important as it might impact student, faculty, and scholar mobility. The other category (i.e., not impacting cross-border partnerships now) suggests that current nativist and nationalistic trends aren't currently impacting cross-border partnerships. Most participants fell into that category.

Two other impacts reflect national policy changes on WU's policy decisions related to compliance with national policies (e.g., export control). This was especially important to the Associate Provost for Global Education when discussing national policy changes:

We're definitely looking at export control. I mean we would look into it (before) but, not in a structured systematic way. And now we're developing a coordinated effort between the Global Institute, meaning the International Office, the Office of the Vice President for Research. And, and we're coordinating immigration issues, with visa issues. We'd also (need to) know where our scholars are coming from. We know their background and we know what they want to develop with our faculty and our research projects. And we're actually training people in our research office to be able to identify and deal with export control and intellectual property issues.

The focus on export controls and intellectual property issues as well as research projects can impact mobility as scholars look elsewhere for research opportunities. Further, restrictions can impact student mobility as many participants expressed concern regarding dropping enrollment.

Kinds of Future Cross-Border Partnerships Reflective of Nationalistic Policy Trends

In this section I will focus on the kinds of cross-border partnerships that might result from current geo-political trends reflective of nationalistic and anti-immigrant/nativist geo-political sentiments at two US public universities. The interview questions in this section delved into kinds of future cross-border partnership opportunities each participant felt their university would develop if current geo-political trends reflective of nationalistic and anti-immigrant/nativist sentiment continue. Interview participants at Middle System University (MSU) and West University (WU) were able to suggest possible new cross-border partnerships that might be developed, while at the same time speaking to challenges their university faced as a result of current geo-political trends. The themes that emanated from the codes suggested how future cross-border partnerships might look like at each site and the associated challenges participants felt their university was facing.

Tables 14 and 15 provide a summary of responses from participants at Middle System University (MSU) and West University (WU) synthesized from over 150 codes identified during first cycle process coding and synthesized into categories using second cycle pattern coding.

Table 14

Nationalistic Political Trends and Kinds of Future Cross-border Partnerships (MSU)

Kinds of Partnerships	Description	Code Frequencies
New countries/regions of outreach and collaboration	Looking at new countries/regions and research locations for collaboration	26
Core partnerships	Maintaining existing core partnership strategy and connections as a part of academic diplomacy while not focusing on agreements with universities in sanctioned countries	18
Building network gateways	Diversifying by building network offices in strategic locations to enhance alumni connections, recruiting efforts study abroad programs, and partner efforts	15
Academic collaborations	Basing partnerships on academic/research collaboration that take into consideration export controls	13
Capacity-building partnerships	Maintaining non-US partner-led capacity-building programs	7

Of the five kinds of future cross-border partnerships at Middle System University (MSU) that could be impacted by nationalistic geo-political trends, two involve issues that could be related to national policies, including changes in university policy related to legal processes (i.e., export control) and the other a focus toward new kinds of outreach and collaboration (i.e., building network hubs in strategic international locations).

The other three kinds of future cross-border partnerships mentioned reflect MSU's effort to maintain their existing cross-border core partnership strategy or focus more on academic collaborations and capacity-building partnerships. Two participants, the Social Work faculty member and the Professor of Global Health and Director of Center for Global Health, mentioned that future capacity-building projects are important to MSU's kinds of partnerships. With that said, capacity-building partnerships, while a fundamental aspect of MSU's core partnership with a university in Kenya, does not feature strongly in future kinds of partnerships, according to the Director of International Partnerships.

We're not going to have another Kenyan university capacity building project that's going to be stellar like that. It's just not going to happen. We will continue to have small-scale partnerships that really don't add up to anything. That's my fear.

Maintaining existing core strategic partnerships is a reflection on various participants' responses that current nationalistic geo-political trends reflective of nativist and/or nationalistic sentiments would "harden the resolve regarding partnerships" as the Associate Dean of Global Health put it. At the same time, it would be important to "maintain the need to be sensitive to the questions raised," according to the Associate Vice President for Student Affairs at MSU. Both sentiments suggest a desire to continue developing cross-border partnerships, while reflecting the university's outlook on future cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions.

Table 15*Nationalistic Political Trends and Kinds of Future Cross-Border Partnerships (WU)*

Kinds of Partnerships	Description	Code Frequencies
Changing country/region focus	Focusing more on other regions/countries, opportunities	22
Student-led, faculty-led programs, expanding language programs, and online programs	Changes in curriculum to reflect virtual learning, language programs, and student-led, and faculty-led programs	15
Partnerships tied to recruitment	Linking recruitment more to partnerships that reflect concerns from competing countries like the UK, Australia, and Canada	11
Diverse types of programs	Linking degrees, diverse articulation types, dual degrees	8

Of the four kinds of cross-border partnerships at West University (WU) that could be impacted by nationalistic geo-political trends, most participants reported that heightened government scrutiny could impact the location of cross-border partnerships, a focus on virtual learning content delivery, as well as more student-led study abroad programs. Further, according to some participants, the focus on the WU campus could change, with more attention on recruitment partnerships where partnerships enhance incoming student mobility and would have to be more directly tied to return on investment with an eye toward the competition (i.e., Canada, Australia, and the UK). Finally, participants reported changes in kinds of partnerships to include more articulation agreements and faculty going abroad with a changing focus away from Asia and toward Europe.

Reason for US Universities' Change in Cross-Border Partnerships

In this section, I will address the reasons for potential changes in cross-border partnerships at each university that reflect current nationalistic and anti-immigrant/nativist trends. Each participant in this study responded differently to why changes might happen. However, there was a distinct belief among the participants at both universities that national policy changes would have an impact on why cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions might change in the future. Tables 16 and 17 provide a summary of responses synthesized from over 150 codes identified during first cycle process coding and synthesized into categories using second cycle pattern coding.

Table 16

Nationalistic Political Trends and Future Cross-Border Partnerships—Basis for Change (MSU)

Reason for Change	Description	Code Frequencies
Enhanced governmental scrutiny	Enhanced governmental scrutiny also involving disinvestment of government research funding will perhaps undercut or change partnerships	30
Focus on mutual benefit and educational diplomacy	Mutual benefit moves university to reemphasize collaboration as the focus toward global educational diplomacy	23
Inability to work together	Difficulties in working together that also include financial problems that limit collaboration	21

Reason for Change	Description	Code Frequencies
Concerns over intellectual property theft and freedom of speech/thought	Worries involving spying, intellectual property theft on the US university campus, and crackdowns on freedom of speech in partner countries, hinder further research collaboration	12

Of the four reasons for potential changes in cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions at Middle System University (MSU), two are related and address the concern regarding the enactment of enhanced national policies that limit and/or change cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. First, some MSU participants suggested there are worries of non-US government spying and intellectual property theft via students and scholar/researchers and the crackdown on freedom of thought/speech in partner countries. Second, as reported by MSU participants, enhanced government scrutiny could undercut significant and fiscally beneficial partnerships that also involve innovative research opportunities.

Of the two other reasons for potential changes in cross-border partnerships with non-US education institutions, one is specifically tied to problems working with the non-US educational institution. Another reason addresses what three participants at MSU believe fulfills MSU's underlying philosophy regarding educational diplomacy. Yet another reason for potential changes are declining student and scholar participation in partnership programs with many students electing to go to other countries. This is not necessarily a change that involves national policies that restrict collaboration but is what MSU participants felt is currently happening as students and scholar/researchers find it more difficult to participate in partner programs (i.e., get

visas, enroll in partner programs, and do research). Still, visa issuance has become a concern that participants felt might be tied to national policies. The Associate Vice President of International Affairs at MSU pointed out that “for the most part, the visa issues are challenges facing scholars and students seeking to study in the US. Of course, there are scholars (and journalists) from the US who are *persona non grata* in places like China. But, in terms of numbers affected, quite small.”

Table 17

Nationalistic Political Trends and Future Cross-Border Partnerships-Basis for Change (WU)

Reason for Change	Description	Code Frequencies
On- and off-campus challenges	Curriculum issues drives university to focus on internationalization at home, changes in content delivery modes, and mutually beneficial agreements	15
Sustaining enrollments	With dropping enrollments cross-border partners will focus on maintaining financially sustainable partnerships	13
Legal and student visa issues	University legal liability and changes in policy changes re: immigration	12
Neo-national trends	Neo-national trends make it more difficult to sustain partnerships, making it important to maintain government relationships and develop university response (e.g., “You are welcome here”)	7

Reason for Change	Description	Code Frequencies
Refocus on university mission/vision	Mission focus help to create stronger partners with emphasis on fewer partners	6

Of the five reasons for potential changes in cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions at West University (WU), two address WU participants' concern about sustaining financially sustainable enrollments from the partnerships and concerns over WU's legal liability and international students' ability to obtain visas. Two other reasons for potential change in cross-border partnerships include a renewed focus on WU's historical mission and vision with projects focusing on internationalization at home and an emphasis on creating stronger partnerships via the disciplines within the affected colleges. These two reasons seem conjoined as they focus more on curricular issues and the need to create stronger partnerships that are also mutually beneficial.

The fifth basis for change in WU's future cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions is tied to neo-national trends. Of note is that the Director of Asian Initiatives at WU was focused on that element as the basis for change. That individual is also the Confucius Institutes (CI) Director at WU and has a central role in maintaining the relationship between CI and WU. It was important to the Director of Asian Initiatives at WU that CI be more transparent in its relationship with US government affairs.

Role of National Policy Changes

In follow-up questions, participants at Middle System University (MSU) and West University (WU) pointed to the important role of national policies on a university's decision to begin, develop, create, or maintain cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. Findings also reveal that many participants viewed national policy changes as

important to the continued success of the university's programs. Tables 18 and 19 describe the dominant perspective on national policy impact participants from Middle System University and West University felt were involved in future cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions.

Table 18

Perspectives on National Policy Impact on Cross-Border Partnerships (MSU)

Role	Dominant Perspective on National Policy Impact
Associate Vice President of International Affairs (SIO)	Emphasized the perception that the US federal government is disinvesting in research and creating more impediments on collaboration, thus affecting the ability to pursue innovative collaborations.
Director of International Partnerships	Emphasized the perception that the US government is creating a difficult situation by defunding universities that receive money from the Hanban, the Confucius Institute (CI) headquarters, and forcing MSU to close their CI, thus negatively impacting MSU's comprehensive collaboration with their Chinese university partner.
Social Work Faculty	Emphasized the perception that the US government is personally impacting students and researchers and that international students are deciding to study elsewhere (e.g., Canada) and US-based researchers are having difficulty maintaining or creating new research collaborations.
Associate Dean/Global Engagement	Emphasized that US government policies via export control are impacting partnerships with universities in sanctioned countries where research for the benefit of mankind is being limited.

Role	Dominant Perspective on National Policy Impact
Executive Director for the Office of International Affairs	Emphasized how US government funding of research in the past was a major source of support (e.g., President George W Bush's support of AIDS funding), but that President Trump has proposed cuts to funding that confuses the situation. Also pointed to Chinese government changes in policies regarding 2+2 programs that adversely affects collaboration.
Former Associate Vice President for International Affairs	Emphasized that government restrictions (e.g., travel warnings, visa restrictions, closing of Confucius Institutes, etc.) often hinders strategic partnerships, while university policies of working only with top universities in top countries stifles meaningful mutually beneficial partnerships.
Associate Dean of Global Health/Professor of Health Policy and Management	Emphasized that, at the time of the initial interview, government policies had no impact on current cross-border partnerships; however, with the closing of Confucius Institutes, potential overseas partners may find MSU to be less desirable for collaboration.
Professor of Global Health/Director of MSU's Center for Global Health	Emphasized that when the US State Department puts travel warnings on certain countries it can kill a program and that government policies often puts stricter limitations on visiting physicians than they do visiting medical students.
Dean of School of Engineering and Technology/Professor of Engineering	Emphasized that, when previous governmental sanctions involving academic agreements were relaxed, things started to improve with relationships and that new travel bans and extreme vetting make everything from completing agreements to obtaining visas more difficult.

Role	Dominant Perspective on National Policy Impact
Associate Director of International Programs	Provided a past example where the US Department of Homeland Security had denied visas to male Muslim faculty while allowing female faculty to enter into the US for a grant funded by the US Department of Education.

Table 19*Perspectives on National Policy Impact on Cross-Border Partnerships (WU)*

Role	Dominant Perspective on National Policy Impact
Associate Provost for Global Education (SIO)	Emphasized that there were 1 or 2 past examples where the foreign government wanted to close efforts toward internationalization. In the case of US government policies, the impact is more on enrollment in some countries, not on international partnerships, and the Confucius Institute has not closed.
Associate Director of International Admissions	Emphasized the perception that policies are impacting students more than institutions and that partnerships are a more stable method of international student recruitment.
International Partnerships Specialist	Emphasized that WU is struggling with China's Ministry of Education over approvals, requiring changes, and creating frustration over the effort to benefit the partner more, while in the US, Chinese partnerships are becoming more complicated with the political climate creating uncertainty
Professor/Director of Global and International Studies program	Emphasized that non-US governments are not often providing data regarding issues that impact their country, while US policies make it harder to get visas for

Role	Dominant Perspective on National Policy Impact
Executive Director, Global Institute	graduate students especially with some embassy officials refusing students and ignoring efforts to build bridges across cultures.
Professor/Political Science	Emphasized how US policies are preventing us from moving faster and that travel warnings are often for political reasons with the intention of limiting immigration and making it difficult to travel to other countries.
Director of Study Abroad	Emphasized that the image US is presenting goes in cycles from being multi-lateral and cooperative to isolationist with Trump creating skepticism regarding cooperation. Still US higher education has cachet with branding still solid and students want to come to the US because they want a good education.
Dean, College of Education	Emphasized that US government policies restrict participation in risky areas.
Director of Asian Initiatives	Emphasized that China's Ministry of Education pushing for the end of 2+2 and wanting whole programs (4+0) to be taught there, while US policies are affecting WU's Confucius Institute program by implementing more difficult requirements when applying for waivers for their programs with policies that reflect Trump administration beliefs that "all Chinese students are spies."
Director of Asian Initiatives	Emphasized the belief that international scholars are having difficulty coming to study in the US because of US policies.

