Routledge Studies in Library and Information Science

THE INTERNATIONALIZATION OF THE ACADEMIC LIBRARY

Emmett Lombard

The Internationalization of the Academic Library

The Internationalization of the Academic Library presents a theoretically informed, empirically grounded analysis of the process of academic library internationalization.

Drawing on interviews with library personnel from around the world, Lombard analyzes internationalization at the departmental level of an academic library. Demonstrating that college and library personnel have positive intentions when it comes to internationalization, the research presented nevertheless reveals little commitment to an intentional, holistic role in the libraries studied. Drawing on internationalization expertise and models of prominent scholars, the book argues that libraries need to be more deliberate in their internationalization efforts and collaborate with other college personnel and departments outside the library. Lombard asserts that internationalization can facilitate a better understanding of the potential for transformation of a library's mission, vision, and policy.

The Internationalization of the Academic Library cuts across the fields of library science and higher education administration, ensuring that the book will appeal to researchers and students working in these disciplines. Library professionals around the world will also find much to interest them within the book.

Emmett Lombard is a higher education professional in the United States, and currently works at Gannon University in Erie, Pennsylvania. His duties include teaching, academic support, and faculty mentoring. His educational background is diverse: History (BA; Pembroke State University, 1994), Library Science (MSLS; Clarion University of Pennsylvania, 1995), English (MA; Gannon University, 2005), and Organizational Learning and Leadership (Ph.D.; Gannon University, 2020). This diverse education enables him to engage in interdisciplinary research, with a primary focus on information literacy. He is also fascinated with internationalization and recognizes its relationship with information literacy and academic libraries. He takes education very seriously and considers it a privilege to share his research and insights with others.

Routledge Studies in Library and Information Science

The following list includes only the most-recent titles to publish within the series. A list of the full catalogue of titles is available at: https://www.routledge.com/Routledge-Studies-in-Library-and-Information-Science/book-series/RSLIS

Information Worlds
Behavior, Technology, and Social Context in the Age of the Internet
Paul T. Jaeger and Gary Burnett

E-Journals Access and Management
Edited by Wayne Jones

Perspectives on Information
Edited by Magnus Ramage and David Chapman

Traditions of Systems Theory
Major Figures and Contemporary Developments
Edited by Darrell Arnold

Libraries, Literatures, and Archives
Edited by Sas Mays

Managing Cultural Change in Public Libraries
Marx, Maslow and Management
John Pateman and Joe Pateman

Globalizing the Library
Librarians and Development Work, 1945–1970
Amanda Laugesen

The Internationalization of the Academic Library
Emmett Lombard

The Internationalization of the Academic Library

Emmett Lombard

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2022
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
605 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10158

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an Informa business

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Lombard, Emmett, 1971- author.
Title: The internationalization of the academic library / Emmett Lombard.
Description: Abingdon, Oxon ; New York, NY : Routledge, 2022. | Series: Routledge studies in library and information science | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2021026647 (print) | LCCN 2021026648 (ebook) | ISBN 9780367653170 (hardback) | ISBN 9780367653194 (paperback) | ISBN 9781003128878 (ebook)
Subjects: LCSH: Academic libraries--Aims and objectives. | Academic libraries--Administration. | International education. | Education and globalization. | Libraries and colleges. | Education, Higher--Aims and objectives.
Classification: LCC Z675.U5 L66 2022 (print) | LCC Z675.U5 (ebook) | DDC 027.7--dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2021026647
LC ebook record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2021026648

ISBN: 978-0-367-65317-0 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-0-367-65319-4 (pbk)
ISBN: 978-1-003-12887-8 (ebk)

DOI: 10.4324/9781003128878

Typeset in Times New Roman
by SPi Technologies India Pvt Ltd (Straive)

Contents

Acknowledgments

Several people helped me complete this project. Here are a few who provided exceptional support:

Mr. Ken Brundage, Library Director, Gannon University: provided time, resources, and encouragement as an effective supervisor does for his subordinates.

Ms. Heidi Lowther: provided insight on how to arrange and present the ideas that comprise this book and advocated for its publication.

Dr. Tarek Al Madanat, Ms. Laura El Shenawy, Mr. Sherif El Shenawy, Ms. Christiane Fluellen, Ms. Jenna Lombard, Dr. Emmett Nicholas Lombard, Ph.D., Dr. Mahboobe Mahdavi, Ph.D., Dr. Joshua Nwokeji, Ph.D., Ms. Debra Renzi, Ms. Julia Takagi, and Ms. Sanae Takagi Lombard: translated key documents, and helped with crucial logistics.

Dr. Jennie Vaughn, Ph.D. and Dr. Mengzhong Zhang, Ph.D.: served on my dissertation committee (the dissertation inspired this book) and gave insight into how to view internationalization and higher education.

Dr. Tania Carlson Reis, Ph.D.: provided inspiration, guidance, and criticism necessary for me to identify the topic and complete the project; without her expertise and collegiality, this book would not happen. She is an amazing educator, scholar, and leader.

It is to Dr. Reis to whom this book is dedicated.

Abbreviations

ALPUS	Academic libraries of privately-owned universities
APA	American Psychological Association
BA	Bachelor of Arts
ERIC	Education Resources Information Center
ESL	English as a Second Language
ICT	Information and Communications Technology
IFLA	International Federation of Library Associations
IRB	*Institutional Review Board*
JAMA	Journal of the American Medical Association
LISA	Library and Information Science Abstracts
MSLS	Masters of Science Library Science
NAFTA	North American Free Trade Agreement
OCLC	Online Computer Library Center
OER	Open Educational Resources
SCONUL	Society of College, National and University Libraries
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
STEM	Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics
USC	University of Southern California

1 Introduction

This book describes academic library internationalization as it happens at colleges and universities around the world. Given that higher education institutions are considered international organizations due to the universal nature of knowledge they produce (Ahmad, 2012; Jati, 2010), it is important for their libraries to align resources and services within this international context. Colleges and universities "internationalize" themselves by creating climates favorable to worldviews beyond simply the local or national (Knight, 2004; Kumar & Suresh, 2000; Rodenberg, 2010). Indications that the higher education sector increasingly recognizes internationalization's importance can be found in such evidence as ever-increasing international student enrollments (Delgado-Márquez, Escudero-Torres, & Hurtado-Torres, 2013; Peters, 2010; Zong & Batalova, 2018), and explicit statements that emphasize activities or notions associated with internationalization in institutional artifacts, e.g., mission statements and strategic plans (Bordonaro & Rauchmann, 2015; Kumar & Suresh, 2000; Rodenberg, 2010; Whitehurst, 2010). As one person interviewed for this book observed: the world is now a "global village". The implication being that neither localized, nor even national resources or services are adequate by themselves for an individual's information literacy purposes. To function in a global village requires global perspective, and a global perspective requires data, information, and knowledge from around the world. Therefore, if academic libraries are to best serve their purpose, then they themselves need to internationalize.

Knight (2004) described a higher education institution's internationalization as, "…the process of integrating international dimension into the teaching/learning, research, and service functions of a university or college" (p. 3). Academic libraries traditionally serve their institutions by providing support to the functions Knight mentioned, especially teaching, learning, and research. Arguably, the two major manifestations of this support are found in a library's resources (e.g., books, journals, study spaces) and services (e.g., consultations, instruction).

Some would argue that internationalizing resources and services requires that library personnel possess both the cultural knowledge necessary to operate in an internationalized setting and also the ability to accommodate different learning styles (Becker, 2006; Kumar & Suresh, 2000); an implication of

DOI: 10.4324/9781003128878-1

such thinking could be that academic libraries must internationalize at their own departmental level before they can support the overall internationalization that occurs at an institutional level. An academic library must see itself as part of the overall institutional culture, and share common situations and actions to be capable of helping to build that culture (Clark, 1998). Fortunately, academic libraries traditionally already have international proclivity (Becker, 2006). However, as will be described throughout the book, this innate proclivity is not sufficient: libraries need to be deliberate and holistic in their efforts to internationalize.

There are different ways to approach internationalization in higher education (e.g., Knight). However, most seem to address basic questions of why, where, who, what, or how in this respect. As colleges attempt to answer these questions, the library should not only be part of the answers but must also answer these questions internally on their own terms. It is common knowledge in the news and different disciplines that internationalization is important, but unless answers to these questions are clear, including among library personnel themselves, there is little sense in an academic library internationalizing.

This book provides insights into these questions by describing academic library internationalization within its internal and external higher education context. Internal internationalization is exclusive to the library: examples include operational model, mission, and policies, along with actual resources and services. External internationalization is how it supports its college, and sometimes the surrounding community, in terms of their internationalizations: examples include curricular integration, enrollment initiatives, information literacy facilitation. One contention that this book subscribes to is that viewing internationalization on these internal and external terms is key to understanding it as a deliberate, holistic process rather than as singular, unintentional activities, something further discussed in Chapter 3.

While observing academic library internationalization as it occurred around the world at different libraries, this study shows that internationalization is not always a straightforward process or phenomenon. Literature related to the topic provides themes that help better understand the issues that often comprise or define it at a given school. Most of these sources do not explicitly use the phrase "academic library internationalization", or even variants of it (e.g., "globalization"); this is likely due to the focus on singular aspects relevant to it (e.g., library instruction; reference; database sharing) and an emphasis on international students. There are many literary themes related to academic library internationalization; rather than focus on just one, this book considers the major ones within the broader framework of the why, where, who, and how questions.

Like many things international, not all academic library internationalization is equal. In terms of all the colleges and universities in operation around the world, few are capable of the ambitious internationalization that gets highlighted. Most colleges and universities that have neither billion-dollar endowments nor globally recognized brands would find it difficult to internationalize beyond their own campuses and surrounding communities. It is this majority

that is of concern to this study. Since the aim is to describe academic library internationalization in common terms, to describe what goes on at the relatively few internationally recognized universities would serve little purpose; such focus, while perhaps inspirational, would paint an unrealistic picture of what occurs at most academic libraries. This idea is further discussed in Chapter 3.

It is not this book's intention to persuade academic libraries to internationalize. However, literature on and related to the topic, along with primary research, indicated that it can help a library become more relevant within its college or university. This book is useful in that its descriptions and observations can help readers evaluate academic libraries in terms of those internal and external aspects of internationalization. Additionally, it could help them to better answer why, where, and what should be done for whom. Such understanding can enable others to make their own decisions about internationalization, including at their own libraries.

It was revealed that the ability to internally internationalize and externally support campus internationalization at the libraries in this study depended on how much of a role and support the institution gave them. Stakeholders were key: understanding and accommodating them are important to the library's case; Chapter 4 focuses on such understanding, while Chapter 5 is about accommodation. The literature tended to focus on international students, but this book identifies all students, along with faculty, administrators and, in some cases, community members as potential stakeholders. Granted, international students were arguably the most important stakeholders to consider, given the goals of the colleges and universities in this study; however, to truly describe academic library internationalization requires consideration of all stakeholders.

The politically-charged atmosphere concerning internationalization as a general concept might induce implications or intentions different from this book's purpose. Some groups view internationalization as a negative process that involves powerful governments or corporations exploiting people and resources; an example that comes to mind is the ANTIFA group with its anti-capitalist agenda. Another negative association is held by some patriotic individuals who see it as a threat to national identity and independence; one need only look at the political situations in North America (e.g., angst over NAFTA) and Europe (nationalist calls for secession from the EU) to see the fears and anger internationalization can trigger (Piketty & Goldhammer, 2020). This book is not suggesting anything parallel to the notions of dissolving national identities or exploiting compromised groups. Quite the opposite: the belief is that internationalization in a higher education context can help people; one way described in this book is through information literacy. Thus, this book's academic library internationalization is simply one way to prepare people for the ever-increasing international reality that technology, economics, and the information explosion have created.

Many issues associated with academic libraries in general run parallel with its internationalization. Example: Chapter 5 discusses how challenges associated with interlibrary loan are also evident *sans* internationalization.

However, it was discovered that internationalization can possibly mediate and/or moderate general library issues in both negative and positive ways. Thus, internationalization can offer rewards beyond what is typical for the library, but also troubles. One thing absolutely positive is that it offers an additional lens through which to consider academic librarianship.

One limitation to internationalization investigation is the lack of consistency among academic libraries. As Knight illustrated, the very nation in which a college or university operates can impact its internationalization and, by extension, its library. Thus, it is difficult to generalize on this topic because needs and approaches differ from institution to institution, even those within the same nation. As noted by Bordonaro and Rauchmann (2015), different libraries, and even personnel within the same libraries, can interpret internationalization differently, and research for this book most definitely validated that important insight, and describes it throughout the following chapters.

It is difficult to develop one encompassing approach to academic library internationalization that suits all academic libraries, just as it would be difficult to generalize about the institutions they serve (Ahwireng, 2016). Therefore, associating one framework or definition with the intention of universal application is unrealistic. Additionally, depending on the library, incentive to internationalize may come from within i.e., library personnel (particularly those in administrative roles), or from outside forces such as professional organizations or the parent institution itself (Downey, 2013). In short, academic library internationalization is more a thematic phenomenon that needs to be studied as such rather than attempting to fit it within one universal framework, which is what this book attempts with themes from the literature and its own primary research.

The rest of this introductory chapter consists of a literature review that identifies the major themes evident in studies about or related to academic library internationalization. These themes inform the book throughout its chapters. The literature review is followed by a methodology section that describes data collection and analyses applied to this study for primary research purposes. The chapter ends with a brief preview of succeeding chapters.