The evidence suggests that participants at both Middle System University (MSU) and West University (WU) were not only aware of how national policies could impact university

cross-border partnerships, but these policies had a fundamental role in the development, creation, participation in, and maintenance of cross-border partnerships. The Director of International Partnerships at MSU and the International Partnerships Specialist at WU, who oversee the day-to-day maintenance of the partnerships, expressed similar concerns over the impact national policies had partnership viability, especially in the case of partnerships located in China. Participants at WU expressed concerns that US policies have created uncertainty and made it possible that the US is no longer an attractive location to study (WU-Director of Asian Initiatives, Dean, College of Education, Professor/Director of Global and International Studies Program, and the Associate Director of International Admissions). The Social Work faculty participant at MSU also emphasized this concern. The faculty participant believed the expressions of anti-immigrant sentiments made to them at MSU made it difficult for them in their ongoing work and in the work of researchers at MSU who traveled abroad for the university and students or scholars who were studying at MSU.

Participants at both WU and MSU who had closer connection to programs affiliated with Confucius Institute (CI) were sensing that programs were not only coming under increased scrutiny, but in the case of MSU, were forced to make the choice of closing their CI or lose US Defense Department funding. Other kinds of national policies, such as travel warnings, travel restrictions, and defunding of government support have also had the potential for killing a program. At MSU, US travel warnings created because of terrorist threats would negatively impact their study abroad programs in Kenya, according to the Professor of Global Health/Director of MSU's Center for Global Health. The Director of Study Abroad at WU also emphasized this but did not make the connection between national policies and future concerns

over limitations put on the university regarding cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions.

Summary of RQ2 Findings

Research question two asked: how, what kind of, and why will cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions develop and/or change at US universities if nationalistic geo-political trends reflective of xenophobic/nativist sentiments in the US and around the world continue?

It was difficult for all participants to conjecture about some things that have not fully been determined. When asked how things might change in the future, the Associate Vice President of International Affairs at MSU said, “I think partnerships are actually going to become more important in the future. I think that all the evidence agrees, virtually all the evidence agrees, that the trend in research is international and interdisciplinary. And that we don't have all the answers in the United States.” Nevertheless, the Associate Vice President also pointed out that nationalistic geo-political trends were not new and that constraints on collaborative research were intensifying. “This is not the first time we've had, in our lifetimes, some of this worry.” Speaking of constraints on partnerships, the Associate Vice President for International Affairs also mentioned “it is good for us to be aware of those factors, to take our expertise on that particular questions seriously even as we pursue partnerships under some constraints.”

Still, many participants at MSU and West University (WU) believed the impact of nationalistic geo-political trends that reflect ongoing nationalistic and/or nativist sentiments on cross-border partnerships could potentially change how cross-border partnerships are developed in the future, the kinds of partnerships that could be developed, and how and why they could

change. From the categories developed for RQ2, there was a sense that national policies that limit and/or restrict cross-border partnerships could impact research collaboration, and types of collaboration such as exchanges, resulting in elimination of programs at MSU that would impact student and scholar mobility. At both MSU and WU, it was important among participants to communicate and/or message tolerance of diverse cultures on campus, both to students and the partner institution. Finally, some participants at both MSU and WU felt that current geo-political trends were not currently impacting cross-border partnerships.

Various participants at MSU and WU mentioned that current geo-political trends and national policies that limit and/or restrict cross-border collaboration could impact the kinds of future cross-border partnerships. MSU's "core strategic partnership" approach to cross-border partnerships has meant developing long-standing partnerships in regions and countries where comprehensive partnerships impact multiple parties on MSU's campus and their partner's university. As MSU's Director of International Partnerships mentioned, "it's probably going to limit the types of opportunities that people will willingly go forward on." Further, as MSU focuses on status driven partnerships, the possibility of entering into capacity building partnerships becomes less likely. The Director said,

with that sort of an attitude we're not going to have another Kenya University capacity building project that's going to be stellar like that. It's just not going to happen. We will continue to have small scale partnerships that really don't add up to anything. That's my fear.

Beyond capacity building partnerships in Kenya, MSU has closed their Confucius Institute (CI) and this may have impacted their Chinese University partnership, according to the Director of International Partnerships.

Further, the Associate Dean of Global Engagement at MSU mentioned that national policies have impacted their effort to meet potential non-US partner representatives in the partner

country. Specifically, Government policies also have extended to who MSU officials meet and where. After our initial interview, and in a follow-up email to me, the Associate Dean/Global Engagement mentioned that “in December 2018 I was invited by a very prestigious university (in a sanctioned country) to speak at a meeting on Internationalization in Higher Education. It was not the (sanctioned country’s) side, but the US that forbade my participating.” He eventually met representatives of that university at one of MSU’s gateway offices.

At WU, the kinds of cross-border partnerships impacted by national policies that limit and/or restrict cross-border collaboration could mean focusing more on recruitment partnerships and the kinds of relations that would bring in more students. From my own experience, recruitment partnerships might not have as many restrictions placed upon them. It could also mean more articulation agreements and diversifying the kinds of partnerships they have in other countries inside and outside of Asia, with a stronger emphasis on changes in curriculum and content delivery (i.e., virtual learning and student-led programs), and in new countries where limitations may not be so restrictive. As the Associate Provost for Global Education at WU mentioned, it has been important to develop a coordinated effort to deal with knowing where international scholars originate and understanding immigration, visa, and export control issues. The Associate Provost for Global Education said, “we’re actually training people in our research office to be able to identify and deal with export control and intellectual property issues.” As they and others at WU mentioned, sustaining and stabilizing international student enrollment has played a large part in the kinds of cross-border partnerships they have created. By diversifying them, especially outside of Asia, participants at WU emphasized that WU’s effort to compensate for the political environment will play a role as they try to deal with the crisis and perceptions of families and students by taking a long-term approach toward cross-border partnerships.

Beyond the kinds of cross-border partnerships and the reasons for possibly changing them, national policies that restrict collaboration were seen as impacting cross-border partnerships at both MSU and WU. The dominant perspective on national policy impact on cross-border partnerships at MSU was that it could impact innovative and potentially life-changing research, student and scholar mobility, and mutually beneficial collaboration. Further, when previous governmental sanctions involving academic agreements were relaxed, relationships improved, while extreme vetting and travel bans make completing agreements and obtaining visas more difficult. At WU, the dominant perspective on national policy impact on cross-border partnerships is on recruitment and mobility; US and non-US government policies prevent building cultural bridges and US government policies might prevent us from moving faster because of perceptions that “all Chinese students are spies.” That being the case, students are still interested in studying in the US because, as the Professor of Political Science stated, “US higher education has cachet” and “students want to come to the US because they want a good education.”

Research Question Three Findings

Research question three (RQ3) asked: how might cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions at two public four-year US universities differ from each other in the future if nationalistic geo-political trends reflective of xenophobic/nativist sentiments in the US and around the world continue and what will be the basis for the differences? To answer this question, it was important to compare the differences in categories developed in research question two (RQ2) as participants indicated what might happen with future cross-border partnerships at both US universities and the basis for changes.

Based on RQ2, and the responses from participants at MSU and WU, current nationalistic geo-political trends could impact how researchers at MSU would do research in the future. However, there were also participants who did not currently sense any specific changes to research collaboration efforts. Some participants expressed concern over current trends changing students' experience and creating anxiety for potential students, families, and scholars. One area of concern expressed by some participants was international student enrollment. At MSU, international student enrollment is declining and partners are raising concerns over policy changes that limit cross-border exchanges that decrease mobility. WU participants also felt that recruitment and student mobility were important elements and concern over national policies could negatively impact their student numbers.

There were three categories from RQ2 responses that revealed important differences between how participants at Middle System University (MSU) and West University (WU) believed that current geo-political trends and national policies that reflect nationalist and nativist sentiment could impact cross-border partnerships at their universities. First, participants at both universities commented on how government policies could impact the kinds of cross-border partnerships, how they might be developed, and why the changes might happen.

China is a significant partner country for both MSU and WU and the most obvious and tangible difference between MSU and WU is that MSU closed their Confucius Institute (CI) and WU did not. In a follow up question about reasons for the CI closure I asked the Director of International Partnerships at MSU in Spring 2019, what the Director felt the closure was tied to. The Director pointed to the 2019 National Defense Authorization Act. When I asked the WU Associate Provost of Global Education the same question, the Associate Provost suggested that WU did not receive a waiver and did not close their CI. According to the Associate Provost of

Global Education, WU did not have to apply for a waiver because they had not received nor were they receiving Department of Defense funding for the Chinese language and cultural programs supported by the Hanban (the Chinese government entity affiliated with the Chinese Ministry of Education). However, the Dean, College of Education and the Director of Asian Initiatives at WU sensed there could be trouble ahead with CI due to government restraints, and that international scholars could have difficulty coming to the US because of US policies and that there could be difficulties in maintaining research collaborations.

Summary of RQ3 Findings

Participants at both universities viewed China as a significant target country in their cross-border partnership plans and that CI's role in partnership relations between US universities and their university partners in China was significant. National policies could not only impact the kinds of partnerships, but how they establish partnerships, and the reason to change them. The architect of the core strategic partnership philosophy at MSU, the Former Associate Vice President for International Affairs, suggested that it not only was significant, but was the basis for MSU's core strategic plan in China. The Former AVP pointed out

If Confucius Institutes are shut down, how on earth is, I mean this is craziness. But that has been it. It won't shut down our partnership with our Chinese partner university totally, but it will take away this sort of hub of what's been happening. Since there's been this Confucius Institute [at MSU], there always have been people from our Chinese partner university on our campus who can respond to any issues that come up in the two plus two programs, etc. If that gets shut down, it will have tremendous impact on how coordinated we can be in going forward.

The current Associate Vice President for International Affairs, who serves as the Senior International Officer at MSU, suggested

The closing of the CI will alter the relationship between the two universities, just as political violence and (low) ranking of the Kenya university partner will have/ has had a similar effect vis a vis Kenya. But both partnerships, it can be assumed, will persist because of the nature of the research collaborations that faculty have forged, and latent ingenuity that will respond to changing circumstances in each case.

By March 2019, Middle System University closed their CI as a result of the recent US government policy regarding CIs in the United States signed by President Donald Trump (National Defense Authorization Act of 2018). MSU's action reflects that of other US public universities that have closed their CIs, including the one at University of Hawai'i-Manoa, where I am currently employed.

WU, on the other hand, did not close their CI. When I asked the Associate Provost for Global Education at WU and the Director of International Partnerships at MSU a follow-up question to determine what would happen with their Chinese university partner relationships, the Associate Provost for Global Education at WU told me that the CI at WU was not closing and they had no intention on closing it and that their partnership with their university partner in China was still strong.

The Director of International Partnerships at MSU, however, pointed to the CI closing as an important loss in developing the relationship with their Chinese university partner. Their efforts to continue the partnership remain in developing the core partnership. However, before it closed, the Director mentioned "the future of our Confucius Institute is now very much in doubt. We had requested a waiver to continue but it is unlikely as another campus in MSU's university system receives DOD (Department of Defense) funding." When the CI at MSU did close, the Director pointed to staffing issues and teachers having to leave, saying

Two of our teachers must leave tomorrow, and the other has another week. It's a real mess. We are hoping to send a delegation to (our partner in China) in the Fall to consolidate the partnership but the CI was always the liaison for that partnership.

When comparing Middle System University (MSU) and West University (WU), the differences between the two seem to be how participants viewed their general understanding of how programs might develop and/or change in the future as a result of nationalistic trends reflective of xenophobic/nativist sentiments worldwide. Participants at Middle System

University (MSU) gravitated toward aspects of how anti-globalization sentiments would impact faculty, researchers, and students and what national policies might impact long-term cross-border relationships. Participants at both MSU and WU noted they had not felt the full force of restrictions on cross-border partnerships at their university but were troubled by where things were going. This was before MSU closed their Confucius Institute (CI). West University (WU) has not closed their CI and when I followed up with questions about their decision, the Associate Provost for Global Education did not anticipate it would close in the future. Yet the Director of Asian Initiatives intimated concerns regarding CI, saying

Well we did hear (about) more regulations. For example, I heard that there's new rules (for) any universities where they have host(ed) Confucius Institute cannot have programs, like STARTALK, or other, (for example) the defense department-related program. And the funny thing is, the Department, the Defense Department itself does not (have anything) against the Confucius Institute at all.

Chapter Summary

Research question one (RQ1) asked: how, what kind of, and why were past cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions developed at two public four-year US universities? Findings show that Middle System University (MSU) and West University (WU) have important similar elements regarding how cross-border partnerships were developed. Participants at both universities indicated that faculty and alumni relationships were important factors in how their cross-border partnerships were created. The kinds of partnerships that were created at MSU and WU reflected their institutions philosophy regarding partnerships. With MSU, the focus has been on a “core strategic partnership.” Core partnerships are comprehensive in nature, impacting multiple stakeholders on campus, with a focus on academic and research-based collaboration. WU’s philosophy has been on strategic partnerships that are driven by student and faculty exchange that could directly impact enrollment. While similar to MSU in form, with dual degrees, articulation agreements, faculty exchange, and study abroad programs,

what differentiates MSU and WU is WU's concern that programs fulfill enrollment goals. Both MSU and WU participants felt that there were both internal and external challenges that impact their university's cross-border partnerships, including campus buy-in (internal) and government policies or visa issues (external).

Research question two (RQ2) asked: how, what kind of, and why will cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions develop and/or change at US universities if nationalistic geo-political trends reflective of xenophobic/nativist sentiments in the US and around the world continue? This study revealed that MSU would focus on their network global gateways, creating partnerships in new countries, and maintaining core partnerships with established core partners. Many of the MSU participants believed that capacity building partnerships would probably not continue and that government policies could discourage innovative research and stifle potential cross-border partnerships. WU participants generally felt that more government scrutiny would create difficulties in developing partnerships in parts of Asia, and that focusing on other regions and countries would be more beneficial, linking recruitment more to partnerships to counter competition from the UK, Australia, and Canada. Also, some WU participants indicated a desire to focus more on changes in curriculum that reflects internationalization at home.