The literature

This book is heavily influenced by a systematic literature review conducted on the topic of academic library internationalization (see Appendix A). Some sources were found on library internationalization as a process, but many focused exclusively on the issue of global sharing (Billings, 2000; Case & Jakubs, 1999; Clausen, 2015; Dougherty, 1985; Miller & Zhou, 1999; Miller, Xu, & Zou, 2008; Paulus, 2013; Rader, 2002; Smiraglia & Leazer, 1999; Somerville, Cooper, Torhell, & Hashert, 2015; Steele, 1993; Taler, 2018). Although relevant in that the libraries expanded operations to more international ranges, focus was on the specific operation itself (e.g., creating holdings

databases; interlibrary loan) versus the process or motivation behind internationalization. This was a common characteristic of literature related to the topic. Of the literature that did focus on holistic library internationalization, three themes emerged: library validation in terms of importance to parent institution; internationalization strategies; and internationalization obstacles.

Becker (2006) illustrated the library's importance to university internationalization, and internationalization's importance to the library itself in terms of survival. This is an interesting parallel to the internal/external dynamic of the process to which this book subscribes. Whitehurst (2010) argued the need for information literacy in response to higher education internationalization, which this book also promotes; however, Whitehurst and this book's interpretations of information literacy somewhat differ. Downey (2013) saw negative implications of internationalization when it was an institutional mandate that did not align with the library's purpose; this is a major theme in Chapter 3.

Eghe-Ohenmwen (2015), Okiy (2010), and Uwhekadom and Olawolu (2013) saw internationalization as critical for institutions in developing nations, but identified budget, technology, and personnel as potential obstacles. McCarthy and Ortiz (2010) found that an institutional location and its library's traditions can be obstacles; some nations, or even regions within one nation, might not be as well equipped to accommodate internationalization. For example, an academic library located in a rural Idaho region likely has less experience with internationalization than a more cosmopolitan metropolis like Miami (e.g., significant ESL population). This book did not focus on any one type of nation in its site selection; however, some of the libraries studied did grapple with these types of issues that could have been due to geographical disadvantage.

Saw, Lui, and Yu (2008) described library internationalization from planning to the implementation stages. They identified international trends, government and institutional policies, information and communication technology, and new teaching and learning techniques as both opportunities for and challenges to the process. Riggs (1997) suggested that internationalization begins with the university's mission and the library management's commitment to it. He believed library resources and services must reflect internationalization priorities, even suggesting a librarian be designated to exclusively attend to internationalization as a process. Neal (2001) contended that internationalization is an entrepreneurial investment; his perspective resembled more an administrative than academic purpose. He suggested that libraries should redefine physical space, intellectual infrastructure, personnel expertise, and understand all aspects of innovation related to the cultures served. Duderstadt (2009) believed that the global, knowledge-driven economy requires new workforce skills, and that universities are obligated to provide students these skills in order for them to compete in a new global environment. He focused more on technology, with the implication that the library will either embrace it or become obsolete.

These studies provide inspiration to academic libraries that are considering internationalization. However, due to some of the limitations described in the preceding paragraph, many of the strategies are unrealistic, at least at the libraries observed in this study. That is not to suggest that they should not be pursued; only that it will take more investment on the part of the parent institution, along with much differing mindsets within the libraries themselves.

International student accommodation

Concern exists that academic libraries are often deficient in the skills and competencies associated with internationalization (Ferriss, 2016; Knight, Hight, & Polfer, 2010; Koenigstein, 2012; Li, 2006; Sackers, Secomb, & Hulett, 2008; Sarkodie-Mensah, 1992). Again, this book contends it is not a matter of simply adding foreign books to the collection, or hiring a person from a different country, but a holistic process that involves overall library operations and alignment with the college or university (Bond, 2003; Burns, 2003; Ellingboe, 1998; Mestenhauser, 2003).

Although the literature did not often consider internationalization as a holistic enterprise, there were ample sources available on singular aspects of it. Some of this literature exclusively focused on cultural interactions between international students and library personnel. Studies indicated that some libraries offer unique instruction geared specifically for international students. Themes that emerged were librarian personal effect, instructional pedagogy, personnel training, resources, budget, policy, environment, collaboration, and promotion of resources and services.

The literature on personal effect mostly dealt with personnel attitude, demeanor, and sensitivity (Agee & Solis, 2005; Albarillo, 2017; Allen, 1987; Amsberry, 2010; Boers, 1994; Burhans, 1991; Gale, 2006; Helms, 1995; Hoffman & Popa, 1986; Hurley, Hegarty, & Bolger, 2006; Iheanacho, 2008; Jackson, 2005; Jackson & Sullivan, 2011; Koehler & Swanson, 1988; Lopez, 1983; McLean, 1978; McSwiney, n.d.; Muroi, White, & San Diego State University, 1990; Ormondroyd, 1989; Osborne & Poon, 1995; Salaz, Kayo, Houlihan, & Birch, 2016; So, 1994; Tsai, 1988; Yusuke & Bartlett, 2014; Zimerman, 2012). Agee and Solis (2005) argued that to best ensure international students are well served requires proper training and attitude on the part of library personnel. Although more focused on trans-nationalization of academic libraries (i.e., supporting American campuses at overseas branches), Salaz, Kayo, Houlihan, and Birch (2016) also emphasized the importance of cultural training to avoid problems. Although this book realizes the potential advantages to such accommodation, it also acknowledgs potential drawbacks.

Included in pedagogy was concern about class size, lesson difficulty, supplements, instruction scheduling, and language delivery (Albarillo, 2018; Boers, 1994; Burhans, 1991; Feldman, 1989; Gale, 2006; Hoffman & Popa, 1986; Hurley, Hegarty, & Bolger, 2006; Koehler & Swanson, 1988; Muroi, White, & San Diego State University, 1990; Ormondroyd, 1989; Patton,

2002a; Yusuke & Bartlett, 2014). Feldman (1989) and Ormondroyd (1989) found curricular integration key to library internationalization. Albarillo (2018) also discussed the importance of collaboration with instructors. Patton investigated the correlation between teaching method and learning style and found that student group size and amount of information librarians shared are important factors.

Related to instruction was the idea of library personnel training. To deliver effective instruction to international students, there was consensus that specialized training in matters of cultural awareness and sensitivity was necessary (Amsberry, 2009; Ball & Mahony, 1987; Chan et al., 2015; Ferriss, 2016; Greenfield et al., 1986; Hoffman & Popa, 1986; Houlihan, Walker, Wiley, & Click, 2017; Mood, 1982; Sarkodie-Mensah, 1992; Welch & Lam, 1991; Yusuke & Bartlett, 2014). Some studies mentioned that library personnel welcomed such training (Amsberry, 2009; Hoffman & Popa, 1986; Yusuke & Bartlett, 2014); no literature indicated resistance.

Resources (e.g., books; instructional guides) geared toward international student interest or need were also identified as important to accommodation (Abdullah, 2000; Buckner & French, 2007; Burhans, 1991; Buttlar, 1994; Han & Hall, 2012; Irving, 1994; Li, 1998; Marcus, 2003; May Ying, 2003; McKenzie, 1995; Mei Jing et al., 2009; Mood, 1982; Ruleman & Riley, 2017; Ury & Baudino, 2005). Content specifically geared to student culture or language was considered (Buckner & French, 2007; Buttlar, 1994; Li, McDowell, & Wang, 2016; McKenzie, 1995; Mei Jing et al., 2009). Buttlar recommended recruiting librarians who speak the students' languages (similar to Riggs' suggestion for an internationalization librarian). However, Li (1998) disagreed that such accommodation is necessary for international students, and believed their success hinged more on classroom than library accommodations, with an underlying implication of collaboration, an important theme throughout the literature and this book.

Important for providing content to international students was format. Some studies showed that digital books, videos, and LibGuides were preferred among international students (Buckner & French, 2007; Han & Hall, 2012; Li, McDowell, & Wang, 2016; May Ying, 2003; Mei Jing et al., 2009). Li, McDowell, and Wang (2016) illustrated preference for technology in their efforts to accommodate international students through vernacular language videos.

In addition to specific resources, overall budget and policy were considered (Buttlar, 1994; Marcus, 2003). Despite concern that library accommodation does not match parent institution priority, (Kline & Rod, 1984; Sarkodie-Mensah, 1992) 92% of libraries Buttlar surveyed allocated funds specifically for "cultural diversity". Marcus (2003) considered reference policy, while Irving (1994) and Ruleman and Riley (2017) specifically focused on interlibrary loan. Irving (1994) found that international students struggle with the interlibrary loan process; Ruleman's and Riley's concern was more about usage than process, specifically attempts to borrow textbooks instead of paying for them. Ruleman and Riley eventually established a reserve section

specifically for textbooks their library owned, and directed all students (rather than single out international students) to use it instead of requesting textbooks. This point about the reserve section being for all stakeholders is important and relates to that about "understanding" international students mentioned earlier; although it can be positive to understand cultures, generalizing about individuals, or making particular arrangements be it for positive or negative circumstances, is usually not a wise course.

Setting up environments conducive to success was also established (Ferriss, 2016; Graubart, 1995; Hoffman & Popa, 1986; Koenigstein, 2012; May Ying, 2003; Moeckel & Presnell, 1995; Onwuegbuzie, Jiao, & Daley, 1997). Most studies focused on environment in terms of personnel (e.g., culturally aware of/sensitive to international student needs), collection development, and events (Baudino, Johnson, & Northwest Missouri State University, 2016; Rosenzweig & Meade, 2017; Sheu & Panchyshyn, 2017). In terms of personnel, Ferriss recognized the importance of hiring international student workers for library public service, especially at schools where few international students are enrolled.

As earlier mentioned, many studies found collaboration crucial to accommodating the needs of international students (Baudino, Johnson, & Northwest Missouri State University, 2016; Cope & Black, 1985; Feldman, 1989; Goudy & Moushey, 1984; Houlihan, Walker, Wiley, & Click, 2017; Ishimura, Howard, & Moukdad, 2007; Kline & Rod, 1984; Lampert, Dabbour, & Solis, 2005; Li, McDowell, & Wang, 2016; Love & Edwards, 2009; Martin, Reaume, Reeves, & Wright, 2012; May Ying, 2003; Norlin, 2001; Osborne & Poon, 1995; Sheu & Panchyshyn, 2017). Examples of librarians and instructors, particularly English and ESL, working together were reported (Martin, Reaume, Reeves, & Wright, 2012; Rosenzweig & Meade, 2017), along with librarians and other academic support personnel, especially those in internationalization capacities at the institutional level (Love & Edwards, 2009; Rosenzweig & Meade, 2017; Sheu & Panchyshyn, 2017). There was also one example of librarians collaborating with student organizations to help international students feel more comfortable (Baudino, Johnson, & Northwest Missouri State University, 2016).

The final major accommodation point was that unless international students are actually aware of library resources and services, efforts to accommodate make little difference (Baudino, Johnson, Park, & Northwest Missouri State University, 2013; Cuiying, 2007; Helms, 1995; Mood, 1982; Schomberg & Bergman, 2012; Wei, 1998). It was important that publicity about what the library can offer international students is generated on terms they understand.

All these themes will be illustrated by the research in this book.

International student library usage

In addition to accommodation, there was plenty of literature relevant to internationalization that focused on international student library usage, particularly struggles in the United States (Ahmadi, 1988; Allen, 1993; Amsberry, 2009; Blummer & Kenton, 2018; Burhans, 1991; Goudy & Moushey, 1984;

Hurley, Hegarty, & Bolger, 2006; Iheanacho, 2008; Ishimura, Howard, & Moukdad, 2007; Kuang, 1989; Lewis, 1969; Li, 2006; Macdonald & Sarkodie-Mensah, 1988; McKenzie, 1995; McSwiney, 1994; Pibulsilp, 2010; So, 1994; Thomas & Victoria University of Wellington, 1995; Wang & Frank, 2002; Wayman, 1984; Zimerman, 2012). Despite the American focus, many of the points made could apply to academic libraries in any nation.

Consensus was that international students must often overcome significant cultural and language barriers. Iheanacho was concerned specifically with those from developing countries where fewer resources are available. Burhans (1991) noted that most academic librarians are white, middle class, highly educated females, which could be a cultural distraction for some students. Puente, Gray, and Agnew (2009), and Song and Lee (2012) disagreed that international students are more susceptible to struggle. Puente, Gray, and Agnew argued that they are no different than domestic students in terms of capability, and Song and Lee (2012) found international student technology acumen to be superior to domestic peers (e.g., mobile devices, PC tablets).

Some studies focused on differences between international and domestic students, again with an American-setting focus (Farid & Syracuse University, 1984; Onwuegbuzie, Jiao, & Daley, 1997; Song & Lee, 2012). Most agreed that international students struggle more, including Abdullah (2000) who argued that the library catalog in particular poses unique challenges (again, Song and Lee would disagree). However, Onwuegbuzie, Jiao, and Daley (1997) observed that international students use the library more than their domestic peers, which can result in long-term advantage (i.e., more usage equals more familiarity equals more comfort equals more success). More important to Yunshan (2009) was that people should remember that all international students are not alike; his contention was that the phrase "international student" itself serves little purpose given extreme differences among cultures.