Research question three (RQ3) asked: how might cross-border partnerships at these US universities differ from each other in the future if more nationalistic geo-political trends reflective of nationalist and nativist sentiment continue and what will be the basis for the differences? This question sought to compare each university's reaction to national policies that could impact their collaborative efforts with non-US educational institutions. Perhaps the most important difference was that Middle System University (MSU) and West University (WU)'s

actions involved their respective Confucius Institutes (CI). MSU closed their CI, while WU did not. Nonetheless, participants at both MSU and WU indicated concern over national policies that could negatively impact their cross-border partnerships not only in China, but in other countries as well.

Chapter 5: Discussion

In this chapter, I will discuss the findings of this research project and synthesize them with the theories and frameworks presented in the literature review. After reviewing the research questions that guided this study, I will discuss the findings based on each research question, culminating in a proposal regarding cross-border partnerships involving US universities and their non-US educational institution counterparts. This chapter will conclude with implications for future practice, suggestions for future research, limitations to the study, and my final reflections and conclusion after completing this study.

Research Questions

As complex, multi-faceted institutions that have multiple levels of authority and diverse colleges and schools, US public universities have long histories of working in partnership with non-US educational institutions (Klasek, 1992; Knight, 2011; de Wit & Merckx, 2012; Helms et al., 2017). This history stems from a tradition that began with the emergence of the nation-state and international aspects that included cross-border research dissemination, student and scholar mobility, and the export of educational systems in the 18th and 19th centuries (de Wit & Merckx, 2012).

Hu and Spence (2017) claimed that the 2016 US election, Brexit, and other political trends in other countries, were a victory for anti-globalism, xenophobia, nationalism, and nativism. To contribute to both practical and theoretical conversation about the current and future state of cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions, it was important first to determine the history of two US public universities' cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. Next it was important to see how or if these trends have impacted the

cross-border partnerships these two US universities have with non-US educational institutions.

To investigate these issues, the following three research questions guided this study:

1. How, what kind of, and why were cross-border partnerships with non-US higher educational institutions developed at two public four-year US universities?
2. How, what kind of, and why will cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions develop and/or change at US universities if nationalistic geo-political trends reflective of xenophobic/nativist sentiments in the US and around the world continue?
3. How might cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions at two public four-year US universities differ from each other in the future if nationalistic geo-political trends reflective of xenophobic/nativist sentiments in the US and around the world continue and what will be the basis for the differences?

Discussion of Findings

In this section, I am going to discuss the research findings as they reflect the literature on US university cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. The discussion will be organized around the three research questions that guided this study.

RQ1 Findings Discussion

Research question one asked: how, what kind of, and why were cross-border partnerships with non-US higher educational institutions developed at two public four-year US universities?

The primary findings that emerged relating to research question one included:

1. MSU Emphasis is on core strategic partnerships.
2. West University's (WU) emphasis is on sustaining enrollment, campus internationalization, and accomplishing research goals.
3. Partnerships are built via faculty connections.

4. Partnerships vary on university emphasis.
5. Internal/External challenges impact success.
6. Partnerships center on the institution's philosophy.

MSU Emphasis is on Core Strategic Partnerships. Middle System University's (MSU) emphasis has been on building strategic mutually beneficial comprehensive "core strategic partnerships." As stated in chapter one, Resource Dependency Theory (RDT) focuses on how organizational environments affect and constrain organizations and how organizations respond to external constraints. The focus on mutual benefit suggests that MSU relies on the organizational environments of the non-US educational institution to successfully engage in cross-border partnership activities. Further, as mentioned in chapter two, engagement with non-US educational institutions suggests that institutions do not function within their own silos, and that as an education institution, the focus is on integration, mutual development of resources, and strategic planning, so higher education institutions can engage more broadly (Deardorff et al., 2012).

It is important to know what mutually beneficial means for MSU and WU. From the interviews, participants at MSU developed their partnerships with attention to mutual benefit. The Associate Vice President for International Affairs pointed out that equal and mutual benefit is vital to any relationship:

The philosophy is mutual benefit and the strategy builds on the faculty relationships or areas of the world that we think are strategic, or it is to (our local area). And we try to bring those two together. So we've, we've been very, very careful about appearing to be, uh, one-sided where we're giving, we're giving them knowledge. We've, the terminology we use is, is that so many partnerships are transactional, and we're interested in transformational partnerships where both parties agree to work on something that neither could achieve on their own.

Another element of RDT mentioned in chapter two is that return on investment (ROI) is also significant to RDT. While RDT suggests that organizations are open and depend on their own organization, it is also important that the organizations develop and grow economically (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). While economic benefit is a necessary aspect of all relationships in higher education between two entities, MSU's participants tended to focus on how the elements of their cross-border partnerships matched MSU's mission and how local, national, and international funding increases would help accomplish their mission. The Professor of Global Health/Director of MSU's Center for Global Health directly commented on the importance of the fiscal aspect of successful partnerships:

I was told when I started this job of learning how to be a development officer in addition to a physician. I was told by my development officer experts that you will never raise money for global health. People don't want to support global health. Though the "development experts" at the inception of the partnership did not think global health would resonate with the philanthropic community, those experts were wrong. The proof is in the pudding: the seven endowed chairs, the millions of dollars in donated dollars and products, etc.

The Professor of Global Health also focused on the mutual monetary benefit at the partner university:

The amount of structure alone is in the millions and millions of dollars (that we) built on the back of philanthropy, built a cancer and chronic disease center. For five million dollars, (we) built a HIV building for a couple million dollars, built a pediatric hospital for two million dollars. We provide every year, we provide 50 full tuition scholarships.

With that said, most participants at MSU viewed fiscal benefit from the perspective of how the partnership matched MSU's determination to follow their mission of comprehensive core strategic partnerships.

West University's (WU) Emphasizes Enrollment Needs, Campus Internationalization, and Research Goals. West University's (WU) emphasis has been on building strategic mutually beneficial comprehensive partnerships aligned with enrollment needs,

campus internationalization, and research goals. West University's (WU) emphasis on cross-border partnerships has also reflected their strategic mission of building mutually beneficial comprehensive partnerships and, like Middle System University (MSU), WU relies on the integration and mutual development of resources (Deardorff et al., 2012) that reflect Resource Dependency Theory (RDT). WU's comprehensive strategic partnerships have not been developed like MSU's. WU's comprehensive strategic partnerships have been built more on how they function to sustain a specific goal. The Associate Provost of Global Education at WU differentiated these needs by telling me how they view strategic partnerships:

You have international enrollment, you have research, you have study abroad. Some partnerships can be strategic in terms of study abroad; others can be strategic in terms of research. Others can be strategic in terms of international enrollment. If you have one or several that are on all the lists, then congratulations, you found yourself a strategic partnership for the entire university.

Further, achieving mutual benefit is an important aspect of all WU's cross-border partnerships. As the Executive Director of Global Education pointed out,

mutually beneficial would be that both partners would benefit from the partnership. So, a dual degree would involve students going in both directions and earning dual degrees. It doesn't have to be that both partners are benefitting in the same way, but both should have some benefit from the partnership.

Partnerships Built via Faculty Connections. Most cross-border partnerships at MSU and WU are built via faculty connections with a combination of other methods. The initial development and creation of the cross-border partnerships means managing them and involves a number of parties both on campus and with the non-US partner. Cross-border Management Theory (CBMT) (Guo, 2015) provides a theoretical approach to cross-border management of MSU and WU's cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. CBMT posits that crossing borders is what good organizations do, but that it also means that those organizations are actively supporting and providing long-term commitment at the highest levels

of the organization (Guo, 2015). As I mentioned in chapter two of this study, Guo noted that the organization mobilizes its available resources (i.e., legal, social, etc., expertise) toward successful cross-border relations and that there needs to be domestic governmental support for effective international cooperation and collaboration. Guo suggests that cross-border agreements should contain items that address the objects, subjects, parties involved, the territorial scope, and the intensity of the cooperation.

MSU's cross-border partnerships are mostly developed through faculty connections, with some established through direct contact with the administration. The Director of International Partnerships pointed out:

(often) individual faculty members (come) in. (In) some cases schools will approach me. Saying that they want to establish a cross-border partnership in some particular place. Or they already have a collaboration there from another university and (they) move to MSU and they want to continue that blessing from our institution. So that's one side, an individual (in) the school or department approached me. On the other hand, when we at this campus have designated strategic international partnerships, which is two or three depending on how we define it. In those cases, I approach schools. For the most part, to try and get them engaged in that country in collaborative projects.

This approach reflects Guo's (2015) theory of mobilizing university resources for successful cross-border partnerships and also supports Resource Dependency Theory (RDT). Further, their approach, and that of others at MSU (i.e., Social Work faculty and the Associate Dean for Global Health at MSU's School of Medicine) reflect Jooste's (2015) concern that I mentioned in chapter two on the development of a "global commons" approach toward collaboration. Jooste called for collaborations that are based on respect and quality and become the norm rather than the typical market-based approach. The best example of the MSU approach toward building mutual respect and creating the partnership is in how MSU created partnerships that reflected using the non-US educational institutions expertise. This approach can be seen in how MSU built its first strategic partnership via faculty at MSU college to drive the partnership in collaboration with the non-US

educational institution faculty. It was also how the Social Work faculty member at MSU developed their programs in Nigeria.

I've made very clear in my informal contacts even though we have a great program here, this is not Africa. Whatever she does there has to be driven by...they're the experts. We're just there to kind of guide. We're not the model because Africa's very different, their needs are different. Their social work will be different. And so, they're really, it's going to be based on what their local needs are.

WU's cross-border partnerships are built mostly via faculty relationships. The kinds of partnerships that constitute their relationships with non-US educational institutions entail dual degree, study abroad, and articulation agreements. One of their earliest cross-border partnerships included a partnership with an educational institution in Malaysia. The relationship started with faculty and administrative connections and WU helped develop the partner university's curriculum. It was the basis for their dual degree program with the partner university. The model for the program included having many students from Malaysia matriculating at WU to earn their WU degree and a degree from the partner institution. When the program first started, the partner institution had a two-year program and the curriculum building and the dual degree program helped to establish the partner institution later as a university. As the International Partnership Specialist noted:

So what's happened is that (it) has been converted to an articulate agreement. So, we don't twin anymore, but they've added their own courses and they have become, that was back when they were a two-year college, and now they're a university. So they can offer their own four year degree.

According to the Professor of Political Science, that partnership motivated many faculty and administrators at WU to seek some other capacity-building partnerships. The Professor said, "we were learning, we learned from the Malaysian effort (that it) was a good place to focus on are developing countries, specifically within developing country areas." To confirm that, I asked the Associate Provost of Global Education whether they have current capacity building

partnerships and was told there are capacity building partnerships currently in China, Taiwan, and the Dominican Republic.

Partnerships Vary on University Emphasis. The kinds of partnerships at MSU and WU vary based on how participants perceive their university's emphasis on what constitutes "strategic comprehensive partnerships." The kinds of cross-border partnerships at MSU and WU are often referred to today as strategic partnerships, a reflection of the American Council on Education's (ACE) Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE) mapping model (Helms et al., 2017).

The *Mapping* study structured its co-equal and integrated pillars of CI around a specific definition of CI: "a strategic, coordinated process that seeks to align and integrate international policies, programs, and initiatives, and positions colleges and universities as more globally oriented and internationally-connected institutions" (p. 2). As a part of that structure, the CIGE model claimed that collaboration and partnership are a key component of any higher education institution's efforts to make comprehensive internationalization a part of their identity.

MSU's and WU's websites reference the CIGE model and the sixth pillar of comprehensive internationalization – collaboration and partnerships. Further, many participants in this study spoke of strategic partnerships. With that said, the kinds of strategic partnerships are not the same at MSU and WU and the term "strategic" does not have the same meaning to each participant in this study.

As previously mentioned, cross-border partnerships at WU reflect a strategy that is centered on strategic enrollment needs, strategic research collaboration, and strategic study abroad goals. The language used to describe the kinds of cross-border partnerships found at WU matches this strategy. Dual or joint degrees and twinning play an important part in the enrollment

strategy, as do articulation agreements. Study abroad programs for outgoing students play a large role in assuring their focus is on US students' exposure to comprehensive internationalization.

As the Associate Provost for Global Education mentioned, "if you have one or several that are on all the lists, then congratulations you found yourself a strategic partnership for the entire university."

At MSU, cross-border partnerships reflect a strategy centered on campus-wide comprehensive involvement in a "core" partnership. The partnership is based on academic college or department buy-in that involves as many colleges or units as possible in a comprehensive and coordinated effort that includes fiscal support, departmental support, faculty incentives, etc., for the core partnership. There are other cross-border partnerships, but as the Director of International Partnerships mentioned, the strategy behind core partnerships is "rallying the resources of the university behind particular...collaborations. That was what the core partnerships was all about." The Director mentioned that there are other partnerships that do not receive the institutional support outside of core partnerships because of the MSU policy to only work with institutions of similar rank. As the Director pointed out,

This leads to (a policy that) is faulty because everyone is following that same sort of lead. If everyone can only partner with an equal or higher institution. But that's just a recipe for the status quo. Of course, our peer institutions—they don't want to partner with us. They're not interested. We will continue to have small-scale partnerships that really don't add up to anything. That's my fear."

Internal/External Challenges Impact Success. Internal (i.e., those within each university) and external (i.e., those outside each university) challenges can impact the success of a cross-border partnership. This is revealed through Globalization Theory, the third and final theoretical construct that informs this study. Levin (2001), in his research on globalization and higher education, saw globalization shaping institutional change especially on the economic level. Other researchers viewed globalization theory as providing one framework for

understanding the competitive behaviors manifest in universities and higher education that would lead to creating international partnerships with educational institutions abroad (Rhoades & Slaughter, 1997).