Information seeking behavior was also discussed (Duan, 2016; Farid & Syracuse University, 1984; Ferrer-Vinent, 2010; Fu, Emanuel, & Shuqin, 2007; Ishimura, 2013; Onwuegbuzie, Jiao, & Daley, 1997; Saw, Abbott, Donaghey, & McDonald, 2013; Sin, 2015). Tools and services were the main focus (Duan, 2016; Farid & Syracuse University, 1984; Onwuegbuzie, Jiao, & Daley, 1997; Sackers, Secomb, & Hulett, 2008; Saw, Abbott, Donaghey, & McDonald, 2013) as well as the actual process of finding information (Ishimura, 2013; Onwuegbuzie, Jiao, & Daley, 1997; Saw, Abbott, Donaghey, & McDonald, 2013). Ferrer-Vincent found international students prefer reference transactions in the native language (in this case English) with follow-up in their primary language. While Onwuegbuzie, Jiao, and Daley found most behavior to be dictated by a desire for academic success, Saw, Abbott, Donaghey, and McDonald (2013) and Bordonaro (2004), also identified social motivations (e.g., meeting new people; improving communication). Another perception was that the library serves as a study hall (Allen, 1993; Bordonaro, 2004; Knight, Hight, & Polfer, 2010). Allen found that computers in particular attracted international students to study in the library (probably not so much a factor today).

International student perception of the academic library was also discussed (Arishee, 2000; Bilal, 1988; Datig, 2014; Gale, 2006; Lin, 2006; Nzivo & Chuanfu, 2013; Puente, Gray, & Agnew, 2009; Shaffer, Vardaman, & Miller, 2010; Tahir, 2007; Tam, Cox, & Bussey, 2009). Despite barriers, most studies found that their perceptions of the library were positive. Arishee (2000) and Tahir (2007) were exceptions, the former finding that Japanese students were often dissatisfied; Ishimura, Howard, and Moukdad (2007) also found that Japanese students needed language support to complete assignments. Again, Bordonaro (2004) believed that international students view the library as not only a place to do research but one where they can practice communication, and that they appreciate the opportunity it provides for recreational reading.

Not all studies found international students to highly regard the library, particularly librarians (Ibraheem & Devine, 2016; Kline & Rod, 1984; Martin, Reaume, Reeves, & Wright, 2012; Sarkodie-Mensah, 1989). Ibraheem and Devine (2016) found interpersonal communication was the biggest factor to lower regard, with Sarkodie-Mensah (1989) specifically citing accent and pronunciation issues that cause misunderstandings. Burhans' (1991) concerns about culture and demographics could also be factors.

The phenomenon known as "library anxiety" was also discussed (Iheanacho, 2008; Patton, 2002a; Koenigstein, 2012; Onwuegbuzie, Jiao, & Daley, 1997). Somewhat related was the issue of plagiarism. Amsberry (2010) and Zimerman (2012) believed the likelihood for international student plagiarism exceeds domestic peers. Lipsett (2004) and Lund (2004) suggested that cultural issues cause international students to plagiarize rather than a motivation to cheat. Swain (2004) described language difficulties endured by international students, and was concerned about the possible racism that might emanate from or influence perception of those who plagiarize. Gunnarsson, Kulesza, and Pettersson (2014) considered plagiarism within context of a research methodology course, and learned that culture and language influenced how students viewed citation, and that this must be accounted for, especially citation mechanics, when helping international students avoid plagiarism. A key takeaway was again the importance of collaboration between instructors and librarians (Herring, 2014; Zimerman, 2012).

This overall theme and its subthemes helped illuminate the idea of immersion and accommodation during research for this book, and forms the basis of Chapter 5.

International faculty

Not much literature was available on faculty in general, other than collaboration with library personnel. Most literature dealt with how many international faculty there are in the United States (Colleges, 2017; Desruisseaux, 1994), or their academic or personal characteristics (Ayala, 2018; Kim, Twombly, & Wolf-Wendel, 2012; Kim, Wolf-Wendel, & Twombly, 2011; Munene, 2014). Munene (2014) offered disturbing insights into the realities of being an international faculty member in the United States. Shiyi (2012)

observed that international faculty were an underserved, relatively small population of the library user community in Canadian higher education; she specifically studied Chinese faculty, and concluded that academic libraries need to more carefully consider international faculty when creating resources and planning services.

Chapter 5 describes some possibilities related to faculty accommodation through opportunities not often associated with interntionalization

Domestic student support

Most academic library internationalization literature concerns itself with international students. However, while there are implications to internationalization in relation to study abroad there was little discussion about the library and study-abroad students. Marcus (1998, 2005) highlighted dangers of American students not getting a global education; additionally, Attwood and Tahir (2007) worried that British students did not get the needed exposure to international peers or resources necessary for global citizenry. Wei, Sullivan, Rudasill, and Ford (2006) argued that if an institution is not committed to internationalization, then it is difficult for the library to justify additional accommodation; regardless, White, Ye, and Guccione (2009) considered design of a library's services to meet needs of its students abroad as part of its mission. As it is, Kutner (2009) found study-abroad students' knowledge of her library's services inadequate.

Many authors agreed the way to combat inadequate domestic student usage is through collaboration (Denda, 2013; Griner, Herron, & White, 2015; Kuntz, 2005; Kutner, 2010; McElroy & Bridges, 2017). Denda (2013) suggested that libraries identify the information needs of students and faculty in study-abroad programs and connect with study-abroad personnel to develop a common vision. McElroy and Bridges (2017) recommended that librarians themselves should lead more study-abroad programs because there are natural information literacy fits (e.g., identifying transportation resources) – this point is something to which this book wholly subscribes. Griner, Herron, and White (2015) shared their experience developing an undergraduate study-abroad program with a finance professor, while Kuntz (2005) discussed potential library/study-abroad program linkages and believed librarians should exchange staff and materials with international library counterparts (reminiscent of some of the broader internationalization strategies earlier cited). Finally, Kutner (2010) discussed the librarian's role in supporting study-abroad students as producers of information, particularly by collaborating with programs that focus on nontraditional locations and activities of direct benefit to host communities.

The literature review provided context for this book and informed methodology and analysis. However, a gap does exist in terms of academic library internationalization, including descriptions of it from a more holistic perspective. Therefore primary research on the topic from an overall library standpoint as opposed to singular aspects was needed.

Primary research

This book is based on and inspired by a dissertation successfully defended in 2020. Two general questions formed the focus of that dissertation. One: how does the college or university impact its academic library's internationalization? Two: how does the academic library impact its college or university's internationalization? Answers to these questions were useful in identifying the notion of internal and external processes at work in academic library internationalization.

The methodology for this book sought to describe situations at some colleges and universities rather than attempt to identify cause-and-effect correlations. As Ahwireng (2016), Becker (2006), and Knight (2004) noted, colleges and their libraries differ in terms of personnel, resources, services, and structure. Even those that share similar classifications (e.g., Carnegie R1) can fundamentally differ in terms of librarianship and/or internationalization; as a result, what might apply in terms of internationalization for one may not apply for others, or even be interpreted the same way. Therefore, it was determined that qualitative research, specifically, case study, could provide more meaning to a study on academic library internationalization than something quantitative in nature.

Case study methodology is commonly used in library research as its focus on one academic library within a stipulated timeframe can provide accurate data (Yin, 2014). Case study focuses on real life (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Yin, 2014), can be described within certain parameters, intentionally illustrate a unique case, present an in-depth understanding through a variety of data, and identify trends within the libraries' operations (Glesne, 2011). Themes, issues, and specific situations were ultimately uncovered and organized in a fashion to derive meaning from the cases (Creswell, 2013).

Different schools from different nations were studied because just as college and university libraries differ, so do nations. Therefore, to gain broader perspective, libraries were selectively identified from Asia, Australia, Europe, the Near and Middle East, North and South America, and sub-Saharan Africa. The libraries studied for this book are not identified in keeping with promises of anonymity, but also concerns on the parts of colleagues and scholars about stereotyping based on nationality and culture. This book simply describes academic library internationalization. It does not want to encourage negative conclusions about the colleges and universities studied or nations in which they operate: just as scholars and reviewers strive to avoid negative generalizations about individuals, so too this book avoids it at institutional and national levels (see Appendix B for fuller methodology details).

Incidentally, many of the internationalization struggles observed were similar around the world rather than exclusive to institutions in one nation. As mentioned earlier, a deliberate attempt was made to select libraries that could be described as typical in higher education; more typical meaning that they are representative of most colleges or universities, not regularly featured in Fortune 500 equivalents of higher education rankings. Colleges and

universities included in this study did not have enormous endowments, thousands of personnel, institutional brands as recognizable as major corporations or professional sports clubs. Some libraries at such prestigious colleges and universities do great things in the areas of internationalization; however, what they do is not realistic at most institutions that lack their privileges, thus unrealistic for the majority of library stakeholders.

Colleges and universities included in this study all showed evidence of internationalization aspiration. To be included, the college or university had to have governing artifacts that explicitly referred to internationalization intentions (e.g., mission, vision, strategic plan). However, none focused exclusively on internationalization or a particular aspect of it; for example, there are many colleges that focus on teaching English in nations where it is not the primary language. That is certainly an aspect of internationalization but, given it is the sole purpose of that type of school, not of interest to this study, concern of which is how libraries at colleges and universities with more holistic higher education missions approach internationalization.

Interviews were conducted with library personnel, faculty, and also personnel directly involved in some aspect of internationalization (e.g., study abroad; second language development programs) (see Appendix C for interview prompts). The purpose of the interviews was to collect data from a small sample size relevant to the topic that is often unobtainable with other instruments (May, 1993; Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2002b). Several researchers agree that interviews are the most "widely" adopted method for collecting qualitative data (Burns, 2003; Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009; Roulston, deMarrais, & Lewis, 2003; Silverman, 2000), and are often employed in library science. Interviews also help garner data about events that have already taken place and are not possible to recreate (Merriam, 2009).

In addition to interviews, content analyses of artifacts and documents were conducted (Bowen, 2009; Hsieh & Shannon, 2005; Patton, 2002b). This included, when available, such items as mission statements, strategic plans, policy manuals, websites, and also de-identified student assignment, faculty syllabi, library instruction, and research consultation data (Yin, 2014). Sometimes the artifacts indicated the internationalization intent of a particular college or university, but the interviews revealed a different reality.

Already established was the book's contention that due to institutional differences one framework cannot universally accommodate academic library internationalization. However, the internationalization model of Jane Knight (2003, 2004) aligns well with the scope and intention of this study, and influenced the questions that structured this book's chapters. Knight's model is predicated on the idea that "Internationalization at the national/sector/institutional levels is defined as the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education" (2003, p. 2). It is a nationally and culturally neutral model that can be applied to any college or university. Knight wrote that her model was designed to assist "institutions and policy makers to reflect on the dominant features of their current approach to internationalization or identify

the approach they might adopt in the future" (p. 21); it is such reflection that this book applies specifically to academic library internationalization.

Three general themes emerged from the primary research, which validate similar findings from other studies, including Bordonaro and Rauchmann (2015), and Jackson and Sullivan (2011). One was the importance of content to all aspects of internationalization. Content referred to actual resources that comprise an academic library; one item in particular was books. This focus on content often seemed to overshadow services, including personnel expertise; generally, neither library nor external personnel associated library services as relevant to internationalization. Another theme was role of the library in relation to its parent institution's internationalization, and the role of the institution to its library's internationalization; again, the internal/external dynamic. The last major theme was intention, as in deliberate academic library internationalization as opposed to that which might happen by default of traditional operation. The latter was often the case in Bordonaro and Rauchmann's (2015) study, where they found instances of "implicit" rather than explicit internationalization.

Terms and limits

For sake of consistency, the following terms are designated. "College", in its more colloquial sense, is used to designate an academic library's parent institution rather than "institute" or "university"; it designates a higher education or tertiary school that confers at least a bachelor's degree. It is understood that colleges, universities, and institutes are technically different entities; however, for the sake of brevity and consistency, this book refers to them as "colleges" simply because while all universities have colleges, not all colleges are universities. Additionally, ERIC, arguably the world's premier education database, also uses the term "College" to represent higher education institutions. "International" is used to designate stakeholders who use or are invested in an academic library in a different nation as opposed to "foreign" which seemed to have negative connotations for some during research for this book. In keeping with the latest APA conventions, and for the sake of inclusiveness (an important part of internationalization), "their" and "they" are used to modify singular nouns. Additionally, "library personnel" is used rather than "librarian" (except when citing words of another author) because, as will hopefully be impressed upon readers, all personnel are needed for true academic library internationalization.

As already mentioned, this book's academic library internationalization descriptions are limited to the colleges studied and relevant literature. It cannot claim universal cause-and-effect relationships. Since interviews were conducted, it was possible that respondents embellished responses with the motivation of favorably portraying their institution, or providing what they thought the researcher wanted (Yin, 2014). Another limitation was the lack of consistent quantities of data, as participation and amounts and types of artifacts differed among the colleges studied.