Perhaps as a response to the neo-liberal foundation of globalization theory, Turner (2019) defined “globalization (as) the movement of people, ideas, goods, capital, services, pollution, and diseases across borders. Internationalization is higher education’s engagement with that reality” (p. 25). Finally, Maringe (2010) defined globalization as a “multidimensional concept that relates to creating a world in which the social, cultural, technological, political, and ideological aspects of life become increasingly homogeneous and in which economic interdependence and growth are driven by the principles of the free market.” (p. 24). Globalization, and its focus on economic factors that impact cross-border partnerships, is an important element in this study as is how universities approach globalization. As Levin (2001) pointed out, economic prosperity is an important motivation for US educational institutions to partner with non-US educational institutions. As indicated by some of the participants at both MSU and WU, fiscal factors can play a role in the success or failure of cross-border partnerships.

At MSU, the Director of International Partnerships suggested that their core partnership strategy and the university’s policy of working only with the top ranked universities in top identified countries is flawed. This dichotomy typifies the inherent struggle between the traditional definition of neo-liberal aspects of globalization (i.e., competition and the concern for rankings, etc.) and Turner’s (2019) definition. It suggests that upper administrative leaders at MSU have focused on the neo-liberal elements of globalization, while those more intimately involved with cross-border partnerships often reflect Turner’s definition. It also suggests that decisions made by upper administrators at MSU could be tied to the failure of one cross-border

partnership in Mexico or the possibility of doing further capacity-building partnerships in the future. The Director of International Partnerships mentioned that only engaging in status driven partnerships will limit “capacity building project that’s going to be stellar like that. It's just not going to happen. We will continue to have small scale partnerships that really don't add up to anything.”

MSU’s cross-border partnership in Kenya has been impacted by the financial success of the partnership. As the Professor of Global Health/Director of MSU’s Center for Global Health said, “the amount of operations money that we've pulled in of course is enormous.” They also pointed to some administrators at MSU and their risk aversion when developing initiatives and wanting to make sure that the initiative is successful and limits financial risk. Fiscal support plays a role in the success of any partnership and enables universities to do innovative research across borders. The Associate Vice President of International Affairs stated:

There's definitely a disinvestment by the federal government in certain kinds of research that's going to affect our ability, on the one hand, to be able to pursue innovative collaborative creative ideas. On the other hand, it forces us to think about the possibility of pursuing research funding outside of the United States, not to the exclusion of the United States, but I think there'll be more of an exploration of where my funds (come from that are) being used to pursue the creative ideas that faculty come up with.

At WU, the challenges mentioned by the Associate Provost for Global Education involve the availability of fiscal and human resources on campus and that monetary incentives for faculty involvement in developing cross-border partnerships plays a large role in their success. A partnership’s success is also based on students’ involvement in partner programs. As the Executive Director of the Global Institute said, “so I’m constantly telling potential partners, it looks like you’ve got a great program, it will be a great experience for our students, if we could get them there.”

Building mutually beneficial agreements is also a challenge at WU since interest from both sides means creating buy-in from WU and the non-US institution administrators. As the Professor of Political Science at WU said [successful partnerships] “preferably involves some faculty that are going to be critical for the exchange. Exchanges take time and they take work and it takes investment over time.” Investment, of course, means that WU participants anticipate a return on that investment and in fact most WU participants frequently mentioned that enrollment is a concern in sustaining programs with cross-border partners.

Partnerships Center on Institution’s Philosophy. The reasons for developing cross-border partnerships at MSU and WU vary, but center on each institution’s philosophy regarding campus comprehensive internationalization. Altbach (1998) referred to the modern university as “the center of an international knowledge system that encompasses technology, communications, and culture” (p. 347). Knight’s (2015) definition of internationalization encompasses the international, intercultural, and global elements that impact US university cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. Sutton and Deardorff (2012) saw the effort to collaborate as a process of “increasing synergies among scholars, deepening student and institutional engagement in the world, and creating larger networks of discovery, transforming the very nature of higher education” (p. 17) thus enhancing the effort to become global citizens.

From the evidence obtained from my interviews with MSU’s participants and what is represented on their website, the codes produced a pattern that reflects the American Council on Education’s (ACE) Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE) mapping model (Helms et al., 2017). There is an articulated institutional belief that MSU will play a role in connecting the university globally, defining it as part of their mission, goals, funding, and benefits that will impact the institution and the local community. Their efforts will also provide

mutual benefit to the partner institution and create a transformative experience for alums, faculty, and the community by educating people, providing services, shaping values, and building international research opportunities and exposure. For MSU, this was done through their “core partnership strategic plan” and their physical gateway offices located in six different countries.

From the evidence obtained from my interviews with WU’s participants and what is represented on their website, the codes also show a pattern reflective of the American Council on Education’s (ACE) Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE) mapping model (Helms et al., 2017). WU participants strongly viewed their participation in cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions “as a part of their DNA.” Further, they viewed their efforts as enriching student and faculty experiences. It was important to WU’s participants that financial concerns played a role (i.e., enrollment) and it was also important to their philosophy. Less important was the focus on expanding research opportunities.

RQ2 Findings Discussion

Research question two (RQ2) asked the question: how, what kind of, and why will cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions develop and/or change at US universities if nationalistic geo-political trends reflective of xenophobic/nativist sentiments in the US and around the world continue? In an investigation of the literature, I suggested that anti-immigrant and nativist sentiments “xenophobia” and “nativism” are words commonly used to describe the prevalence of an “us vs them” dichotomy with the focus of protecting the interests of natives against those of immigrants (Ashwill, 2017). According to Lee (2020), xenophobia is an “irrational fear, hatred, and hostility toward immigrants, refugees, or others considered ‘foreign’ as threats” (p. 5). The primary findings that emerged relating to research question two included:

1. Government policies could impact MSU’s decision-making regarding partnerships.

2. Government policies could impact MSU's research collaboration/partnership success.
3. Government policies make WU give more attention to compliance.
4. Partnership focus is changing at both universities.
5. WU is focused on internalization at home.
6. MSU is focused more on global "academic diplomacy."
7. Loss of student enrollment pushes WU toward sustainable partnerships.
8. National policies could negatively impact future cross-border partnerships.

Government Policies Could Impact MSU's Decision-Making Regarding

Partnerships. From the interviews, the categories developed from pattern coding revealed that government policies can impact MSU's decision-making, which can possibly impact MSU's research collaborations. MSU's research collaborations form the basis of many of their core strategic partnerships and the various college-level partnerships. Code frequencies from the interviews developed two categories that might be correlated since one might be affecting the other: "decision-making" and "research collaboration."

In a follow-up interview, the Associate Vice President of International Affairs, referencing the National Defense Authorization Act of 2018 and Threats to the US Research Enterprise: China's Talent Recruitment Plans (2019), pointed to the US Senate's Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, as evidence that it "has turned from an investigation of the Confucius Institutes to indictment of the Thousand Talents Program" and mentioned that "restrictive governmental policies have now made themselves felt." The Associate Vice President for International Affairs' comment suggests that government policies, perhaps impacted by nationalist tendencies, are casting doubt on US higher education efforts to

collaborate with Chinese universities. This would not only impact cross-border research but also a university's decision when entering into cross-border partnerships.

Government Policies Could Impact MSU's Research Collaboration/Partnership

Success. At MSU, government policies that limit and/or restrict cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions can affect research collaboration, thus impacting the success of each partnership. Research collaboration is a fundamental aspect of all cross-border partnerships at MSU, whether as a "core strategic partner" or via agreements through specific colleges at MSU. As mentioned in chapter four, core partnerships are full-bodied, research-based, and mutually beneficial comprehensive partnerships that involve multiple colleges and units at MSU and the partner institution in an effort to build transformational partnership activities. In an effort to consolidate their research efforts toward a comprehensive, university-wide approach, the Director of International Partnerships mentioned,

so, you know the challenge in the past, it's the same ability of these partnerships you know (of) the smaller scale ones, and so often these projects only last as long as the faculty member is engaged in that and they come and go. And in fact, that's why we started the core partnership idea. It's supposed to have a longer life than all the certain faculty members currently engaged in it.

Further, as the Associate Vice President of International Affairs suggested, enhanced government scrutiny and policies implemented to protect the country from intellectual property theft can threaten future innovative and creative research potential and ultimately impact partnership success. Export controls will ultimately determine the ability to enter into some partnerships, as the Associate Vice President suggested, "we have situations now where we have successfully gotten permission to explore some of these opportunities through the export control license. But I think that's going to be more and more difficult."

Government Policies Make WU Give More Attention to Compliance. University decisions often reflect financial and logistical limitations that government policies place on the

university both in and outside of the US (Lane & Kinser, 2011). Lane and Kinser suggested this is especially true as multinational colleges and universities work across borders where policies change depending on the country and its policies. As national policies that limit and/or restrict cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions are implemented, WU has focused on how their partnerships can continue with non-US educational institutions by putting more emphasis on compliance with government policies. University policy decisions will what the Associate Provost for Global Education discussed about government concerns for intellectual property theft.

We're actually training people in our research office to be able to identify and deal with export control and intellectual property issues. And I think this was a concern addressed systematically at our university. I think it is at universities that are more research-intensive, bigger universities. I'm sure for them there, there has been a concern far longer, but here, for us, it's a new policy. To address export control systematically is a new policy for sure.

Partnership Focus is Changing at Both Universities. The kinds of partnerships and initiatives are changing at both MSU and WU. MSU, with a focus on comprehensive core partnerships, has developed global gateway offices in key countries and regions (China, India, Germany (regional), Thailand (regional), Mexico, and South Africa, with South America pending) as a way to develop connections in countries that will help enhance their study abroad, research connections, recruitment efforts, and alumni connections. These gateway offices are meant not to replace the core partnership strategy, but to supplement efforts and to develop meaningful action. Further, the loss of MSU's Confucius Institute and the move toward a more entrepreneurial approach toward cross-border partnerships that emphasize country and partner rankings could impact continuing the core strategic partnership philosophy when building new cross-border partnerships. That said, the code frequencies indicated that MSU is trying to maintain the strategy.

WU is also looking at other countries and regions. The Associate Provost for Global Education pointed to Europe for potential partnership development, suggesting that WU has spent too much time on Asia. The Associate Provost said,

I think there is the incredible potential for, to do more with Europe that, that because we have looked for so long and have become such experts in term of internationalization how to work with Asia. We're forgetting Europe a little bit and there's, I don't think in general we do enough with, with Europe--definitely (WU) does not.

The partnership adjustment to another region could reflect concerns regarding export controls with China. In the previous section I mentioned that WU is enhancing export control. By redirecting their effort to other countries, it is possible this move is related to the concern regarding export controls.

WU is Focused on Internalization at Home. West University will focus on changes in curriculum to reflect “internationalization at home,” virtual learning, language programs, and student-led and faculty-led programs. Further changes at WU include more emphasis on curriculum and delivery, as well as linking partnerships to recruitment efforts. The Executive Director of the Global Institute spoke to the importance of internationalization at home saying, “internationalization at home, working on classrooms that, classes working with faculty where they're doing cooperative projects with students from another country or from one of our partner universities.”

While these sentiments were expressed in fall 2018, the recent issues with COVID-19, social distancing, campuses closing, and the move to virtual delivery of content has perhaps made that element prescient. Due to COVID-19 and with campuses closing in-person activities, most universities are offering online and distance delivery of programs (Martel, 2020).

Most WU participants saw cross-border partnerships as an important part of their recruitment strategy. Of course, with that said, US university international student recruiting is

liable to be negatively impacted by the current environment because of the COVID-19 pandemic with 51% of higher education recruitment efforts being canceled (Martel, 2020). According to many participants at WU, traditional methods of international student recruitment that include traveling to fairs and events are not efficient so this would make recruitment via the partner even more important.

MSU is Focused on Academic Diplomacy. Interviews revealed that MSU will focus on global “academic diplomacy” with government restrictions possibly impacting core partnerships. Guo (2015) suggested that, in an optimum cross-border relationship, organizations mobilize available resources (i.e., legal, social, expertise, etc.) toward successful cross-border relations and that there needs to be domestic governmental support for effective international cooperation and collaboration. When domestic government support is lacking, the belief in education as a source of “academic diplomacy” becomes even more important. This theme was shared by many of the participants, with the Former Associate Vice President of International Affairs suggesting,

So, I personally don't think it will last, but I do think a couple of, if it does it will certainly shut down the partnerships with (our work in a sanctioned country), of course. Because, it's also, it's, it's the opposite of academic diplomacy. It's creating more barriers and hostility and posturing and, will make it extremely difficult to continue with (that sanctioned country).

The effort to maintain their core strategic partnership approach, while an important element of their approach to all relationships, has come under threat. The Director of International Partnerships, in a follow-up interview, said:

It's too early to tell yet. We are still working through the staffing issues and the end of the semester to get through. Two of our teachers must leave tomorrow, and the other has another week. It's a real mess. We are hoping to send a delegation to (the partner university) in the Fall to consolidate the partnership but the CI was always the liaison for that partnership. We had another meeting last week about engagement with China and many faculty are concerned about this crackdown on visas from our end, and the similar suppression of topics in China, like philanthropy, social science etc. It's not looking very positive at this stage.

Loss of Student Enrollment Pushes WU Toward Sustainable Partnerships.

Sustainable partnerships at WU are a part of their cross-border partnership strategy. Future changes at WU will include making sure any partnership they create will sustain and grow enrollment. Increasing government restrictions on student visas will mean international enrollments at US universities might decline. WU has been a part of the “you are welcome here” campaign that messages a welcoming environment to international students and scholars coming to WU in response to the impact of the Trump administration’s “America First” vision (Laws & Ammigan, 2020). The International Partnerships Specialist at WU noted the impact an unwelcoming environment might have on student enrollment:

I know that some of the partners we've talked to have, you know, there's been a decline in student numbers and they're seeing more students are going to particular, if they need to learn English or if they're going, if they're choosing an English-speaking country that they're choosing England or Australia or somewhere. You know when they may be used to choosing the U.S. So, I feel, I feel as though as though we're falling out of favor slightly.