The book's author also poses many limits. The author did not speak all of the languages of personnel approached for interviews, and many of the interviews were translated, both questions and answers. It is therefore possible that misunderstandings occurred, due to what for many participants was an unfamiliar subject. Another possible limitation is that the author is American, and likely influenced by American perspectives on higher education, academic librarianship, and internationalization. This could have compromised data collection and analysis: as an American with what Wibbeke and McArthur (2014) would classify as "active communication" patterns, the author may have missed important contextual messages when researching those colleges or universities where general communication patterns might have been more "passive". The author's nationality could also have limited trust on the parts of personnel approached to participate. For example, Dr. Tarek Al Madanat, an expert in Jordanian leadership and culture, explained how interviews might not only be compromised by language difference, but also lack of trust of those not part of one's family or tribe; this was substantiated as fewer than half the personnel approached agreed to be interviewed. Finally, the author is a strong academic library internationalization advocate, thus could be biased about the topic despite best efforts. In fact, the point was made by one reviewer that the author needed to acknowledge both positive and negative implications of internationalization.

The great novelist Kurt Vonnegut wrote that he always let readers know at the beginning how his stories would end. *The Internationalization of the Academic Library* is certainly not a novel (even more certain is that this author is nowhere near Kurt Vonnegut, as a writer or thinker); however, that same literary device is now applied to this book. The quick and short of it is that research shows that academic library internationalization can be a good thing, but it must be properly conceived and implemented. End of story. However, like a Vonnegut novel, this ending cannot be fully appreciated without first reading the ensuing descriptions within the conceptual framework of why, where, who, and how/what.

A plot twist already mentioned is the recognition that academic library internationalization mirrors other general library circumstances. Again, while researching for this book, many of the standard problems that prevent academic libraries from fulfilling their overall missions (e.g., budget; diminished and/or misunderstood role) also emerged as obstacles to internationalization. Institutional executives may claim to value the library, or at least not claim they do not value it, but there is often little proof. Sometimes this is a result of lack of resources: for example, even if they did want to give the library what it needs, there is not enough money. However, research for this book indicated that it can also be due to lack of understanding; many executives simply did not understand what an academic library is or can do in relation to internationalization. This point is evident throughout this book, especially Chapter 3. Again, this is not a new phenomenon but its manifestations and consequences take on different appearances within the context of internationalization.

This book does not attempt to serve as a technical how-to guide. Even Chapter 5's "How to Accommodate Stakeholders" describes what is happening rather than prescribes what must happen. Although such guides can be useful, for the same reasons one should not generalize about academic library internationalization, the fact that every college is different renders them impractical; what works at one college might not work at another. The "best practices" craze currently sweeping higher education, while sometimes providing useful tips, should not be interpreted as laws to be mandated and obeyed, especially in a diverse and inclusive sector like higher education; the same applies specifically to academic internationalization.

It is evident from the literature review that common themes related to academic library internationalization exist, but can fall within different components of a given framework. Therefore, it is helpful to describe it in terms of the why, where, who, and how framework this book conceptualized. The four succeeding chapters are framed within those general questions. Chapter 2 addresses why academic libraries should internationalize, with emphases on library validation, social equity, and information literacy. Chapter 3 describes where; although international settings are briefly considered, where in this context applies more to the internal and external aspects of internationalization at home. Chapter 4 provides new ways of thinking about stakeholders to better understand them while respecting the fears of many scholars about stereotypes. Again, Chapter 5 discusses ways to accommodate stakeholders based upon understandings established in Chapter 4; framing this discussion is the idea of immersion in relation to international stakeholders and their cultural acclimation. Chapter 6 concludes and synthesizes the themes and discussions, offers avenues for future research, and is succeeded by the appendices and Index.

Throughout all the chapters, themes from the literature and research describe internationalization as it exists at the colleges in this study. Although the chapter arrangement does not reflect a prescribed sequence – like information literacy, internationalization is often nonlinear – if reading the entire book, then rather than simply going to specific passages or chapters, it is advisable to read in the order presented, as many points established early reemerge later.

References

Abdullah, A. S. (2000). Factors affecting international students use of the online catalog and other information sources. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations (Publication No. AAT 9973229).

Agee, J., & Solis, J. (2005). Sofia 2004 conference report. *Slavic & East European Information Resources*, *6*(4), 57–62.

Ahmad, S. (2012). Internationalization of higher education: Tool for sustainable development. *International Journal of Sustainable Development*, *4*(12), 79–90.

Ahmadi, H. (1988). Reactions of international students to academic library services and resources: Problems and difficulties encountered by international students in terms of using library services and resources at two sample American universities (USC and UCLA). Place of publication not identified: publisher not identified. Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations.

Ahwireng, D. (2016). Internationalization of higher education: A comparative case study of two U.S. universities (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations. (OCLC: 987459234)

Albarillo, F. (2017). Is the library's online orientation program effective with English Language Learners? *College & Research Libraries*, *78*(5), 652–674.

Albarillo, F. (2018). Super-diversity and foreign-born students in academic libraries: A survey study. *Portal: Libraries & the Academy*, *18*(1), 59–91.

Allen, M. B. (1987). *Information Literacy, the Library and the Basic Reader/Writer*. *Conference on Composition and Communication*. Atlanta.

Allen, M. B. (1993). International students in academic libraries: A user survey. *College & Research Libraries*, *54*(4), 323–333.

Amsberry, D. (2009). Using effective listening skills with international patrons. *Reference Services Review*, *37*(1), 10–19.

Amsberry, D. (2010). Deconstructing plagiarism: International students and textual borrowing practices. *Reference Librarian*, *51*(1), 31–44.

Arishee, J. (2000). Personal and cultural values as factors in user satisfaction: A comparative study of users of library services (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations. (OCLC: 48482768)

Attwood, R., & Tahir, T. (2007). UK fails to integrate overseas students. *Times Higher Education Supplement*, *1814*, 4.

Ayala, L. S. (2018). Foreigners and inclusion in academia. *Hypatia*, *33*(2), 325–342.

Ball, M. A., & Mahony, M. (1987). Foreign students, libraries, and culture. *College and Research Libraries*, *48*(2), 160–166.

Baudino, F., Johnson, C., Park, S. G., & Northwest Missouri State University (Eds.). (2013). *Brick & click libraries: An academic library symposium*, 13th, Maryville, Missouri, November 1, 2013.

Baudino, F., Johnson, C., & Northwest Missouri State University (Eds.). (2016). *Brick & click libraries: An academic library conference proceedings*, 16th, Maryville, Missouri, November 4, 2016.

Baxter, P., & Jack, S. (2008). Qualitative case study methodology: Study design and implementation for novice researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, *13*(4), 544–559.

Becker, L. K. W. (2006). Globalisation and internationalisation: Models and patterns of change for Australian academic librarians. *Australian Academic & Research Libraries*, *37*(4), 282–298.

Bilal, D. M. (1988). Library knowledge of international students from developing countries: A comparison of their perceptions with those of reference librarians (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations. (OCLC: 19620291)

Billings, H. (2000). Shared collection building: Constructing the 21st century relational research library. *Journal of Library Administration*, *31*(2), 3–14.

Blummer, B., & Kenton, J. M. (2018). Optimizing library services – International students and academic libraries: Identifying themes in the literature from 2001 to the present. *Against the Grain*, *30*(2), 51–53.

Boers, G. G. (1994). Designing a library instruction program for international students. *Georgia Librarian*, *31*(4), 92–96.

Bond, S. (2003). Untapped resources: Internationalization of the curriculum and classroom experience. *Canadian Bureau for International Education Research*, *7*, 1–5.

Bordonaro, K. (2004). The use of an American college library by ESL students: An exploratory study in the utilization of resources and language learning (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations. (OCLC: 57439794)

Bordonaro, K., & Rauchmann, S. (2015). Internationalization in German academic libraries: Moving beyond North American perspectives. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, *15*(4), 677–697.

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, *9*(2), 27–40.

Buckner, T., & French, T. (2007). International students and the academic library: How one library is working to make its international students feel at home. *Kentucky Libraries*, *71*(2), 8–11.

Burhans, S. (1991). *Serving the Information Needs of the International and Minority Students at the Small College Library: A Librarian's View*. *Annual Meeting of the Central States Communication Association*. Chicago.

Burns, M. (2003). Interviewing: Embodied communication. *Feminism and Psychology*, *13*(2), 229–236.

Buttlar, L. (1994). Facilitating cultural diversity in college and university libraries. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *20*(1), 10.

Case, M., & Jakubs, D. (1999). Building the global collection world class collection development: A chronicle of the AAU/ARL Global Resource Program. *Journal of Library Administration*, *28*(1), 237–254.

Chan, K. P., Colvin, J. B., Vinyard, M., Leach, C., Naumann, M. A., & Stenis, P. (2015). Libraries across the sea: Using a virtual presence and skilled student assistants to serve students abroad. *Journal of Library Administration*, *55*(4), 278–301.

Clark, B. R. (1998). *Creating entrepreneurial universities: Organizational pathways to transformation*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Clausen, B. E. (2015). Think globally, act locally: A library perspective. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, *15*(3), 389–392.

Click, A. B. et al. (2017). The internationalization of the academic library: A systematic review of 25 years of literature on international Students. *College & Research Libraries*, *78*(3), 328–358.

Colleges with the highest percentages of nonresident aliens on the full-time instructional staff, Fall 2015. (2017, August 18). *Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. 14.

Cope, J., & Black, E. (1985). New library orientation for international students. *College Teaching*, *33*(4), 159–162.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design choosing among five traditions* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Cuiying, M. (2007). Marketing academic library resources and information services to international students from Asia. *Reference Services Review*, *35*(4), 571–583.

Datig, I. (2014). What is a library?: International college students' perceptions of libraries. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *40*(3/4), 350–356.

Delgado-Márquez, B., Escudero-Torres, M., & Hurtado-Torres, N. (2013). Being highly internationalised strengthens your reputation: An empirical investigation of top higher education institutions. *Higher Education (00181560)*, *66*(5), 619–633.

Denda, K. (2013). Study abroad programs: A golden opportunity for academic library engagement. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *39*(2), 155–160.

Desruisseaux, P. (1994, November 23). 59,981 scholars from abroad teach or study in U.S. Chronicle of Higher Education, p. A40.

Dougherty, R. M. (1985). Research libraries in an international setting: Requirements for expanded resource sharing. *College and Research Libraries*, *46*(5), 383–389.

Downey, K. (2013). Why did we buy that? New customers and changing directions in collection development. *Collection Management*, *38*(2), 90–103.

Duan, X. (2016). How they search, how they feel, and how to serve them? Information needs and seeking behaviors of Chinese students using academic libraries. *International Information & Library Review*, *48*(3), 157–168.

Duderstadt, J. J. (2009). Possible futures for the research library in the 21st century. *Journal of Library Administration*, *49*(3), 217–225.

Eghe-Ohenmwen, A. (2015). Best practices for repositioning, towards global competitiveness in academic libraries of privately-owned universities (ALPUS) in Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *6*(13), 50–52.

Ellingboe, B. J. (1998). Divisional strategies to internationalize a campus portrait. In J. A. Mestenhauser & B. A. Ellingboe (Eds.), *Reforming the Higher Education Curriculum: Internationalizing the Campus* (pp. 198–228). Phoenix, AZ: The Oryx Press.

Farid, M. (1984). A study of information seeking behavior of Ph.D. students in selected disciplines. Final Report. (ED252213).

Feldman, D. (1989). The international student and course-integrated instruction: The ESL instructor's perspective. *Research Strategies*, *7*(4), 159–166.

Ferrer-Vinent, I. J. (2010). For English, Press 1: International students' language preference at the reference desk. *Reference Librarian*, *51*(3), 189–201.

Ferriss, J. (2016). Integrating international students through the library experience. *Christian Librarian*, *59*(1), 7–9.

Fu, Z., Emanuel, J., & Shuqin, J. (2007). International students and language preferences in library database use. *Technical Services Quarterly*, *24*(4), 1–13.

Gale, C. (2006). Serving them right? How libraries can enhance the learning experience of international students: A case study from the University of Exeter. *SCONUL Focus*, *39*, 36–39.

Glesne, C. (2011). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (4th ed.). New York: Longman.

Goudy, F. W., & Moushey, E. (1984). Library instruction and foreign students: A survey of opinions and practices among selected libraries. *Reference Librarian* (10), 215–226.

Graubart, M. (1995). Orientation sessions in Israeli academic libraries. *Research Strategies*, *13*(3), 165–175.

Greenfield, L., et al. (1986). Educating the world: Training library staff to communicate effectively with international students. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *12*(4), 227–231.

Griner, L., Herron, P. J., & White, S. (2015). Study abroad partnerships: Librarians, business faculty, and in-country facilitator develop an innovative experiential learning program. *Journal of Business & Finance Librarianship*, *20*(3), 189–208.

Gunnarsson, J., Kulesza, W. J., & Pettersson, A. (2014). Teaching international students how to avoid plagiarism: Librarians and faculty in collaboration. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *40*(3/4), 413–417.

Han, N., & Hall, S. L. (2012). Think globally! Enhancing the international student experience with LibGuides. *Journal of Electronic Resources Librarianship*, *24*(4), 288–297.

Helms, C. M. (1995). Reaching out to the international students through bibliographic instruction. *The Reference Librarian*, *51–52*, 295–307.

Herring, D. N. (2014). A purposeful collaboration: Using a library course enhancement grant program to enrich ESL instruction. *Reference Librarian*, *55*(2), 128–143.

Hoffman, I., & Popa, O. (1986). Library orientation and instruction for international students. The University of California-Davis experience. *Rq*, *25*(3), 356–360.

Houlihan, M., Walker Wiley, C., & Click, A. B. (2017). International students and information literacy: A systematic review. *Reference Services Review*, *45*(2), 258–277.

Hsieh, H., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, *15*(9), 1277–1288.

Hurley, T., Hegarty, N., & Bolger, J. (2006). Crossing a bridge. *New Library World*, *107*(7/8), 302–320.

Ibraheem, A. I., & Devine, C. (2016). Saudi students, American academic library: A survey. *Library Review*, *65*(4/5), 267–280.

Iheanacho, P. C. (2008). A plan for making the University of Delaware's Morris Library more accessible to students from developing countries. Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations (Publication No. 3324456).

Irving, S. (1994). Addressing the special needs of international students in interlibrary loan: Some considerations. *Reference Librarian*, *45*, 111–117.

Ishimura, Y., Howard, V., & Moukdad, H. (2007). Information literacy in academic libraries: Assessment of Japanese students' needs for successful assignment completion in two Halifax universities. *Canadian Journal of Information & Library Sciences*, *31*(1), 1–26.

Ishimura, Y. (2013). Information behavior and Japanese students: How can an understanding of the research process lead to better information literacy? *Public Services Quarterly*, *9*(1), 20–33.

Jackson, P. A. (2005). Incoming international students and the library: A survey. *Reference Services Review*, *33*(2), 197–209.

Jackson, P. A., & Sullivan, P. (Eds.). (2011). *International students and academic libraries: Initiatives for academic success*. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries.

Jati, H. (2010). Decision support system for managing and determining international class program: Ga and AHP approach. *Journal of Education*, *3*(1), 11–32.

Kim, D., Twombly, S., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2012). International faculty in American Universities: Experiences of academic life, productivity, and career mobility. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, *2012*(155), 27–46.

Kim, D., Wolf-Wendel, L., & Twombly, S. (2011). International faculty: Experiences of academic life and productivity in U.S. universities. *Journal of Higher Education*, *82*(6), 720–747.

Kline, L. S., & Rod, C. M. (1984). Library orientation programs for foreign students: A survey. *Rq*, *24*(2), 210–216.

Knight, J. (2003). Updated internationalization definition. *International Higher Education*, *33*(3), 2–3.

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *8*, 5–31.

Knight, L., Hight, M., & Polfer, L. (2010). Rethinking the library for the international student community. *Reference Services Review*, *38*(4), 581–605.

Koehler, B., & Swanson, K. (1988). ESL students and bibliographic instruction: Learning yet another language. *Research Strategies*, *6*(4), 148–160.

Koenigstein, D. (2012). Alleviating international students' culture shock and anxiety in American academic libraries: Welcome, Ahlan Wa Sahlan, Anyeong Hae Sae Yo, Bienvenidos, Huan ying, Sanu Da Zuwa, Shalom, Swaagat hai. *Library Philosophy & Practice*, *14*, 78–83.

Kuang, J. Q. (1989). A study to determine how international students utilize the library resources and services of the Bowling Green State University Libraries. Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations.

Kumar, S., & Suresh, R. (2000). Strategies for providing effective reference services for international adult learners. *Reference Librarian*, *33*(69/70), 327–336.

Kuntz, P. S. (2005). *Libraries of Rovigno/Rovinj Istria/Istra, Croatia: European Border Cultures*. Online Submission. Online Submission. Retrieved from https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=sso&db=eric&AN=ED491476&site=ehost-live.

Kutner, L. (2009). Think locally, act globally: Understanding home Institution library engagement among study-abroad students. *College & Research Libraries*, *70*(2), 158–176.

Kutner, L. (2010). Study-abroad programs as information producers: An expanding role for support of our students studying abroad. *Journal of Library Administration*, *50*(7/8), 767–778.

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lampert, L. D., Dabbour, K. S., & Solis, J. (2005). When it's all Greek: The importance of Collaborative Information Literacy Outreach Programming to Greek Student Organizations. *Research Strategies*, *20*(4), 300–310.

Lewis, M. G. (1969). Library orientation for Asian college students. *College & Research Libraries*, *30*, 267–272.

Li, S. D. (1998). Library services to students with diverse language and cultural backgrounds. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *24*(2), 139–143.

Li, Z. (2006). Communication in academic libraries: An East Asian perspective. *Reference Services Review*, *34*(1), 164–176.

Li, X., McDowell, K., & Wang, X. (2016). Building bridges: Outreach to international students via vernacular language videos. *Reference Services Review*, *44*(3), 324–340. doi:10.1108/RSR-10-2015-0044

Lin, S. (2006). Perceptions of U.S. academic library services of first-year graduate students from Taiwan: a photo elicitation study (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations. (OCLC: 607091718)

Lipsett, A. (2004). Flattery does not translate into all cultures. *Times Higher Education Supplement*, (1665), 3.

Lopez, M. D. (1983). Chinese spoken here: Foreign language library orientation tours. *College & Research Libraries*, *44*(8), 267–269.

Love, E., & Edwards, M. B. (2009). Forging inroads between libraries and academic, multicultural and student services. *Reference Services Review*, *37*(1), 20–29.

Lund, J. R. (2004). Plagiarism: A cultural perspective. *Journal of Religious & Theological Information*, *6*(3/4), 93–101.

Macdonald, G., & Sarkodie-Mensah, E. (1988). ESL students and American libraries. *College and Research Libraries*, *49*(5), 425–431.

Marcus, J. (1998). Britain is tops for US students. *Times Higher Education Supplement*, *1363*, 10.

Marcus, J. (2005). American lack of foreign knowledge "dangerous." *Times Higher Education Supplement*, *1720*, 13.

Marcus, S. (2003). Multilingualism at the reference desk. *College & Research Libraries News*, *64*(5), 322.

Martin, J. A., Reaume, K. M., Reeves, E. M., & Wright, R. D. (2012). Relationship building with students and instructors of ESL: Bridging the gap for library instruction and services. *Reference Services Review*, *40*(3), 352–367.

May Ying, C. (2003). Helping hands: Serving and engaging international students. *Reference Librarian*, *38*(79–80), 383–393.

McCarthy, J. P., & Ortiz, J. T. (2010). Globalisation in academic libraries: A reflective comparison of academic libraries at Cork, Ireland, and Chihuahua, Mexico. *Library Management*, *31*(7), 505–520.

McElroy, K., & Bridges, L. M. (2017). Librarians leading short-term study abroad. *In the Library with the Lead Pipe*, 1.

McKenzie, D. E. (1995, May 1). Survey of Library and Information Needs of the International Students at Kent State University. (ED309410).

McLean, D. D. (1978). Library User Education for the International Student: A Feasibility Study. (ED197702).

McSwiney, C. M. (1994). Academic library needs of international students: The Swinburne response. Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations.

McSwiney, C. (n.d.). Transnational programs graduate qualities, information literacy and the response and role of the University Library: A report to the University Librarian. Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations.

Mei Jing, L., Li, S., Womack, R., Wu, C., & Tao, Y. (2009). Celebrating diversity, welcoming the world: Developing a Chinese Webpage at Rutgers University Libraries. *CALA Occasional Paper Series*, *5*, 2–11.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mestenhauser, J. A. (2003). In search of a comprehensive approach to international education: A system perspective. In W. Grunweig and N. Rinehart (Eds.), *Rockin in red square: Critical approaches to international education in the age of cyberculture* (pp. 165–213). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Miller, R. G., Xu, H., & Zou, P. X. (2008). Global document delivery, user studies, and service evaluation: The gateway experience. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *34*(4), 314–321.

Miller, R. G., & Zhou, P. X. (1999). Global resource sharing: A gateway model. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *25*(4), 281–287.

Moeckel, N., & Presnell, J. (1995). Recognizing, understanding, and responding: A program model of library instruction services for international students. *The Reference Librarian*, *51*, 309–325.

Mood, T. A. (1982). Foreign students and the academic library. *Rq*, *22*(2), 175–180.

Munene, I. I. (2014). Outsiders within: Isolation of international faculty in an American university. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, *19*(4), 450–467.

Muroi, L., White, P., & San Diego State University (1990). *Library research guide for international students* (2nd ed.). (ED286524).

Neal, J. G. (2001). The entrepreneurial imperative advancing from incremental to radical change in the academic library. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, *1*(1), 1–13.

Norlin, E. (2001). University goes back to basics to reach minority students. (cover story). *American Libraries*, *32*(7), 60.

Nzivo, C. N., & Chuanfu, C. (2013). International students' perception of library services and information resources in Chinese academic libraries. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *39*(2), 129–137.

Okiy, R. B. (2010). Globalization and ICT in academic libraries in Nigeria: The way forward. *Library Philosophy & Practice*, *12*, 1–10.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Jiao, Q. G., & Daley, C. E. (1997). *The Experience of Non-Native English-Speaking Students in Academic Libraries in the United States*. Paper presented at the *Annual Conference of the Mid-South Educational Research Association*, 26th, Memphis, TN, November 12–14, 1997.

Ormondroyd, J. (1989). The international student and course-integrated instruction: The librarian's perspective. *Research Strategies*, *7*(4), 148–158.

Osborne, N. S., & Poon, C. (1995). Serving diverse library populations through the specialized instructional services concept. *The Reference Librarian*, *51*, 285–294.

Patton, B. A. (2002a, May 1). International students and the American university library. Master of Arts Thesis, Biola University.

Patton, M. Q. (2002b). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Paulus, A. R. (2013). North American Coordinating Council on Japanese Library Resources. *Interlending & Document Supply*, *41*(2), 36–42.

Peters, D. E. (2010). *International students and academic libraries: A survey of issues and annotated bibliography*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Pibulsilp, T. (2010). An investigation of cultural influence on academic library usage and experience of international medical students from Asian countries: A case study of students at the Christchurch School of Medicine, University of Otago, Christchurch: submitted to the School of Information Management, Victoria University of Wellington in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Library and Information Studies. Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations.

Piketty, T., & Goldhammer, A. (2020). *Capital and ideology*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Puente, M. A., Gray, L., & Agnew, S. (2009). The expanding library wall: Outreach to the University of Tennessee's multicultural/international student population. *Reference Services Review*, *37*(1), 30–43.

Rader, H. B. (2002). Information literacy 1973–2002: A selected literature review. *Library Trends*, *51*(2), 242–259.

Riggs, D. E. (1997). What's in store for academic libraries? Leadership and management Issues. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *23*(1), 3–8.

Rodenberg, T. C. (2010). Measuring commitment to internationalizing the campus: An institutional fingerprint. *Journal of Applied Learning in Higher Education*, *2*, 39–53.

Rosenzweig, J. W., & Meade, Q. H. (2017). Checking out the library: Partnering for outreach to short-term international students. *Journal of Library Administration*, *57*(4), 375–388.

Roulston, K., deMarrais, K., & Lewis, J. (2003). Learning to interview in the social sciences. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *9*(4), 643–668.

Ruleman, A. B., & Riley, C. (2017). Serving the textbook needs of international students through course reserves. *Journal of Access Services*, *14*(2), 46–52.

Sackers, N., Secomb, B., & Hulett, H. (2008). How well do you know your clients?: international students' preferences for learning about library services. *Australian Academic & Research Libraries*, *39*(1), 38–55.

Salaz, A. M., Kayo, C., Houlihan, M., & Birch, S. (2016). The future of U.S. university international branch campus libraries. *College & Research Libraries News*, *77*(11), 551–554.

Sarkodie-Mensah, K. (1989). Foreign students and U.S. academic libraries: A case study of foreign students and libraries in two universities in New Orleans, Louisiana (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations. (OCLC: 20848887)

Sarkodie-Mensah, K. (1992). Dealing with international students in a multicultural era. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *18*(4), 214–216.

Saw, G., Abbott, W., Donaghey, J., & McDonald, C. (2013). Social media for international students – It's not all about Facebook. *Library Management*, *34*(3), 156–174.

Saw, G., Lui, W. W., & Yu, F. (2008). 2010: A library odyssey. *Library Management*, *29*(1/2), 51–66.

Schomberg, J., & Bergman, B. (2012). International students' use of a library's media collection. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services*, *36*(3/4), 121–126.

Shaffer, C., Vardaman, L., & Miller, D. (2010). Library usage trends and needs of international students. *Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarian*, *29*(2), 109–117.

Sheu, F., & Panchyshyn, R. S. (2017). Social introduction to library services for international students. *Library Review*, *66*(3), 127–143.

Shiyi, X. (2012). Canadian academic library support for international faculty: Library experience and information needs of Chinese visiting scholars at the University of Western Ontario. *Partnership: The Canadian Journal of Library & Information Practice & Research*, *7*(2), 1–14.

Silverman, D. (2000). *Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Sin, S. J. (2015). Demographic differences in international students' information source uses and everyday information seeking challenges. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *41*(4), 466–474.

Smiraglia, R. P., & Leazer, G. H. (1999). Derivative bibliographic relationships: The work relationship in a global bibliographic database. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, *50*(6), 493–504.

So, S. (1994). International students and American academic libraries: An empowering relation. (ED ED369403).

Somerville, M. M., Cooper, L., Torhell, C., & Hashert, C. (2015). At home in the world. *IFLA Journal*, *41*(4), 326–335.

Song, Y., & Lee, J. (2012). Mobile device ownership among international business students: A road to the ubiquitous library. *Reference Services Review*, *40*(4), 574–588.

Steele, C. (1993). Millennial libraries: Management changes in an electronic environment. *Electronic Library*, *11*(6), 393–402.