Cross-border partnerships have helped maintain enrollments, according to the Associate Provost for Global Education. The Associate Provost said,

The other great impact that I've seen is that since we have all these partnerships and dual degrees, we actually had a three percent increase in international enrollment in the fall of 17, and we had an eight percent increase in international involvement in the fall of 18.

National Policies Could Negatively Impact Future Cross-border Partnerships.

Participants at MSU and WU believed that national policies could negatively impact their future cross-border partnerships with non-US educational partners. MSU’s participants emphasized that current national policies can damage MSU’s goal to maintain educational diplomacy efforts, pursue collaborative research opportunities, obtain US government funding for beneficial and innovative research, be a desirable location to study and do research, and create opportunities to partner with non-US educational institutions. WU’s participants emphasized that national

policies that limit and/or restrict cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions could negatively impact international enrollment, make it harder for students and researchers to get visas, and make it harder to travel to/from other countries. Further, it was felt that Chinese government policies ending mutually beneficial agreements (e.g., dual degrees 2+2 articulations) are making it difficult to partner, and that US policies that reflect the belief that “all Chinese students are spies” are affecting opportunities to partner with Chinese universities.

RQ3 Findings Discussion

Research question three (RQ3) asked: how might cross-border partnerships at these US universities differ from each other in the future if more nationalistic geo-political trends reflective of nationalist and nativist sentiment continue and what will be the basis for the differences? National policies that limit and/or restrict cross-border collaboration with non-US educational institutions are impacting MSU and WU, albeit differently. The Confucius Institute (CI) has closed at MSU, while the one at WU has not. CIs nationwide have closed because of US policies that restrict public universities from receiving funding from CI if they receive Department of Defense (DoD) funding from the US government. While WU has never received that funding, MSU has, thus pushing the MSU administration to close their CI. That said, the Director of Asian Initiatives at WU did share a concern about new US government regulations that could hinder programs like CI from operating on other campuses that do not have DoD funding. While this is only one example of how nationalistic geo-political trends have impacted MSU and WU differently, both WU and MSU Senior International Officers (SIO) mention the increasing impact of export control and government oversight of their programs.

Implications for Future Practice

US university administrators, faculty, and staff who create cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions should consider how government policies are impacting their partnerships, how their partnerships are being developed, and what limitations might develop over the course of the relationships. From this study, evidence indicated that these limitations might include enhanced export control requirements, enhanced government scrutiny of all research collaborations, and fiscal impact on collaboration, including such prosperous collaborations as MSU's capacity-building partnership in Kenya. Marginson (2018) suggested that government regulation could limit globally active World Class Universities (WCU) and that

the strength of the nation-state in the domain of people mobility, it shows that the national/global tensions are so potent as to trump economic rationality. This is true of Brexit as well as education exports. This environment challenges WCUs to find ways both round and through the national polity (p. 77).

As MSU, WU, and other similar US universities develop cross-border partnerships, the method of finding ways "both round and through the national polity" could be their biggest challenge (Maringe & de Wit, 2016). Maringe and de Wit suggested that a "distinguishing feature across all these partnership forms is the distribution and flow of human and knowledge capital" (p. 400). Maringe and de Wit also proposed that the sources of many current global problems require multiple viewpoints and tools to deal with them, including the importance of building equitable partnerships. Hagenmeier (2015) mentioned that there could be fiscal inequity between university partners, thus impacting the power dynamic between each university. Mwangi (2017) agreed and suggested that working as equals and in a collaborative context creates challenges where transactional partnerships often supersede transformational partnerships where the power dynamic between the US and non-US educational institutions sets a tone for

any project or partnership effort. While MSU and WU participants recognized that building strategically significant and mutually beneficial cross-border partnerships will require significant expenditure of both human and fiscal capital from the US university and their non-US partner, the findings from this study suggest that national policies that reflect nationalist “my country first” tendencies could inhibit potential growth of such partnerships, even in the case of what some participants referred to as “mutually beneficial partnerships.”

Suggestions for Future Research

There are several potential areas for future research based on this study. More research can be done on specific practices US universities are implementing that take into account national policies that limit and/or restrict cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. This study found that participants at two US public universities have distinctly different views on how policies that limit and/or restrict such partnerships and are reflective of anti-global and nationalistic political and public sentiments, might impact their university’s future collaborations with non-US educational institutions. There were also similarities in how each university developed partnerships, including developing them via faculty connections. More research should be done to examine how other populations feel about cross-border partnerships, including those impacted by the partnerships like students, researchers, and representatives of MSU and WU’s non-US educational institutions. Researchers should consider looking at students or researchers who are attending MSU and WU to confirm that what each university is doing fulfills the strategic mission of each institution. It would also be interesting how private US universities and community colleges are dealing with recent government restrictions.

As mentioned in the typology section in chapter two, there are differences in cross-border partnerships depending on university locations. US cross-border partnerships are not the same as

those in Europe, Asia, or Africa. This study did not directly focus on cross-border partnerships from the perspective the non-US educational institution. Future studies would need to be completed that would address the perspective of the cross-border partner. Further, aspects of inequity between partner were not addressed directly in the research questions. While some participants at both MSU and WU mentioned “mutual benefit” as important to any cross-border partnership, they also had different interpretations of what that meant. The American Council on Education (2011) mentioned that “successful partnerships will require mutual respect between the partners, a commitment to reciprocity, and a clearheaded understanding of related risks, including reputational and financial” p.22. While mutually beneficial partnerships were mentioned by some participants in this study, further study of what that entails would need be addressed in another study, especially as it impacts the power dynamic between the US and non-US partner. Zambeta (2005) suggested that anti-globalization efforts and the implementation of insular policies that reflect these efforts is to be expected, as “globalization is not a force that meets with no resistance” (p. 79). While this may be true, it is important to consider what administrators, faculty, and staff working in US higher education will do in light of further national policies that limit and/or restrict partnerships impact their future plans for transnational education, research collaborations, and strategic comprehensive internationalization goals. As the Former Associate Vice President of International Affairs at MSU pointed out:

My life has prepared me to know that this is where we're in one of those troughs right now. And, it could end tomorrow; it could end tonight. I haven't turned on the news yet today, but I don't know. But that, but also I suppose this: we can fly and we can continue to fly under the radar with our partnerships and keep them going at the level at a low but sustained level so that when there's time for them to flourish again, they will flourish. And it really behooves us to try to do that--to try to keep them alive under the radar if need be but know that they're there.

Whether cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions can continue to “fly under the radar” is hard to say. Flourishing relationships require sufficient funding and support to succeed and as the Associate Vice President of International Affairs at MSU mentioned, government sources for research investment are declining. Whereas the traditional emphasis on internationalization has been on cooperation and exchange, the competitive nature of internationalization today, with the focus on rankings, competition for students, research funding, etc., could undermine further traditional collaborative endeavors (de Wit, 2019). It will also be interesting to see how the COVID-19 pandemic will affect cross-border partnerships and if governments will enact intensive government restriction that lead to further research disinvestment as a result of the pandemic, thus inhibiting university cross-border partnerships.

Limitations to the Study

There are a number of limitations to this study that future researchers could address if they wanted to extend this research. First, this was an exploratory case study that utilized semi-structured interviews. It was important to deal with issues such as interviewer confirmation bias, the tendency to view new evidence as validation of one's prevailing views or beliefs. As the interviewer, I made every effort to allow participants' views to guide the direction of the interview and the details that supported their beliefs, but there may have been instances where my own bias may have interfered with what was being said. That said, the participants did have the opportunity to provide feedback. Of the 19 who participated, 14 provided responses and edits to the findings chapter.

The initial interviews were also limited to a specific time and space (fall and winter 2018), but as noted in chapter four, participants did adjust their comments to reflect current realities. That could suggest that a longitudinal study would provide more extensive data to

answer research question two (RQ2). Still, the time between the initial interview with participants and member checking was approximately 12 months and that gave participants the opportunity to review and edit their responses.

For this study, participants were chosen via purposive sampling. Purposive sampling is useful when a researcher wants to study trends as it relates to what are considered "typical" members of the effected population (Merriam & Tisdale, 2016). With that said, the differences between the participants at the two universities chosen for this study could also make it difficult to accurately compare each university. To be more specific, it might have been better to interview participants who held exactly similar roles at MSU and WU. Some participants had similar roles, but I allowed the Senior International Officer (SIO) at each institution to choose participants for me, as long as they were administrators, faculty, or staff. In addition, MSU had more faculty representation than WU and one more participant involved in the study. It is possible that faculty and administrators have distinctly different views on some of the issues dealt with in this study, so it might be important to address that in a future study.

It is also important to consider individual participant power dynamics in this study. Each participant in this study was chosen by their respective SIO, but was unfamiliar with, nor did I ask, the specific power dynamics within each institution's offices. I am unaware of any significant differences in how each participant is viewed at their institution. Further, I did not treat one participant as more authoritative than any other but viewed each participant equally as experts in their field.

A further limitation not addressed in this study was the issue of how power dynamics impacts university cross-border partner relationships. Universities located in other countries do not always share similar financial or human capital. The concern over inequity between

universities needs to be explored further. Hagenmeier's (2015) research on inequitable relationships suggests that the level of inequity between the US university and their non-US partner could impact cross-border partnerships.

Finally, MSU and WU are distinctly different universities. MSU is a larger research university and is part of a state system. WU is a smaller state university and does not have as broad a mandate as MSU. Both institutions have similar rubrics that describe comprehensive internationalization as described by the American Council on Education's (ACE) Center for Internationalization and Global Engagement (CIGE) mapping model (Helms et al., 2017). That said, because MSU and WU are different institutions, future researchers might want to compare universities that have more similarities.

Final Reflections

As I write this final chapter, the world is in the throes of the COVID-19 pandemic crisis. People are practicing social distancing throughout the world, companies are laying off workers, and the crisis is impacting worldwide mobility and trade. Geo-political trends suggest politicians and hate groups are perpetrating increases in xenophobic reaction against Asians, Roma, and Hispanics in the US and Europe ("COVID-19 stoking xenophobia," 2020; Stevens, 2020). Attitudes against global integration have risen since the crisis began with some suggesting that the COVID-19 pandemic could be "the nail in the coffin for the current era of globalization" (LeGrain, 2020), while others suggest that nationalism can't beat a pandemic and a global problem (Kenny, 2020). Kenny pointed to the Trump administration's failed efforts to secure exclusive US access to a coronavirus vaccine, thus supporting the "America First" platform (Oltermann, 2020).

What does this mean for international higher education and cross-border partnerships? On a practical scale, student, faculty, and researcher mobility has declined and universities are implementing online and distance learning measures. Online and distance education may be the biggest beneficiaries in the effort to enhance cross-border partnerships, with learning online, teleconferencing, and collaborative project learning across borders a possible solution (Dennis, 2020). Other possible avenues include students progressing via branch campuses, partners delivering courses overseas, education institutions providing courses as prior learning, and online education (Ilieva & Raimo, 2020).

Research collaboration between World-Class Universities (WCU) could be a continuing concern as science and innovation are not limited to local resources, but an integration of global forces (Marginson, 2018). Marginson suggested that “with the partial exception of the United States, science-based innovations in knowledge, and its applications, are largely sourced not from national science but from the store of global science” (p. 6). National policies that push disinvestment in global science and research reflects what the Associate Vice President of International Affairs at MSU saw as a movement away from innovative cross-border collaboration.

For US universities, building sustainable cross-border partnerships means heightened efforts to deal with national policies that increase scrutiny of their cross-border collaborative efforts. Already, nationalists view globalization with cynicism and as a threat to national interests (Vogel, 2020). What COVID-19 will mean for international higher education in the distant future is hard to determine. Yet, with COVID-19 creating the greatest global health threat in over a century, the post-pandemic outlook for international higher education could mean that

anti-globalists will call into question the very benefit of a global approach to this threat (Altbach & de Wit, 2020).

Universities that succeed in the post-COVID-19 world will need fiscal reserves to withstand years of potential global fiscal decline. In the immediate future (1-5 years), English-speaking countries will be “hunting scarce international students for some years to come” (Marginson, 2020), with only the fittest universities surviving (Altbach & de Wit, 2020). As fiscal limitations strain higher education, universities that are involved in cross-border partnerships will have to deal with policy limitations that could limit their collaborative efforts. Further, competition and a pandemic that threatens a university’s fiscal resources will mean some universities will have difficulty surviving. As found in this study, additional policy constraints via export controls will become more important to any cross-border partnership, reflecting US policymakers’ concern about intellectual property theft.

Conclusion

For this study, I set out to explore how two US universities developed cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions, the kinds of partnerships they developed, and the philosophical basis for developing them. This formed a basis for further questions about how these same two US universities might change their approach given geo-political trends that limit and/or restrict cross-border collaboration. I asked participants to talk about the kinds of cross-border partnerships they believed their university would develop given continuing trends, and why they thought things would change. Finally, I compared the two universities and how things might differ between them in the future if these trends continued. To answer these questions and contribute to both theoretical and practical knowledge on these topics, I conducted an exploratory, collective case study, using semi-structured interviews with 19 participants at two

US public universities. Participants in the study included faculty, administrators, and staff that have direct involvement in cross-border partnership management and development.

This study found that there are internal and external challenges in creating and sustaining cross-border partnerships when working with non-US educational institutions. At MSU, internal challenges included developing on-campus buy-in among stakeholders (i.e., students, faculty, staff, and administration), overcoming administrative risk aversion concerns, and making sure partnerships were mutually beneficial. External challenges included working with diverse concerns of non-US educational partners, communicating expectations, and non-US government policies.

At WU, internal challenges included developing financial support, assuring curricular balance between WU and the non-US partner, maintaining mutual beneficial agreements, and developing support among students participating in the various programs. External challenges included problems with credit transfer and partner curriculum (in the case of dual degree and articulations), unequal study away exchanges, and government policies both in the US and the partner country. These challenges could also limit mobility, research collaboration, and dealing with partner country education ministries and their demands involving engagement.