Swain, H. (2004). I could not have put it better – So I won't. *Times Higher Education Supplement*, *1646*, 62.

Tahir, T. (2007). Britain gets vote of foreign students. (cover story). *Times Higher Education Supplement*, *1813*, 1.

Taler, I. (2018). Globalization of area studies: An analysis of collection development resources. *Collection Building*, *37*(3), 97–110.

Tam, W., Cox, A. M., & Bussey, A. (2009). Student user preferences for features of next-Generation OPACs: A case study of University of Sheffield international students. *Program: Electronic Library and Information Systems*, *43*(4), 349–374.

Thomas, J. I., & Victoria University of Wellington. (1995). The foreign students and the Victoria University of Wellington Library: A survey on the difficulties the foreign and New Zealand students encountered when using the Victoria University of Wellington Library: a thesis submitted to the Victoria University of Wellington in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Librarianship. Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations.

Tsai, B. (1988). Special bibliographic instruction for international students: A survey of academic libraries in medium sized state universities. Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations.

Ury, C. J., & Baudino, F. (Eds.). (2005). *Brick and Click Libraries: Proceedings of an Academic Library Symposium*, Northwest Missouri State University, Maryville, Missouri, October 14, 2005.

Uwhekadom, E. E., & Olawolu, O. E. (2013). Globalization, information technology and higher education in Nigeria: The roles of library professionals. *African Higher Education Review*, *7*(1), 79–87.

Wang, J., & Frank, D. G. (2002). Cross-cultural communication: Implications for effective information services in academic libraries. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, *2*(2), 207–216.

Wayman, S. G. (1984). The international student in the academic library. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *9*(6), 336–341.

Wei, K., Sullivan, H., Rudasill, L., & Ford, B. I. (2006). Not just icing on the cake. *College & Research Libraries News*, *67*(1), 10–13.

Wei, W. (1998). Outreach to international students and scholars using the World Wide Web. *Sci-Tech News*, *52*(2), 11–14.

Welch, J. E., & Lam, R. E. (1991). The library and the pluralistic campus in the year 2000: Implications for administrators. *Library Administration & Management*, *5*(4), 212–216.

White, A., Ye, Y., & Guccione, M. (2009). Study abroad students: Designing library services to meet their needs. *Journal of Library Administration*, *49*(1–2), 187–196.

Whitehurst, A. P. (2010). Information literacy and global readiness: Library involvement can make a world of difference. *Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarian*, *29*(3), 207–232.

Wibbeke, E. S., & McArthur, S. (2014). *Global business leadership* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.

Yunshan, Y. (2009). New thoughts on library outreach to international students. *Reference Services Review*, *37*(1), 7–9.

Yusuke, I., & Bartlett, J. C. (2014). Are librarians equipped to teach international students? A survey of current practices and recommendations for training. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *40*(3/4), 313–321.

Zimerman, M. (2012). Plagiarism and international students in academic libraries. *New Library World*, *113*(5/6), 290–299.

Zong, J., & Batalova, J. (2018). International students in the United States. Migration InformationSource. https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/international-students-united-states.

2 Why internationalize?

As established in the Introduction, higher education institutions by nature are international organizations. Knight (2004) further answers why a college should internationalize at the college level. Among the many reasons she provides are to increase academic standards, revenue, diversity, and stakeholder development. Although the library typically does not make executive decisions that set policy for such initiatives, it can support them through its own mission and also provide resources and services. This is important in terms of the library itself and its ability to support its college. This chapter describes these two terms by specifically addressing the reasons why the library needs to internationalize.

There are at least four important reasons why an academic library should itself internationalize. One revolves around mission. The mission statements of libraries included in this study shared at least one common theme: support their college. If a college states in its own mission, or in a strategic plan, that it wants to internationalize, then it can be argued that, by extension not only is the library justified to internationalize its resources and services, but obligated. How much obligation or justification depends upon the college, particularly its own level of commitment. Although colleges included in this study stated through various artifacts that they had an intention to internationalize, research indicated that actual effort did not always match the rhetoric.

Even if a college does not internationalize, there still could be justification for its library to do so. In fact, this often happens by default of the very nature and purpose of an academic library (Bordonaro & Rauchmann, 2015). An adequate academic library collection requires content beyond regional or national spheres. For example, no nation can lay claim to all the great novels published; thus, building a collection reflective of great literature requires at least one type of internationalization. Granted, internationalization by default of content does not represent the brand of holistic, deliberate internationalization for which scholars like Becker (2006) or Riggs (1997) would advocate; however, the point is that an academic library with the purpose of serving the needs of students at a college should provide resources outside the national realm, and often already does. In this way, an academic library has an innate proclivity toward internationalization before any deliberate attempt needs to be initiated.

DOI: 10.4324/9781003128878-2

The second reason is social equity. Although library professionals do not take an oath like some other professions that includes or implies adherence to a moral or ethical code, it can be argued that there is a social responsibility that accompanies librarianship. For example, IFLA (International Federation of Library Associations) has a set of core values on which it operates. Three of them explicitly address social equity:

> …the endorsement of the principles of freedom of access to information, ideas and works of imagination and freedom of expression…the belief that people, communities and organizations need universal and equitable access to information, ideas and works of imagination for their social, educational, cultural, democratic and economic well-being…the conviction that delivery of high quality library and information services helps guarantee that access…enable all Members of the Federation to engage in, and benefit from, its activities without regard to citizenship, disability, ethnic origin, gender, geographical location, language, political philosophy, race or religion.
>
> (IFLA, 2018)

The idea of universal and equitable access to information will be thoroughly discussed in this chapter, not only in terms of traditional information literacy objectives but in relation to a holistic academic library internationalization process.

With education comes responsibility. Responsible, educated people should invest in concepts like diversity, inclusion, and social justice. Such notions were either stated or implied within the college mission statements read in this study, and the library should play a pivotal role in supporting and facilitating them. Even if there were a college uninvested in social justice, and then only local or national interests, given the professional codes of library associations, it could be argued that libraries would still be ethically responsible for facilitating information literacy, which now necessitates international perspectives given the amount of information emerging at global levels, and the sorts of issues that require global rather than national solutions (e.g., the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic).

The third reason is validation and justification. Although this should not be a reason, unfortunately libraries in this study found themselves frequently having to justify their budgets not being cut, curricular integration, involvement in information literacy, and occasionally even having to argue why information literacy should be an explicit academic objective. Academic library internationalization can help validate relevance and justification for involvement in these and other college initiatives. Back to Knight's points about increases in academic standards and diversity: libraries in this study did not administer academic affairs divisions, nor enroll students; however, databases with peer-reviewed literature and meaningful library instruction certainly support academics, and friendly reference support that makes research easier to accomplish can be the difference in retaining some students.

Libraries in this study were not always perceived in terms that were flattering, fair, or appropriate to a higher education setting. Part of the problem observed was faculty disengagement; some library personnel complained about lack of faculty support or use, and yet if a library is to serve a legitimate academic support role, then it must collaborate with faculty, which requires their recognizing the library's value.

Another threat was administrative indifference. If administrators view the library's value solely in terms of a return-on-investment perspective that relies on fiscal quarterly revenue generation, then many libraries are at a disadvantage, including those in this study. In such cases, the library would do well to at least demonstrate some appeal to prospective students and correlate its resources and services with retention (more on this in the next chapter). Another threat was campus misperception about information literacy, and/or the library's role in it. If the library does not effectively market itself, along with the importance of information literacy, then both may be severely underutilized or misconceived. According to scholars to which this book subscribes, internationalization offers the library opportunities to avoid or overcome all these threats.

This threat concerning information literacy connects with the earlier social equity academic library internationalization justification. Arguments can be made that the misinformation and "fake news" phenomena that seemingly increases in a parallel trajectory with the Information Explosion serves as a threat to equity in that those less educated can be more easily misled, or denied opportunities; thus, once again information literacy is a major component to an equitable society. The academic library should play a pivotal role in information literacy facilitation, and information literacy as described in this book is crucial to any sort of legitimate internationalization. As will be discussed, the reverse also holds true – internationalization is now required for information literacy. Few organizations or sectors can afford exclusively local or national limitations.

The rest of this chapter describes the rationale, or why, behind academic library internationalization. The next section addresses why it is important to demonstrate the library's value to internationalization, along with why internationalization demonstrates the library's value – it is a symbiotic duality of sorts. It is also important that internationalization be implemented for the right reasons; the section discusses what can happen if it is not.

The last section addresses internationalization's relationship with information literacy – and why it is important to stakeholders. A different, more universal information literacy framework that involves components referred to as Identify, Locate, Evaluate, and Use is applied to describe the relationship. The idea that information can be more than a learning objective geared toward students is discussed, along with a distinction between it and information fluency in the context of internationalization.

Demonstrating library value

Becker (2006) and Delgado-Márquez, Escudero-Torres, and Hurtado-Torres (2013) illustrated internationalization's importance to the library in terms of

validation. Becker recommended the following initiatives to facilitate library internationalization that align well with Knight's (2004) framework: librarian proactivity (e.g., international librarian exchanges, collaboration, conference attendance; building foreign language skills, multicultural training); establishing a stable budget for internationalization; and strategic planning participation at institutional and international levels.

Becker is visionary, and looked beyond singular interactions with international students. She recognized the importance of internationalization for academic libraries in response to the concern that many colleges do not see their value. Although her article is older, the same perceptions about libraries are still in play: based on research for this book, many libraries are not considered crucial to college missions or strategic plans, and internationalization could revalidate them.

Becker's idea of library exchanges between colleges from different nations offers intriguing opportunities. If exchanges could be made between libraries at colleges that already exchange students, then library personnel could learn more about the types of international students with whom they will be working, and vice versa: when overseas, library personnel could share with their host colleges what to expect from the students from their home schools. Exchanges also offer intercollegiate collaboration potential which could positively impact other library operations, notably collection development (work with colleagues to increase access to foreign titles). Jiao et al. (2009) also demonstrated the value of librarian exchange in their research.

The exchange process could be administered through human resources and/or in some cases a department that handles the schools' international partnerships or initiatives. If one office were responsible for the administration of an exchange program, then important yet confusing processes like visa applications, passports, and other documentation could be more efficiently handled. Administering international work and travel details on behalf of the library personnel rather than making them do it themselves would ease the burden and stress of such a dramatic change of lifestyle. There would also need to be mechanisms and guidelines in place for when colleagues return, as this can be a difficult readjustment for them and the organization (Ferraro & Briody, 2017).

Some exchanges would offer more hassles than others based upon international realities (back to Knight's consideration of the nation within which a higher education sector resides). For example, exchanging librarians between Indian and Japanese colleges would likely be less hassle than between Iranian and British colleges due to diplomatic issues at work at national levels.

Again, it would help if personnel exchanges took place between colleges with established partnerships. For example, one North American college in this study had an exchange program with a European college in their respective software engineering programs. However, there was no collaboration between the libraries, let alone any exchange – those in the library were not even aware this exchange program existed. Based upon the concerns this library had regarding its image on campus, this would be a strategic place to

integrate itself. The computer science department had little use for the library at this North American college; by becoming involved with and showing interest in its software engineering program, the library might make strides not only in its internationalization efforts with this department, but in terms of revitalizing its overall image on campus.

The key to Becker's suggestions is aligning them with the college and library missions. Again, if the library's mission does not align with that of its college in terms of internationalization, then there is little justification to pursue it (Downey, 2013), nor is there incentive on the part of the college to support the library's internationalization efforts.

Whitehurst (2010) discussed the need for information literacy in response to higher education internationalization. She recognized it as an excellent opportunity to promote the library's importance and encouraged greater librarian–faculty collaboration in the effort to internationalize. One particular point Whitehurst made was that assessment of the impact of information literacy instruction on internationalization is crucial to demonstrating the library's value in the process.

Research for this book could also see the potential for extending this consideration to administrative aspects of information literacy (e.g., demonstrating correlation between library usage and international student retention). By advocating for, and teaching about the importance of information literacy within the context of internationalization, the academic library might secure or reaffirm its role at the college. Library administration could work with other interdepartmental peers, including enrollment, student living, international offices, and institutional research personnel to measure information literacy in ways that can be connected to full time enrollment and revenue generation.

Although internationalization can revitalize and revalidate the library's role in the higher education sector and individual college, it must be implemented for the right reasons. Important to remember is that the implementation should not be primarily for the sake of the library itself; if so, then estimates of its value could actually diminish. In addition to the library's internationalization intentions, Downey (2013) reminded that the college's intentions must also be sincere and realistic relative to the role it assigns the library; otherwise, she saw the possibility of negative implications to both internationalization and the library.

Downey used an American university as a case study to illustrate. She described executive pressure at this university on the library to internationalize for reasons that did not align with the library's mission; the library in her case study had more of an academic purpose, yet the university was pushing internationalization for more administrative purposes. The point was that when reasons for supporting internationalization are for administrative rather than academic reasons at a library with an academic mission, then not only is it doomed to fail, but everything else also suffers. Note: this aligns with the implications of the importance of understanding the library model concept to be discussed next chapter. Such a departure from mission is more distraction than opportunity and can harm the library's image and morale.