This study also found that US public university administrators, faculty, and staff who oversee cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions are dealing with increasing governmental restrictions; restrictions that reflect increasing concern about intellectual property theft and crackdowns on freedom of speech in partner countries that hinder further research collaboration. It will be important to consider how US and non-US cross-border partnerships will develop in the next few years, especially as anti-globalization policies might impact opportunities to collaborate. This study further found that geo-political trends that reflect

nationalist and nativist sentiments are not an isolated phenomenon but have existed at various points throughout history (Calhoun, 1993), and as Zambeta suggested “globalization is not a force that meets with no resistance” (p. 79). That resistance could impact future US higher education cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions and its role in comprehensive internationalization.

References

- Ahamer, G. (2014). Quality assurance in transnational education management: The developmental “global studies” curriculum. In S. Mukerji & P. Tripathi (Eds.), *Handbook of research on transnational higher education* (pp. 259–302). IGI Global.
- Aiginger, K., & Handler, H. (2020). *European identity politics* (Working Paper 20–1). www.querdenkereuropa.at
- Aldrich, H., & Herker, D. (1977). Boundary spanning roles and organization structure. *The Academy of Management Review*, 2(2), 217–230. <https://doi.org/10.2307/257905>
- Altbach, P. G. (2013). Is there a future for branch campuses? In P. G. Altbach (Ed.), *The international imperative in higher education* (pp. 101–106). Sense Publishers.
- Altbach, P. G. (2016). *Global perspectives on higher education*. Hopkins University Press.
- Altbach, P., & de Wit, H. (2017, April 7). Revolutions ahead in international student mobility. *University World News*. <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=2017040412022639>
- Altbach, P., & de Wit, H. (2020, April 4). *Post pandemic outlook for HE is bleakest for the poorest*. *University World News*. <https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20200402152914362>
- Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L. E. (2011). *Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution*. UNESCO & Sense Publishers.
- Altbach, P., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 11(3-4), 290–305. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315307303542>

- American Council on Education. (2011). *Strength through global leadership and engagement: U.S. higher education in the 21st century*.
- American Council on Education. (2019). Senate hearing, reports look at Chinese impact on U.S. universities. <https://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/Senate-Hearing-Reports-Look-at-Chinese-Impact-on-U-S-Universities.aspx>
- American Council on Education. (2020). *Comprehensive internationalization framework*. [Table]. <https://www.acenet.edu/Research-Insights/Pages/Internationalization/CIGE-Model-for-Comprehensive-Internationalization.aspx>
- Amey, M. J. (2010). Administrative perspectives on international partnerships. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2010(150), 57–67. <https://doi.org/10.1002/he.390>
- Ashwill, M. (2017, January 20). The turn to nativism hinders international education. *University World News*. www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20170116192441402
- Arrowood, R. J., & Hitch, L. (2016). The centrality of the faculty role in transnational partnerships: A research agenda. In P. Blessinger & B. Cozza (Eds.), *Innovations in higher education teaching and learning* (Vol. 7, pp. 39–54). Emerald Group Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S2055-3641201600000070101>
- Arum, S., & van de Water, J. (1992). The need for a definition of international education in U.S. universities. In C. Klasek (Ed.), *Bridges to the futures: Strategies for internationalizing higher education* (pp. 191–203). Association of International Education Administrators.
- Austin, A., & Foxcroft, C. (2012). Fostering organizational change and individual learning through “ground-up” inter-institutional cross-border collaboration. In R. Sakamoto & D. Chapman (Eds.), *Cross-border partnerships in higher education: Strategies and issues* (pp. 115–132). Routledge.

- Barnett, B., & Jacobson, S. (2010). Higher education partnerships for studying and improving leadership preparation and development around the world. In F. Maringe & N. Foskett (Eds.), *Globalization and internationalization in higher education: Theoretical, strategic, and management perspectives* (pp. 255–276). Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Barrow, E. (2017). No global citizenship? Re-envisioning global citizenship education in times of growing nationalism. *The High School Journal*, *100*(3), 163–165.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/hsj.2017.0005>
- Bermingham, J., & Ryan, M. (2013). Transforming international education through institutional capacity building. *New Directions for Universities*, *161*, 55–70.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.20048>
- Brandenburg, U., de Wit, H., Jones, E., & Leask, B. (2019). Internationalisation in higher education for society. *University World News*.
<https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20190414195843914>
- Bresser-Pereira, L. C. (2008). Globalization, nation-state and catching up. *Revista de Economia Política*, *28*(4), 557–576. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0101-31572008000400002>
- Brewer, E. (2015). Beloit College: Internationalization in the American Midwest. In J. Hudzik (Ed.), *Comprehensive internationalization: Institutional pathways to success* (pp. 135–143). Routledge.
- Calhoun, C. (1993). Nationalism and ethnicity. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *19*(1), 211–239.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.19.080193.001235>
- Cameron, K. (1984). Organizational adaptation and higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education* *55*(2), 122–144. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1981182>

- Chapman, B. (2017). G7 Summit: Donald Trump calls Germans ‘bad, very bad’ and vows to curb foreign car imports. *The Independent*.
<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/business/news/donald-trump-g7-summit-germans-bad-very-bad-car-imports-curb-us-trade-surplus-president-a7757106.html>
- Chapman, D., & Sakamoto, R. (2011). The future of cross-border partnerships in higher education. In R. Sakamoto & D. Chapman (Eds.), *Cross-border partnerships in higher education: Strategies and issues* (pp. 265–270). Routledge.
- Chapman, D., & Pekol, A. (2012, November 21-23). *Cross-border collaboration in higher education: Learning to work together*. Paper presented at the UNESCO-APEID International Conference, Bangkok, Thailand.
http://www.unescobkk.org/fileadmin/user_upload/apeid/Conference/16thConference/papers/D._Chapman_and_A._Pekol_-_cross_border_collaboration__10-16-12.pdf
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Sage.
- Coleman, D. (2003). Quality assurance in transnational education. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 7(4), 354–78. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315303255597>
- Coulby, D., & Zambeta, E. (2005). Introduction: Trends in globalization. In D. Coulby & E. Zambeta (Eds.), *Globalization and nationalism in education* (pp. 1–19). Routledge.
- Creswell, J. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Sage.
- Cucu, S., Peck, J., & Ittel, A. (2016). Global networks: Helping or hindering strategic partnerships. In C. Banks, B. Siebe-Herbig, & K. Norton (Eds.), *Global perspectives on strategic international partnerships* (pp. 159–164). Institute of International Education.

- de Wit, H. (2019). Internationalization in higher education, a critical review. *SFU Educational Review*, 12(3), 9–17. <https://doi.org/10.21810/sfuer.v12i3.1036>
- de Wit, H., & Altbach, P. (2018, August 11). Dramatic instability in international higher education. *Inside Higher Education*. <https://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/world-view/dramatic-instability-international-higher-education>
- de Wit, H., Gacel-Ávila, J., & Jones, E. (2017). Voices and perspectives on internationalization from the emerging and developing world: Where are we heading? In H. de Wit, J. Gacel-Ávila, E. Jones, & N. Jooste (Eds.), *The globalization of internationalization: Emerging voices and perspectives* (pp. 283–301). Routledge.
- de Wit, H., & Hunter, F. (2015). The future of internationalization of higher education in Europe. *International Higher Education*, 83, 2–3. <https://doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2015.83.9073>
- de Wit, H., & Merckx, G. (2012). The history of internationalization of higher education. In D. K. Deardorff, H. de Wit, J. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of international higher education* (pp. 43–59). Sage.
- Deardorff, D. K., de Wit, H., & Heyl, J. (2012). Bridges to the future: The global landscape of international higher education. In D. K. Deardorff, H. de Wit, J. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of international higher education* (pp. 457–485). Sage.
- Dennis, M. J. (2017). International student mobility and the new world disorder. *Enrollment Management Report*, 21(8), 3–3. <https://doi.org/10.1002/emt.30354>
- Dennis, M. (2019, May 11). *Fewer Chinese students in the US may not be a bad thing*. *University World News*.
<https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20190507111155578>

Eddy, P. L. (2010). Editor's notes. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2010(150), 3–6.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/he.385>

Egron-Polak, E., & Marmolejo, F. (2017). Higher education internationalization: Adjusting to new landscapes. In H. de Wit, J. Gacel-Ávila, E. Jones, & N. Jooste (Eds.), *The globalization of internationalization: Emerging voices and perspectives* (pp. 9–16). Routledge.

Emerson, R. (1962). Power-dependence relations. *American Sociological Review*, 27(1), 31-41.

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2089716>

Fischer, K. (2019). Visas revoked at the border put a new dent in American higher ed's image abroad. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/Visas-Revoked-at-the-Border/247074>

Frost, R. (2011). One college, one world: A small town community college and the impact of globalization. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 35(9), 710-723.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10668920801949521d>

Ghemawat, P., & Bastian, P. (2017). (Anti)globalization and higher education.

<http://bized.aacsb.edu/articles/2017/07/anti-globalization-and-higher-education>

Godwin, K. A., & de Wit, H. (Eds.). (2020). *Intelligent internationalization: The shape of things to come*. Brill Sense.

Green, M., & Siaya, L. (2005). *Measuring internationalization at universities*.

<http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/Measuring-CommunityCollege.pdf>

Guo, R. (2015). *Cross-border management: Theory, method, and application*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.

- Guttal, S. (2007). Globalisation. *Development in Practice*, 17(4–5), 523–531.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09614520701469492>
- Hanban. (2007). <http://english.hanban.org/>
- Harder, N. (2010). Internationalization efforts in United States universities: A comparative analysis of urban, suburban, and rural institutions. *University Journal of Research and Practice*, 35(1), 152–64. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2011.525186>
- Hawawini, G. (2016). Internationalization: Motives. In G. Hawawini (Ed.), *The Internationalization of Higher Education and Business Schools* (pp. 17–26). Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-1757-5_3
- Helms, R. M., Brajkovic, L., & Struthers, B. (2017). *Mapping internationalization on US campuses: 2017 edition*. American Council on Education Website.
<https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/Mapping-Internationalization-2017.pdf>
- Hofstede, G. H., Hofstede, G. J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organization: Software of the mind: Intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival*. McGraw-Hill.
- Howlett, M., & Ramesh, M. (2002). The policy effects of internationalization: A subsystem adjustment analysis of policy change. *Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis*, 4(1), 31–50.
- Hudzik, J. (2015a). *Comprehensive internationalization: Institutional pathways to success*. Routledge.
- Hudzik, J. (2015b). Strategic institutional partnerships and comprehensive internationalization. In N. Jooste, H. de Wit, & S. Heleta (Eds.), *Higher education: Partnerships for the future* (pp. 23–40). Unit for Higher Education Internationalization in the Developing World.

- Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (NMMU). http://www.highered-research.com/2015/11/25/higher-education_partnerships_for_the_future/
- Ilieva, J. (2017). Do political events in host countries affect international education engagement? *Australian International Education Conference 2017. Embracing Diversity*, 1–31. http://aiec.idp.com/uploads/pdf/PDFs%20AIEC%202017/Do_political_events_in_host_countries_affect_international_education_engagement_Dr_Janet_Ilieva_AIEC2017.pdf
- Ilieva, J., & Raimo, V. (2020, March 28). *Challenges of student recruitment in the age of COVID-19. University World News*. <https://www.universityworldnews.com/post.php?story=20200327082653290>
- Institute of International Education. (2016). Top 25 places of origin of international students. *Open Doors Report on International Educational Exchange*. <http://www.iie.org/opendoors>
- Jette, D., Grover, L., & Keck, C. (2003). A qualitative study of clinical decision making in recommending discharge placement from the acute care setting. *Physical Therapy*, 83(3), 224–236. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ptj/83.3.224>
- Jooste, N. (2015). Higher education partnerships for the future: A view from the south. In N. Jooste, H. de Wit, & S. Heleta (Eds.), *Higher education: Partnerships for the future*, (11–22). Unit for Higher Education Internationalization in the Developing World. Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (NMMU). http://www.highered-research.com/2015/11/25/higher-education_partnerships_for_the_future/
- Karni, A. (2018). Trump rants behind closed doors with CEOs. <https://politi.co/2vQw5jA>

- Kenny, C. (2020). *Has “America First” met its match in the coronavirus?* Slate.
<https://slate.com/technology/2020/03/history-smallpox-vaccine-nationalism-coronavirus.html>
- Klasek, C. (1992). Inter-institutional cooperation guidelines and agreements. In C. Klasek, B. Garavalia, K. Kellerman, & B. Marx (Eds.), *Bridges to the future: Strategies for internationalizing higher education* (pp. 108–128). Association of International Education Administrators.
- Knight, J. (1994). *Internationalization: Elements and checkpoints*. CBIE Research No. 7. Canadian Bureau for International Education (CBIE).
- Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales.” *Journal of Studies in International Education* (8)1, 5–31.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315303260832>
- Knight, J. (2007). Cross-border higher education: Issues and implications for quality assurance and accreditation. In Global University Network for innovation (Ed.), *Higher education in the world 2007: Accreditation for quality assurance: What is at stake?* (pp. 134–146). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Knight, J. (2008). *Higher education in turmoil: The changing world of internationalization*. Sense Publishers.
- Knight, J. (2011). Higher education crossing borders: A framework and overview of new developments and issues. In R. Sakamoto & D. Chapman (Eds.), *Cross-border partnerships in higher education: Strategies and issues* (pp. 16–41). Routledge.
- Knight, J. (2014). Introduction. In J. Knight (Ed.), *International education hubs* (pp. 1–12). Springer Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-7025-6_1

- Knight, J. (2015). Updated definition of internationalization. *International Higher Education*, 33. <https://doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2003.33.7391>
- Knight, J. (2018). International education hubs. In P. Meusburger, M. Heffernan, & L. Suarsana (Eds.), *Geographies of the university* (pp. 637–655). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-75593-9_21
- Knight, J., & Lee, J. (2012). International joint, double, and consecutive degree programs: New developments, issues, and challenges. In D. K. Deardorff, H. de Wit, J. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of international higher education* (pp. 343–358). Sage.
- Koromi, C. (2020). *What are college articulation agreements all about?* CollegeExpress. <https://www.collegexpress.com/interests/transfer/articles/how-transfer/what-are-college-articulation-agreements-all-about/>
- Korstjens, I., & Moser, A. (2018). Series: Practical guidance to qualitative research. Part 4: Trustworthiness and publishing. *European Journal of General Practice*, 24(1), 120–124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13814788.2017.1375092>
- Lane, J. (2011). Global expansion of international branch campuses: Managerial and leadership challenges. In J. Lane & K. Kinser (Eds.), *Multinational colleges and universities: Leading, governing, and managing international branch campuses* (pp. 5–17). Jossey-Bass.
- Lane, J., & Kinser, K. (2011). The cross-border education policy context: Educational hubs, trade liberalization, and national sovereignty. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2011(155), 79–85. <https://doi.org/10.1002/he.446>

- Lane, J., Kinser, K., & Zhang, L. (2018). Cross-border educational accountability: Navigating accountability expectations when educational provision crosses borders. In E. Hazelkorn, H. Coates, & A. C. McCormick (Eds.), *Research handbook on quality, performance and accountability in higher education*. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Laws, K., & Ammigan, R. (2020). International students in the Trump era. *Journal of International Students*, 10(3). <https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v10i3.2001>
- League of nationalists. (2016, November 16). *The Economist*.
<https://www.economist.com/international/2016/11/19/league-of-nationalists>
- Lee, E. (2020). America first, immigrants last: American xenophobia then and now. *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era*, 19(1), 3–18.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537781419000409>
- Lee, J. (2019). The “China threat” in US universities. In NAFSA 2018-2019 Senior Fellows (Eds.), *International education in a time of global disruption*. International Association of International Educators (NAFSA).
https://shop.nafsa.org/detail.aspx?id=SF2019&_ga=2.116285838.986696503.1571395195-1466626333.1570475833
- LeGrain, P. (2020, March 12). *The coronavirus is killing globalization and empowering nationalists and protectionists*. Foreign Policy.
<https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/03/12/coronavirus-killing-globalization-nationalism-protectionism-trump/>
- Levin, J. (2001). *Globalizing the community college: Strategies for change in the twenty-first century*. Palgrave.

- Levy, A., & Merry, U. (1986). *Organizational transformation: Approaches, strategies, theories*. Praeger.
- Mann, M. (1997). Has globalization ended the rise and rise of the nation-state? *Review of International Political Economy*, 4(3), 472–496.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/096922997347715>
- Marginson, S. (1999). After globalization: Emerging politics of education. *Journal of Education Policy*, 14(1), 19–31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/026809399286477>
- Marginson, S. (2018). *The new geo-politics of higher education: Global cooperation, national competition and social inequality in the World-Class University (WCU) sector*. Centre for Global Higher Education Working Paper No. 34.
<https://www.researchcghe.org/publications/working-paper/the-new-geo-politics-of-higher-education/>
- Marginson, S. (2020, March 25). *Risk and reputational challenges and how to tackle them*. International Higher Education Forum Online.
<https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/events/Pages/IHEF-2020.aspx>
- Maringe, F. (2010). The meanings of globalization and internationalization in HE: Findings from a world survey. In N. Foskett & F. Maringe (Eds.), *Globalization and internationalization in higher education: Theoretical, strategic and management perspectives*. Continuum.
- Maringe, F., & de Wit, H. (2016). Global higher education partnerships: Equity and epistemic concerns with distribution and flows of intellectual capital. In J. E. Côté & A. Furlong (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of the sociology of higher education* (pp. 299–314). Routledge.

- Martel, M. (2020, March). *COVID-19 effects on US higher education campuses*. Institute of International Education. <https://www.iie.org:443/Research-and-Insights/Publications/COVID-19-Effects-on-US-Higher-Education-Campuses>
- Mathison, S. (1988). Why triangulate? *Educational Researcher*, 17(2), 13–17.
<https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X017002013>
- May, E. T. (2017). *Fortress America: How we embraced fear and abandoned democracy*. Basic Books.
- Merriam, S. B. (2002). Introduction to qualitative research. *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis*, 1(1), 1-17.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Wiley.
- Miroff, N. (2020, February 11). Trump is fulfilling his pledge to build fortress America—And running on it. *Washington Post*. https://www.washingtonpost.com/immigration/trump-is-fulfilling-his-pledge-to-build-fortress-america--and-running-on-it/2020/02/11/39a2fbb8-4863-11ea-8124-0ca81effcdfb_story.html
- Morgan, G. (1997). *Images of organization*. Sage.
- Mwangi, C. A. G. (2017). Partner positioning: Examining international higher education partnerships through a mutuality lens. *The Review of Higher Education*, 41(1), 33–60.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2017.0032>
- NAFSA: Association of International Educators. (2017). Senator Paul Simon Award for Campus Internationalization. <http://www.nafsa.org>

- National Defense Authorization Act. (2018). <https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/house-bill/2810>
- Nezvi, F. (2017, March 8). *Possibilities of a post-globalization educational policyscape*. Lecture presented at CIES 2017 in Sheraton Hotel, Atlanta, Georgia.
- Nolan, R., & Hunter, F. (2012). Institutional strategies and international programs: Learning from experiences of change. In *The SAGE handbook of international higher education* (pp. 131–146). Sage.
- Noor, K. B. M. (2008). Case study: A strategic research methodology. *American Journal of Applied Sciences*, 5(11), 1602–1604.
- Observatory on Borderless Higher Education. (2020). <http://www.obhe.ac.uk/>
- OECD (2016). *Education at a Glance 2016: OECD Indicators*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/eag-2016-en>
- OECD. (2004). *Internationalization and trade in higher education: Opportunities and challenges*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264015067-en>
- OECD. (2005, May). UNESCO, OECD guidelines for quality provision in cross-border higher education. <http://www.oecd.org/general/unescooecdguidelinesforqualityprovisionincross-borderhighereducation.htm>
- Olcott, D., Jr. (2009). Global connections to global partnerships: Navigating the changing landscape of internationalism and cross-border higher education. *Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, 59, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07377360902804085>
- Olson, C., Evans, R., & Shoenberg, R. (2007). *At home in the world: Bridging the gap between internationalization and multicultural education*. 1–60.

<https://www.acenet.edu/Documents/at-home-in-the-world.pdf>

- Oltermann, P. (2020, March 15). Trump “offers large sums” for exclusive US access to coronavirus vaccine. *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2020/mar/15/trump-offers-large-sums-for-exclusive-access-to-coronavirus-vaccine>
- Paletta, D., & Swanson, A. (2017). Trump suggests ignoring World Trade Organization in major policy shift. *Washington Post*.
https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2017/03/01/trump-may-ignore-wto-in-major-shift-of-u-s-trade-policy/?utm_term=.da6321f42086
- Patton, M. Q. (2005). Qualitative research. In B. S. Everitt & D. C. Howell (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of statistics in behavioral science*. Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/0470013192.bsa514>
- Pernecky, T. (2016). *Epistemology and metaphysics for qualitative research*. Sage.
- Peterson, P. (2017, August 15). The call for patriotic internationalism. *Inside Higher Education*.
<https://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/world-view/call-patriotic-internationalism>
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. (1978). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective*. Stanford Business Books.
- Pisani-Ferry, J. (2018). *Should we give up on global governance?* Bruegel Policy Contribution, (Working Paper No. 17). <https://bruegel.org>
- Prawat, R. S. (1996). Constructivisms, modern and postmodern. *Educational Psychologist*, 31(3–4), 215–225. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.1996.9653268>
- Pysarchik, D. T., & Hudzik, J. (2015). Michigan State University: Origins and evolution of an institution toward a global frame. In J. Hudzik (Ed.), *Comprehensive internationalization: Institutional pathways to success* (pp. 166–174). Routledge.

- Ramirez, F., Meyer, J., & Lerch, J. (2016). World society and the globalization of educational policy. In K. Mundy, A. Green, B. Lingard, & A. Verger (Eds.), *The handbook of global education policy* (pp. 43–63). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118468005.ch2>
- Raskin, J. (2002). Constructivism in psychology: Personal construct psychology, radical constructivism, and social constructionism. In J. D. Raskin & S. K. Bridges (Eds.), *Studies in meaning: Exploring constructivist psychology* (pp. 1–25). Pace University Press.
- Redden, E. (2019, May 1). *Three more universities close Confucius Institutes*. Inside Higher Education. <https://www.insidehighered.com/quicktakes/2019/05/01/3-more-universities-close-confucius-institutes>
- Regulska, J., & Burrola, B. (2016). Fostering strategic partnerships: The critical role of NGOs in partnership development. In C. Banks, B. Siebe-Herbig, & K. Norton (Eds.) *Global perspectives on strategic international partnerships: A guide to building sustainable academic linkages* (pp. 121–132). Institute of International Education.
- Rhoades, G., & Slaughter, S. (1997). Academic capitalism, managed professionals, and supply-side higher education. *Social Text*, 51(9). <https://doi.org/10.2307/466645>
- Ritchie, J., Lewis, Jane, & Elam, G. (2003). Designing and selecting samples. In J. Ritchie & J. Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers* (pp. 77–137). Sage Publications.
- https://mthoyibi.files.wordpress.com/2011/10/qualitative-research-practice_a-guide-for-social-science-students-and-researchers_jane-ritchie-and-jane-lewis-eds_20031.pdf

- Rizvi, F. (2017, March 8). *Possibilities of a post-globalization educational policyscape*. Address presented at Comparative & International Education Society Conference in Sheraton Hotel, Atlanta, Georgia.
- Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2010). *Globalizing education policy*. Routledge.
- Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization: Social theory and global culture* (M. Featherstone, Ed.). Sage.
- Robertson, R., & Lechner, F. (1985). Modernization, globalization, and the problem of culture in world-systems theory. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 2, 103–117.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276485002003009>
- Ryan, M. (2011). *U.S. university professional staff seek South African doctoral degrees: An analysis of an international doctoral program partnership* (Publication No. ED534432) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.
- Saad-Filho, A., & Johnston, D. (2005). *Neoliberalism: A critical reader*. Pluto Press.
- Sakamoto, R., & Chapman, D. (2011). Expanding across borders: The growth of cross-border partnerships in higher education. In R. Sakamoto & D. Chapman (Eds.), *Cross-border partnerships in higher education: Strategies and issues* (pp. 3–15). Routledge.
- Sanyal, B., & Martin, M. (2007). Quality assurance and the role of accreditation: An overview. In Global University Network for Innovation (Eds.), *Higher education in the world 2007: Accreditation for quality assurance: What is at stake?* Palgrave Macmillan.
- Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Scott, W., & Davis, G. (2007). *Organizations and organizing: Rational, natural, and open system perspectives*. Pearson Prentice Hall.

- Seawright, J., & Gerring, J. (2008). Case selection techniques in case study research: A menu of qualitative and quantitative options. *Political Research Quarterly*, 61(2), 294–308.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912907313077>
- Sexton, T. L. (1997). Constructivist thinking within the history of ideas: The challenge of a new paradigm. In T. L. Sexton & B. L. Griffin (Eds.), *Constructivist thinking in counseling practice, research, and training* (pp. 3–18). Teachers College Press.
- Shenton, A. K. (2004). Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information*, 22, 63-75.
- Sipe, D. (2014). *Internationalization in Oregon and Washington universities*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Oregon State University).
<http://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1957/48386/SipeDeborahM2014.pdf?sequence=1>
- Slusarciuc, M. (2013). Partnership and cooperation models in cross-border areas. *Acta Universitatis Danubius. Œconomica*, 9(4), 267–280.
- Smircich, L. (1983). Concepts of culture and organizational analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 28, 339–358. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2392246>
- Soderqvist, M. (2002). *Internationalization and its management at higher-education institutions: Applying conceptual, content and discourse analysis*. Helsinki School of Economics.
- Stella, A. (2006). Quality assurance of cross-border higher education. *Quality in Higher Education*, 12(3), 257–276. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13538320601072859>
- Stevens, M. (2020, March 29). How Asian-American leaders are grappling with xenophobia amid coronavirus. *The New York Times*.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/29/us/politics/coronavirus-asian-americans.html>

- Sutton, S. (2010, January-February). Transforming internationalization through partnerships. *International Educator*, 60–63.
<https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/bitstream/handle/1805/4593/sutton-2010-transforming.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- Sutton, S., & Obst, D. (2011). The changing landscape of international partnerships. In S. B. Sutton & D. Obst (Eds.), *Developing strategic international partnerships: Models for initiating and sustaining innovative institutional linkages* (pp. xiii–xxiii). Institute of International Education.
- Sutton, S. B., Egginton, E., & Favela, R. (2012). Collaborating on the future: Strategic partnerships and linkages. In D. Deardorff, H. de Wit, J. Heyl, & J. Heyl (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of international higher education* (pp. 147–166). Sage.
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452218397.n9>
- Swanson, A. (2017). Trump administration formally launches NAFTA renegotiation. *Washington Post*. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2017/05/18/trump-administration-formally-launches-nafta-renegotiation/?utm_term=.732428ae9e4c
- Taylor, J. (2010). The response of governments and universities to globalization and internationalization in higher education. In F. Maringe & N. Foskett (Eds.), *Globalization in higher education: Theoretical, strategic and management perspectives* (pp. 83–96). Continuum.
- Teeple, G. (1995). *Globalization and the decline of social reform*. Humanities Press.
- Theel, J. (2012). *A comparative case study of partnership development between Christian institutions of higher education located in the United States and Eastern Europe*

(Publication 3527492) [Doctoral Dissertation, Azusa Pacific University]. ProQuest Dissertations.

Thorsen, D., & Lie, A. (2010). What is neoliberalism?

<http://folk.uio.no/daget/What%20is%20Neo-Liberalism%20FINAL.pdf>

Threats to the U.S. Research Enterprise: China's Talent Recruitment Plans. (2019).