Primary research conducted for this book validated Downey's concerns. Most personnel interviewed seemed to support the idea of internationalization as a general concept, or at least certain aspects of it (e.g., socializing with international students), but not all recognized or agreed about its specific benefits or potential in relation to library validation. In fact, some viewed it as an additional drain on already depleted resources (including some library administrators). Unless library personnel embrace it, internationalization is unlikely to succeed in the library.

It is important to emphasize that library personnel whose thinking aligns with Downey's are not necessarily against internationalization. Most are simply against misconceived applications of it at both college and library levels. Internationalization can manifest itself at a college in numerous ways for several reasons; whatever ways or reasons, if the library is to support them, then it better do so in alignment with its own mission if it wants to improve its image on campus. This is where strong library administration/leadership is needed. It is now tempting for the sake of validation to accept any opportunity to play a role in overall college initiatives, especially something timely like internationalization. However, if the role runs counter to the library's purpose, not only is the library likely to fail, but the effects on it might also work to further invalidate it. Most library director equivalents in this study seemed to realize this danger.

One role the library should assume is one in facilitating information literacy. Despite efforts at some colleges to eliminate the library from this role (e.g., one writing center renamed itself the Writing and Research Center, and claimed it was the gatekeeper of information literacy, and no one else should touch it), it is difficult to make a case to exclude the library in anything to do with information literacy. However, a new way to approach and consider it could benefit the library, and also overall internationalization.

Information literacy

Why information literacy in a book about internationalization? It is this book's contention that the two now rely on one another. As one internationalization professional at an African university put it, "Information by its nature is international"; this statement has never been truer. People now require reliable information, including knowing why they need it, and how to locate, evaluate, and use it. Information is arguably the most valuable commodity in any sector. To increase information literacy requires increased international perspective, and to increase internationalization requires increased information literacy.

Higher education seems to want to limit information literacy to a student learning objective. However, this book contends that it is a state of mind or awareness rather than a quantifiable learning objective. Related to information literacy is information fluency; many would define or describe it as information literacy 2.0, with an emphasis on technology and multimedia. However, for purposes of this book, information literacy and information fluency differ whereas information literacy is considered more an individual

state of mind, information fluency is an organization's ability to facilitate it (Lombard, 2016). Information fluency is a process or ability on the part of a college to increase the information literacy of individual stakeholders. No two stakeholders will have the exact same levels of information literacy on any topic; however, an information fluent college provides mechanisms that make it possible for all stakeholders to have the best chance of achieving their highest potential information literacy. This in turn can lead to increased internationalization. Thus, if the library is key to a college's information fluency, it can also be key to its internationalization.

The rest of this chapter focuses on four information literacy components: Identify, Locate, Evaluate, Use. These components were chosen because they encompass the essence of any serious information literacy framework and are less complicated to consider than many of the new ones currently being promoted. It should also be noted that information literacy is not the linear progression implied by so many frameworks with their diagrams; something done in one information literacy component might impact another, requiring revisiting or revising the entire process. It is more like a cycle than a straight line from one point to another. In this way, internationalization is very similar in process to information literacy: one does not start at step one, then progress in an orderly fashion. For example, internationalization rationale will determine what objectives to pursue; however, during the specific pursuit of an objective, it might be determined that the overall rationale needs adjustment.

This book's information literacy interpretation was criticized by some library professionals, including one who reviewed it. Its legitimacy was questioned in the face of frequently updated frameworks in the various professional associations, especially the association of one nation in particular. What is ironic about this last point is that many of these same individuals became offended when this same nation is the focus of internationalization. In terms of internationalization, they want a multicultural perspective rather than English-speaking domination, yet clamor for the information literacy frameworks of one specific English-speaking nation. It is this book's contention that the following approach provides the perspective best suited for internationalization, and better aligns with answers to why a library should pursue it. One more important point that transcends throughout the rest of the book: the following information literacy interpretation is not only for library personnel to teach, but also to practice in terms of internationalization.

Identify

The literature seems preoccupied with how students find sources of information. However, ability to find information does not suffice to achieve information literacy; before people find it, they must understand why they look for it. Just as a library should understand why to internationalize, so should an individual understand why they pursue information literacy.

Identify is an oft-overlooked component of information literacy. For purposes of this book, it means full grasp of why one wants what it is they wish

to learn or achieve. For true information literacy, it is not enough to simply know "I need to find information on Madagascar", or "The editor requires another source about culture and communication". True Identify that leads to a higher level of information literacy demands that the researcher takes ownership of their information needs – this includes literally identifying a topic or goal. It is a transformative realization as opposed to transactional obedience, a distinction to be further discussed in Chapter 4 in terms of stakeholders.

Academic libraries, including those studied for this book, often accommodate information literacy in terms of "how", as in "How do I find…?". How type questions are indeed important; however, "what" and "why" should first be answered if "how" is to satisfactorily be achieved. Conceptualizing answers to such questions as "What is my topic?" and "Why have I chosen this topic?" leads to a truer grasp of that concept. Identify especially applies to matters of internationalization, including within the library itself. For example, "why internationalize?". Before pursuing internationalization, an academic library should answer this question. Is the answer a valid reason? Is it because the college insists? Is it to gain publicity? Is it so the director can apply for another job? Knowing the reasons why a library truly wants internationalization makes it more likely to eventually locate information in the pursuit.

One academic assignment considered for this study was a paper on Confucian communalism. Before directing the student to resources, the librarian asked them such questions as: "Why are you pursuing this topic?"; "What do you know about Confucianism or communalism?"; "Do you consider yourself more spiritual or religious?"; "Where do you stand on individual responsibility?"; "What do you intend to learn about this topic that might make you question your own beliefs?" It is through such question and answer dialogue, that the librarian learned: (1) how knowledgeable the student was about themselves, (2) about the subjects or topics related to the assignment, and (3) what the student hoped to accomplish. Again, this also applies to library personnel, not only in terms of being able to help stakeholders pursue information literacy but in their own pursuit of multicultural knowledge relevant to internationalization (Amsberry, 2009; Chan et al., 2015; Yusuke & Bartlett, 2014).

In addition to Locate, related literature on this topic often focuses on international students. This book has impressed the point that internationalization is not solely about them; however, if it were, then ironically the Identify phase would likely be the component that received the most focus. Research for this book indicated that it is during this phase when challenges arise for many international students. One of the goals of going to college is arguably learning to think for oneself, a premise on which Identify hinges; depending on the nation, many students do not learn this lesson. Although many domestic students can also struggle with Identify, especially in terms of internationalization, international students often have additional cultural and linguistic challenges.

A prominent cultural challenge relates to a nation or region's secondary school system (Bordonaro & Rauchmann, 2015). For example, the United States, although often priding itself on its rugged individualism, places emphasis on standardized testing for college admission; thus, many American students can effectively address writing prompts, and solve equations in under 30 minutes, but struggle to Identify in college (Hubbell, 2015). If a student graduated from a secondary school that is prescriptive and standardized, then they might not understand the value of Identify. In fact, information literacy as a whole may be a different notion entirely if a notion at all. This would be an obstacle to class success where the instructor does not assign topics and expects students to think for themselves. While the library may have resources to Locate, it would first have to help such students Identify.

To illustrate, a male librarian at one university in this study discussed having worked with a female student from a country where women were perceived and treated differently than men, including often having men make decisions for them (a contrast from what this librarian was accustomed to). The student was in a freshman composition course that required her to write a research paper, including choosing a topic. She evidently had never been required to do such an assignment and was confused by the implicit Identify component. She was told she needed to use the library to complete the assignment, so likely assumed that someone there would tell her all she needed to know, including on what topic to research.

At that moment of initial interaction, both student and librarian were confused (perhaps in addition to underlying cultural awkwardness related to gender). Whereas the librarian suspected the student simply was not effectively communicating, thus not confident he understood what she wanted, the student likely did not understand or even realize his confusion in terms of Identify. Again, she likely assumed because the instructor did not tell her what to write, that the librarian would because that instructor told her to use the library. She followed what she viewed as the hierarchical chain of command: first faculty member, then librarian, a secondary authority in this process who should have been able to resolve her dilemma. Note: hierarchy is a common theme to describe cultures and nations among social scientists like Hofstede (2001), but this book will not assign specific nationalities to the behaviors (more on this in Chapter 4).

After the librarian unraveled this initial confusion and explained that the student was required to Identify a topic on which to do library research, the student was still confused, and now disappointed because he still had not told her what to do. The librarian thought he clearly explained the assignment objectives, and that his explanation enabled her to identify a topic that was meaningful to her. The librarian thought that maybe he had not made things clear due to her limited English, but language was not the main problem; it was rather her inexperience being required to think for herself in such a way in a formal educational setting. She did not grasp the implications of what he explained.

At this point in the information literacy process, cultural differences can create additional problems. This student evidently held the librarian more responsible for her problem than the instructor. From her perspective, the instructor did her job telling the student to go to the library; it was this incompetent librarian who was not doing his job. Such a perception could pose a problem beyond information literacy, "Why is he not helping me?", "Maybe he does not like… (e.g., Muslims, Asians, women)?". The idea that she herself must choose a topic of interest to complete the assignment was literally foreign for her.

Thanks to the librarian, she was now better informed about the assignment, but still did not understand what was required in terms of Identify. This sort of disconnect is not uncommon between library personnel and library users; however, when the user is an international stakeholder from a different culture, other factors like language and customs can amplify the challenge and have negative consequences (e.g., stakeholder resentment toward library; personnel assumptions about people from a certain nation).

The librarian did not quit. He tried to help her by speaking more slowly and used what he thought would be less confusing language, but the student eventually gave up, and said she would go back to her instructor. She was polite, but it was clear that she was frustrated and did not trust that he was doing his job. The librarian disappointed her: from her vantage he was either intentionally not helping, or simply incompetent, thus not an authority who should be supporting student learning. The librarian felt like a failure, and feared that in addition to confusing her more about what seemed to be a simple task, that she might also run into other problems: he knew from experience that this particular instructor did not relish what she perceived as spoon-feeding college students; further, this instructor was a full immersionist, i.e., everyone should be accommodated within the university on the same terms, regardless of international or domestic status (more on this in Chapter 5).

This example exemplifies the importance of Identify, not only for those pursuing information literacy, but also those facilitating it. The literature concerned with internationalization and information literacy deals with similar struggles, but the prognosis seems to be that problems are related more to second language difficulties (e.g., Iheanacho, 2008). Indeed, the young lady was not as competent in the librarian's language as other typical, native speakers; however, her English was serviceable, and upon reflection, the librarian believed she understood the literal meaning of his words. Where the problem more likely arose was in terms of the Identify component, its implications to information literacy, and in relation to her culture. This could be the actual problem in many cases of international student struggle rather than, or in addition to, language or technology barriers commonly discussed in the literature. The frequent context of international student information literacy struggle is Locate, and the findings often point to language and technology as obstacles to them finding information. However, it could be that in many of these cases, it started with Identify, of which problems detected during the Locate sequence were but symptoms.

For Identify, it is not enough to simply determine a topic or goal (or have one assigned by an authority). To be information literate, the prospective researcher must make personal connections to the topic or project; they must understand why they identified it, including their personal relationship to it (e.g., objective/subjective; personal growth/public dissemination). If they expect, and/or are more content when an authority figure such as an instructor, or possibly a librarian prescribes Identify for them rather than passes responsibility onto them, then problems and stress, even a phenomenon known as "library anxiety" (Koenigstein, 2012), can arise. Rather than perceive such freedom as giving ownership to a student over their learning, in some cultures it might be seen as shirking responsibility on the part of authority figures. This could have implications with library users who place stock in relationships and respect for authority.

No libraries studied for this book had authority to require that students use their resources, as was also the case in the literature (Ibraheem & Devine, 2016; Kline & Rod, 1984; Martin, Reaume, Reeves, & Wright, 2012; Sarkodie-Mensah, 1989). Here is where collaboration, integration, and information fluency enter: students at the libraries in this study were more likely to listen to their faculty than library personnel. Therefore, a good place to begin facilitating information literacy at the Identify stage is through collaboration with faculty, and curricular integration (Jackson & Sullivan, 2011).

If the faculty internationalize curricula, then they and library personnel should work to integrate information literacy within it, especially the Identify component. As previously noted, it is important for library personnel to have the necessary subject background that can help support Identify; however, they must also understand their users, especially international students. Collaboration with faculty can serve both interests. It would also be helpful for librarians to collaborate with international faculty (Shiyi, 2012), and understand the types of content needed to support all faculty in an internationalized college. Sadly, collaboration is not always an automatic option; some library personnel interviewed for this book shared that faculty had even less interest in the library than students.

Locate

Locate preoccupies much of the information literacy literature, including that associated with internationalization. The emphasis is international students in Western nations, particularly their struggles using technology. Iheanacho (2008) was concerned about students from developing nations studying in more affluent ones; he believed that, in addition to language barriers, they feel overwhelmed by the technology. Some scholars disagree; Song and Lee (2012) found international students more adept at using the library, particularly technology, than domestic counterparts.

In terms of struggle, research for this book found that much depends on national background, particularly affluence. For example, as Iheanacho (2008) noted, someone from a less affluent nation where there is less money

for technology, might face struggles when using a library in a nation where technology is more abundant and accessible. However, contrasting voices worry that assuming there is a learning deficit can lead to presumptions. The differing findings regarding Locate and students likely arise more from differing intentions on the parts of authors. Those who fear international stakeholders are at a disadvantage simply want to eliminate obstacles to their locating information – they want to avoid an academic problem. Whereas those who argue that international stakeholders are as competent as or superior to domestic peers do not want them stereotyped by librarians as inadequate – they want to avoid a social problem. Both points are well taken and will reemerge throughout this book.