<https://www.hsgac.senate.gov/subcommittees/investigations/hearings/securing-the-us-research-enterprise-from-chinas-talent-recruitment-plans>

Tongco, M. D. C. (2007). Purposive sampling as a tool for informant selection. *Ethnobotany Research and Applications*, 5, 147–158.

Tubbeh, L., & Williams, J. (2010). Framing issues of international education. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 150, 7–16. <https://doi.org/10.1002/he.386>

Turner, P. K. (2019). The voice of communication in comprehensive internationalization.

Communication Research and Practice, 5(1), 23–38.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/22041451.2019.1561395>

COVID-19 stoking xenophobia, hate and exclusion, minority rights expert warns. (2020, March 30). UN News. <https://news.un.org/en/story/2020/03/1060602>

USAID. (2012). *Education, opportunity through learning. USAID education strategy*. United States Agency for International Development.

USAID. (2011). *Education: Opportunity through learning: USAID education strategy, 2011–2015*. United States Agency for International Development.

USDOE. (2017). The database of accredited postsecondary institutions and programs.

<https://ope.ed.gov/accreditation/agencies.aspx>

US Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. (2019). *Threats to the U.S. research enterprise: China's talent recruitment plans*.

<https://www.hsgac.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/2019-11-18%20PSI%20Staff%20Report%20-%20China's%20Talent%20Recruitment%20Plans%20Updated2.pdf>

Van der Wende, M. C. (1997). Missing links. The relationship between national policies for internationalization and those for higher education in general. In T. Kälvermark & M. C. van der Wende (Eds.), *National policies for internationalization of higher education in Europe* (pp. 10-42). National Agency for Higher Education.

Vincent-Lancrin, S. (2011). Cross-border higher education and the internationalization of academic research. In R. Sakamoto & D. Chapman (Eds.), *Cross-border partnerships in higher education: Strategies and issues* (pp. 93–114). Routledge.

WASC. (2014, October). International Education Resource Guide.

<https://www.wscuc.org/content/international-education-resource-guide>

Weiss, T. G., & Wilkinson, R. (2019). *Rethinking global governance*. Polity Press.

Whiting, L. S. (2008). Semi-structured interviews: Guidance for novice researchers. *Nursing Standard*, 22(23), 35.

Wilson, E. (2012). *Faculty perceptions of success in cross-border university-to-university partnerships*. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota].

http://conservancy.umn.edu/bitstream/handle/11299/130391/Wilson_umn_0130E_12664.pdf?sequence=1

- Wu, H., & Zha, Q. (2018). A New Typology for Analyzing the Direction of Movement in Higher Education Internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 22(3), 259–277. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315318762582>
- Yin, R. K. (2013). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Sage.
- Yin, R. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Sage.
- Young, J. G. (2017). Making America 1920 again? Nativism and US immigration, past and present. *Journal on Migration and Human Security*, 5(1), 217–235.
<https://doi.org/10.14240/jmhs.v5i1.8>
- Youssef, L. (2014). Globalisation and higher education: From within-border to cross-border. *open learning: The Journal of Open, Distance and e-Learning*, 29(2), 100–115.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02680513.2014.932686>
- Zambeta, E. (2005). The survival of nationalism in a globalized system. In D. Coulby & E. Zambeta (Eds.), *Globalization and nationalism in education* (pp. 59–88). Routledge.
- Ziguras, C., & McBurnie, G. (2015). *Governing cross-border higher education*. Routledge.

Appendix A

Email to Potential Study Participants

Dear Senior International Officer:

I'm reaching out to US university international affairs administrators, faculty, and staff who are involved in initiating, developing, creating, and maintaining cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions for their university to recruit participants in a study entitled *The Impact of Geo-Political Trends on US University Cross-Border Partnerships with Non-US Educational Institutions: An Exploratory Case Study* which I am conducting for my dissertation for the doctorate in higher education administration at Oregon State University. My dissertation chair and principal investigator is Dr. Larry Roper, whom I've included in this email.

This is a qualitative, exploratory case study focusing on three research questions:

- How, what kind of, and why were cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions developed at two public four-year US universities?
- How, what kind of, and why will cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions develop and/or change at US universities if nationalistic geo-political trends reflective of xenophobic/nativist sentiments in the US and around the world continue?
- How might cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions at two public four-year US universities differ from each other in the future if nationalistic geo-political trends reflective of xenophobic/nativist sentiments in the US and around the world continue and what will be the basis for the differences?

This research has both theoretical and practical applications. In terms of research, it will address gaps in the literature about how US university international administrators and staff, as well as faculty who work with cross-border partnerships make sense of how geo-political trends are impacting the work that they do with these partnerships. In terms of practice, the study will provide recommendations regarding US higher education cross-border partnerships that can be applied to training university personnel who work with these partnerships and suggestions for university development of cross-border partnerships.

Participants in the study will need to agree to engage in two interviews which will be approximately an hour long in duration each. Interviews may be conducted in person if feasible, but most will probably need to be conducted via Skype, Facetime, or some similar app. Phone interviews are also an option. The interviews will be recorded to ensure accuracy in the transcription and coding process. To ensure the protection of the participants, I will offer participants the option to use pseudonyms for both themselves and the name of the universities in which they serve(d). Finally, as part of the validation process, participants will be given the opportunity to read transcripts of their interviews and the drafts of the research findings in order to give feedback and clarify points. You have the right to decline to answer one or more of the interview questions and you have the right to request that the interview end at any point.

If you are interested in participating in this study, please respond to this email. Afterwards, I will contact you to schedule dates for your first and second interviews. I will also send you a confidentiality agreement. Thank you for considering participation in this research project. Current geo-political trends and their impact on US university cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions have become an important concern among international educators and the universities they represent. Your participation will not only help fill theoretical gaps but provide practical knowledge to current and future leaders who work with university cross-border partnerships, especially in light of current and future geo-political trends that impact institutional comprehensive internationalization.

Sincerely,

Daniel T. Ferguson, Ph.D. Candidate
Doctoral Candidate at Oregon State University.
xxx@oregonstate.edu

Larry D. Roper
Professor, School of Language, Culture and Society
Coordinator, College Student Services Administration
Coordinator, Social Justice Minor
203 Waldo Hall
Oregon State University
Corvallis, OR 97331
Larry.roper@oregonstate.edu

Appendix B

Explanation of Research

Project Title: The Geo-Political Trends on US University Cross-Border Partnerships with Non-US Educational Institutions: An Exploratory Case Study.

Principal Investigator: Larry Roper, PhD

Student Researcher: Daniel T. Ferguson

Version Date: June 4, 2018

Purpose: You are being asked to take part in a research study. The purpose of this research study is to conduct a qualitative, exploratory case study on how international affairs administrators, impacted faculty, and staff draw on their cognitive schema to make sense of how current national and international geo-political trends impact cross-border partnerships with international higher educational institutions at their universities. Your understanding of these trends and your experience working in collaboration with non-US educational institutional representatives from other countries will focus on your impressions and beliefs about the issues involved in past and current cross-border partnership initiation, development, creation, and maintenance of these partnerships at your university. This study will further investigate how current national and international geo-political trends might impact future challenges, opportunities, and risks that international affairs administrators, impacted faculty, and staff at US public universities may face in initiating, creating, developing, and maintaining cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions. The results of this study will be used for the student researcher's dissertation.

Activities: The study activities include participation in two semi-structured interviews which can be conducted in person if feasible or via a digital application like Skype or Facetime. Phone interviews are also possible.

Interviews will be recorded and transcribed. Recordings will be destroyed once transcribed and validated by the participant. If participants do not wish to be recorded, they should not participate in this study.

The second interview will be used as a member checking procedure and be scheduled within two months after the first round of data is collected, dependent on approval of a program revision by IRB at Oregon State University. If a participant is unable to participate in second round interviews, the data collected during the first round will still be used with a note added to the study indicating this limitation to the data. If you have suggested transcript changes please respond within one month. If participants have not responded within one month the data will still be used.

Data will be shared with participants as a measure to increase the validity of findings. Each participant will be provided with a copy of their interview transcripts to check for accuracy and clarify their points. In addition, all the participants will be presented with a copy of the final research findings.

Time: Your participation in this study will last about an hour for each interview.

Risks: By participating in this study there is always the risk that someone might be able to identify either you or the institution where you were employed. To minimize this risk in this study you and the institution in which you served will be referred to through the use of pseudonyms. The researcher will know who you are and the researcher will keep all data confidential.

Benefit: We do not know if you will benefit from being in this study. However, the study will add to the theoretical research on how administrators, faculty, and staff approach cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions at their university. It will also provide practical knowledge that can contribute to the training and recruitment of university administrators, faculty, and staff.

Payment: You will not be paid for being in this research study.

Confidentiality: Other people may learn that you participated in this study but the information you provide will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law. The researcher will offer you the choice of using your real name or adopting a pseudonym to provide confidentiality. The information obtained from this study may be used for future research studies involving the completion of the student researcher's dissertation and/or publications in academic journals based on this research.

The security and confidentiality of information collected online cannot be guaranteed. Confidentiality will be kept to the extent permitted by the technology being used. Information collected online can be intercepted, corrupted, lost, destroyed, arrive late or incomplete, or contain viruses.

Voluntary: Participation in this study is voluntary. If questions are posed by the researcher that you would prefer not to answer, you may decline to respond. Participants can withdraw their participation from the study at any time. If you choose to withdraw from this research before it ends, data collected may be used by the researchers

Study contacts: If you have any questions about this research project, please contact: Larry Roper, PhD at larry.ropер@oregonstate.edu. If you have questions about your rights or welfare as a participant, please contact the Oregon State University Human Research Protection Program (HRPP) office, at (541) 737-8008 or by email at IRB@oregonstate.edu

Appendix C: Semi-Structured Interview Protocol

Semi-structured Interview Protocol

Whiting (2008) recommends using distinct stages when designing semi-structured interviews. First, the process should begin with prompt questions, described as open-ended questions designed to both put the respondent at ease and begin to stimulate their memory about the subject being investigated. This is followed by an exploratory phrase, where direct open-ended questions are used to delve more deeply into the topic and a co-operative phrase, where a strong comfort level has been established enabling a more free-form discussion to take place. To allow for the respondent to be more actively involved in the learning process from the interview, the interview moves into the participation phrase which is characterized by the respondent guiding and teaching the interviewer about the subject. Finally, there is the conclusion phrase, where the interviewer thanks the respondent and ends the interview with both parties feeling comfortable about the interview and ready to finish.

Level 1 – Verbal Interview Questions

Since this is a semi-structured interview process, the following questions will serve as a basic guide for the researcher during the interview process. The researcher is free to deviate from this script to ask for clarification on points, probe different responses more deeply, and put the respondent at ease with more general, conversational follow-up questions.

The questions for this protocol are designed to be broad and open ended at first to give participants the space to define and categorize aspects of their impressions and beliefs. What motivations the respondent has in developing cross-border partnerships is reflected in how the respondent feels about policy and practice changes, their part in being involved with cross-border partnerships, their experiences in international education, the kind of partnerships their university

has (e.g., branch campuses, study abroad programs, articulation agreements, English-medium programs or degrees), and describes how and why they made sense of it that way.

The questions narrow throughout the protocol to have participants focus on what they perceive to be challenges and opportunities, and what approaches they will take going forward when it comes to cross-border partnerships. If the participants adopt the terms “cross-border,” “challenges,” “opportunities,” and “approaches” and define them I will proceed with the interview using the terms they have suggested, replacing these terms with the terms they use. Likewise, I will avoid using any technical terms like personality traits, behaviors, and competencies unless the participant incorporates them into the conversation.

Prompt Questions – Breaking the Ice

- How would you like to be identified in this study?
- What has been your role in developing cross-border partnerships for the university?
- Where are your university’s cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions abroad located?

Exploratory Questions—Research Question 1

- How were past cross-border relationships developed, created, and maintained at your university (e.g., via faculty connections, administrative connections, via the partner)?
- What form/kind of partnership was developed and what were the challenges in developing them?
- Why were international partnerships at your university developed in the past and what impact did they have on your university?

- How did US governmental policies and those where the partnerships were located when the partnerships were created, affect your university's involvement in cross-border partnerships?

Exploratory Questions—Research Question 2

- How have cross-border partnerships at your university been impacted by the rise of nativism in the US and around the world?
- What challenges and new opportunities in developing cross-border partnerships will you face as an (administrator, faculty member, staff member) if current nativist geo-political trends continue?
- Do you think your university will change its cross-border partnerships as a result of current nativist trends in the US and around the world? Why or why not?

Exploratory Questions—Research Question 3

- What policy changes and related challenges, opportunities, and future risks is your university facing in developing, creating, and maintaining cross-border partnerships with non-US educational institutions?
- What will be the basis for the changes if your university's cross-border partnerships will change in the future as a result of continuing national and international nativist geo-political trends?

Cooperative Phase

- How has your involvement in international education prepared you for the challenges of working with cross-border partnerships?

Participation Phase – Respondent as Guide and Teacher

- What do you think is the best way of dealing with the current political situation in the work you do with cross-border partnerships?

Conclusion Questions

- Do you have any concluding thoughts to share about this topic?

Level 2 – Mental Questions for the Researcher During the Interview

As Yin (2014) described, level two questions are mental questions that the researcher keeps in mind during the interview process that inform the pre-scripted questions as well as impromptu lines of inquiry that emerge based on information that is revealed during the interview.

- How did the cognitive schema of the respondent inform their sense-making approach to understanding the challenges, opportunities, and future approaches they might face?
- How did the respondent's sense-making approach inform their role as an administrator, faculty, or staff involved in developing, creating, and maintaining cross-border partnerships at their university?
- How do the impressions and beliefs about nativism and its impact on international engagement across borders the respondents describe fall within the multi-dimensional framework proposed for this study?
- Does the respondent's description of their university's cross-border partnerships match a theoretical model of cross-border partnerships in higher education?
- How often do environmental variables such as nativism in society emerge as factors influencing respondents' sense-making and approach to developing cross-border partnerships?