Yunshan (2009) believed the phrase "international student" itself is meaningless because there are so many international students from different nations. Since the countries that supply the most international students include China, India, Japan, and Saudi Arabia (International, 2020; OECD, 2020), none of which have much culturally or linguistically in common, his point is relevant in a very practical sense. Additionally, even within these and most other countries, there can be differences in terms of exposure to academic libraries and their resources and services for locating information; where exactly stakeholders are from in a given nation can be valuable to know. For example, it is not enough to understand general tendencies about British students: from what part of a particular nation is just as important to understand according to McCarthy and Ortiz (2010). Keeping with the British example: if from London, then there is a good chance that they had access to the types of technology libraries provide that help find sources; if from rural areas, they might then lack familiarity. None of the libraries studied for this book could definitely say whether national or regional distinctions made a Locate difference.

Evaluate

For purposes of this book, to effectively Evaluate the quality of a source, the general criteria include relevance, timeliness, and authority in relation to the topic. Relevance involves how well the source aligns with the topic in terms of content. Timeliness relates to relevance in that it is topic-sensitive (e.g., the topic "Russian foreign policy impact on the EU" could be quickly outdated). Authority is measured in terms of an author's qualifications to write on the topic (e.g., experience, academic credentials, methodology).

In terms of internationalization, the stakes increase in relation to source quality. For example, a domestic student who plans to do a study abroad had better be certain that the information they use is timely and authoritative, or the consequences could be more dire than a low test score. The highest quality sources are arguably those found in an academic library, namely peer-reviewed journals and books published by trusted publishers (e.g., Routledge). One can be assured information in such sources has been evaluated by subject experts according to this field's criteria.

Convenience should not trump quality; for example, stakeholders in this study sometimes limited database searches to full-text rather than peer reviewed. Databases that arrange results by relevance create additional dilemmas; although laypeople may believe that what is at the top of the list is the best source on their topic, it is unlikely that an algorithm can better understand user Identify than users themselves.

Depending on topic, students might also be inclined to accept what they find on social media from friends or other non-authorities if they have a deeper, personal connection to the topic. As demonstrated by the "fake news" phenomenon, some trust more what they read on their friends' Twitter feeds than what is available in the complex, polysyllabically-worded articles found in library databases. Example: students in one class being observed in this study often included a source's readability as the main factor in evaluating its quality. If they could not understand it, then they deemed it lower quality than something easier to read, like a friend's social media post.

Due to the prominence of social media, Evaluate can be a very personal component in relation to internationalization. However, it should be the one most directed by objectivity. Here lies irony: Identify should be the most subjective in terms of personal relationship to topic, yet sometimes is not (i.e., a student who, due to educational background, expects a topic to be assigned); whereas Evaluate should be most driven by objectivity, but is often not, instead supplanted by Facebook likes, or Twitter tweets which enjoy wide international familiarity and use.

The importance of source quality must be impressed upon students. Unfortunately, libraries can no longer assume faculty will do so; some research assignments in this study had no source quality requirements. It was disappointing to learn of the lack of concern of some faculty in relation to source quality. It was also ironic, given that it is they who typically author the articles published in peer-reviewed journals that are often associated with source quality.

There are reasons faculty might not emphasize Evaluate. One, academic standards in general might be dipping: in the seemingly business-model approach to higher education, there is increasing pressure to please the student, i.e., customer; this could especially be the case with international students who often pay full tuition, and on whom some colleges have become financially reliant. Forcing them to select high quality journals is harder and takes more time than allowing them to simply refer to dot-com websites, the result of which can lead to bad student faculty evaluations. This seemed possible in at least a few of the libraries in this study. Two, a byproduct of number one, and a perpetuating cycle: some newer faculty might themselves be products of this higher education business model, and simply do not have awareness of, nor concern for source quality since it was not as heavily impressed upon them in their own student experience. Three, library budgets are getting cut; hence there is not always enough high quality material available in the library, so why bother to require it? Again, only speculations, but possibilities that could pose obstacles to Evaluate.

Another problem for some libraries is how curricula is structured. For example, many colleges have freshman composition courses where "information literacy" is a learning objective. Depending on the instructor's approach, it is difficult to impress the tenets of Evaluate on students in such courses. If students pick topics related to their intended majors, which was a recommendation for one of the freshman composition classes studied for this book, as freshmen they do not yet have the subject knowledge that comes from having taken classes in their program – thus Identify and Locate would also be compromised. Additionally, unless their topics align with the instructor's expertise (e.g., in this case something composition or literature related), how is the instructor in such a course able to effectively assess student ability to incorporate peer-reviewed sources for topics related to the students' majors? Many students now major in STEM fields, and fewer freshman composition instructors are likely to find students majoring in literature (Clarke & Kim, 2018); what difference does it make if the nursing major cites an article out of *JAMA*? That instructor with the graduate degree in language or literature has no subject expertise in which to assess the article, let alone the student's ability to Evaluate it. This difference in subject expertise in relation to topic can also be a problem for librarians (Clarke & Kim, 2018).

When dealing with topics and issues related to internationalization, Evaluate problems can become even more complex. Example: one freshman composition instructor in this study embraced both internationalization and information literacy and insisted on students citing only peer-reviewed journal articles for their global awareness assignments. On the one hand, the instructor's insistence on high quality authority is commendable; unfortunately, it was often at the expense of timeliness and/or relevance. One student did a paper on a social media device and its potential impacts on the social aspects of a foreign nation. The product was new, and the best source to use was the product's website itself, at least in a primary source capacity. However, the instructor forbade this student from citing it because it was a dot-com website; there were no relevant peer-reviewed articles. This student would have had to do major connecting between theoretical concepts of social media and economics to effectively Use in this situation, and this faculty member did not have expertise in or experience with the major aspects of the topic. This was a domestic student: imagine if they were international from a secondary school system that did few research assignments. Having to accommodate such thoughts, to make the leap from simply citing to validating, is a lot to ask of any student, let alone one unfamiliar with the language and culture of the source material and subject.

The bottom line is library personnel should be involved in the Evaluate phase. They can help instructors see the bigger picture that is the entire information literacy process, and the place of Evaluate within it. Given the above examples, it would also be beneficial to have them involved in the Identify phase; that way, they can help faculty understand the entire purpose of information literacy in relation to assignments (i.e., do not allow students to do research projects that fall far from instructor familiarity). Perhaps the library

could facilitate campus collaboration where faculty help one another by sharing expertise, and international office colleagues inform about the student body. This would be the essence of information fluency; unfortunately, no college in this study enjoyed such collaboration.

Administrators might also consider applying Evaluate principles to their own work. Many colleges now claim to be "data driven", the implication being they make informed decisions based on objective data instead of "going with one's gut". An admirable intention, especially in terms of internationalization (e.g., curriculum development; international partnerships). A college that employs a data-driven model to decision-making on internationalization exhibits characteristics of the information literacy process: Identify goal or problem (e.g., increase number of students from a particular nation); Locate data about that nation (e.g., preferred subjects of study; employment needs); Evaluate data (i.e., author, date, relevance); Use to determine and develop attractive programs.

Unfortunately, according to various evidence (e.g., personnel comments; college artifacts), not all colleges in this study approached their decisions in terms of the data-driven model, including those that claimed to do so. Example: a college looking to tap a new international student market did not do due diligence in evaluating its data. Source authority, specifically reliability was sketchy, and timeliness was definitely weak given the data in relation to the decision. Questions that should have been asked were: From where did the data originate? Was it from a government source? If so, then how reliable is that government in terms of objectivity and competence? How recent is the data? Instead of asking such questions, there seemed to be subjective conjecture and personal agenda.

Another problem can be simple denial of the actual data. Example: a student with preconceived notions about what they want to accomplish in an assignment, who uses only information that validates that end. This was evident in some papers reviewed for this study that dealt with culture; although there was information available that contradicted their theses, they only evaluated for validation of their preconceptions. This is especially detrimental to any higher education internationalization initiative, especially one at an administrative level that can impact the entire college.

Use

Theoretically once one reaches the Use stage they either have or have not achieved information literacy. However, as already mentioned information literacy is not always linear; what a researcher discovers in one component could require adjusting previous ones. This is especially important within the context of Use: if the information literacy process reveals data that differs from preconceived notions, yet the researcher insists upon making things fit Use, then information literacy is unlikely attained. A breakdown during any one of the components can lead to information illiteracy; however, nowhere is it more evident than in Use when other people might ultimately be relying on the researcher as an information provider.

One common illustration of domestic student Use within context of internationalization is study abroad. If an effective information literacy progression took place, then what the student gained during the three other stages will not only determine the program/nation in which they study, but how they approach the overall experience (e.g., travel; study; cultural assimilation). Without proper preparation, one might not enjoy the full internationalization experience. The library can play a pivotal role in supplying the content needed for domestic students in such scenarios, but is often disregarded (Kutner, 2009, 2010).

The literature reveals unique challenges for international students (Baron & Strout-Dapaz, 2001), especially those from what anthropologists might refer to as communal cultures studying in proprietary settings. A particular Use problem can be citation. It is during citation when many international students struggle according to literature on the subject, of which most deals with Eastern students studying in the West. Citation issues often stem more from cultural differences somewhat similar as those described for the Identify phase. Just as some students unaccustomed to identifying topics on their own struggle with Identify, some are also unaccustomed to citation, and struggle with that aspect of Use. This will be further discussed in Chapter 4. At the schools studied for this project, many students struggled with citation, both domestic and international.

Information literacy and academic library internationalization are now intertwined. To effectively support international stakeholders requires understanding their cultures; additionally, for domestic stakeholders to be information literate requires more internationalized content. This can be taken to a much broader level, given the current state of the world and society. It is impressed upon people that the Industrial Age has ended, and the world has evolved into a new Information Age, where information is now the most valuable commodity. Part of this evolution is arguably fueled by a more global perspective; people must account for multiple cultures and be globally informed to be truly information literate. By the same token, to effectively operate in such a global context requires optimal information literacy; thus, the academic library that internationalizes has a better chance of facilitating information literacy across campus. Research for this book indicated that intentions within this internationalization/information literacy dynamic are pivotal. In general, for stakeholders the intention needs to be to inform rather than opine or persuade; for librarians, understand rather than stereotype. Trust is pivotal in relation to intentions, i.e., do not automatically assume the worst about others involved; without at least some trust, internationalization is likely to fail. For example, when library personnel acknowledge a person's culture it does not mean they are trying to stereotype them in a negative way; most times they just want them to feel comfortable and demonstrate that they are invested in them. However, if people insist that the intention is to stereotype, then there is little hope for any information literacy at such a college because the library personnel will be thwarted whichever way they proceed. In such a judgmental mindset, if they do not acknowledge culture, then they are unenlightened; if they do, then they are bigots.

It is not only on campus where internationalization offers the academic library opportunities to increase information literacy. Depending on the college mission or strategic plan there can be excellent opportunities to engage the community. Whether through resources or services, an academic library can help a community increase cultural awareness. This is especially so for rural, secluded communities with little diversity (McCarthy & Ortiz, 2010); however large, diverse metropolises, especially those with refugee populations, can also benefit if the library provides access to tools and skill training necessary for information literacy (e.g., guest privileges to its databases; instruction on how to Identify and Evaluate).

Either through what it offers in terms of content and/or as a gathering place, an academic library can make a positive contribution to internationalization efforts on their campuses and in their communities. For example, one library in this study provided outreach to its local international institute in the form of information literacy education to refugees; the instruction was adjusted to accommodate everyday living issues rather than academic matters. Although the institute was not particularly supportive, the library personnel were able to at least form friendly relationships with individual refugees.

College executives can be major contributors to information fluency by supporting the library, including acknowledging it as key to information literacy. They can determine the library's role and impress upon faculty, maybe in the form of evaluations, the importance of collaboration with and integration of the library into the curriculum. One case study college's strategic plan had collaboration as an academic affairs objective, along with internationalization. Imagine the role the library could assume through information fluency in this plan; unfortunately, the library was neither explicitly nor implicitly involved in any aspect of it. This was not through unwillingness on the part of the library, but lack of executive investment. This lack, or misplaced college investment was not uncommon for the libraries studied in this book and helps segue into the next chapter when attention turns from why to where.

One last note on why internationalize. The OCLC Global Council illustrates how libraries can impact internationalization beyond their own colleges. It has aligned its 2021 agenda with the United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, specifically their Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) which are supported by IFLA through its International Advocacy Programme. These SDGs represent 17 areas in need of global rather than national attention. OCLC has decided to emphasize five SDGs in particular: quality education (SDG #4); decent work and economic growth (SDG #8); reduced inequalities (SDG #10); peace, justice, and strong institutions (SDG #16); and partnerships for the goals (SDG #17) (Global, 2020). By aligning with the United Nations, the OCLC and IFLA (organizations that exemplify library internationalization) not only demonstrate the importance of internationalization to the academic library, but the importance of the library to internationalization. However, before libraries can effectively address SDGs, deliberate focus on internationalization is required within the academic library itself, and its role throughout campus.

Before implementing academic library internationalization of any sort, especially of the holistic variety to which this book subscribes, it is important to understand why the library should be internationalized. The reciprocal dualities at work with internationalization in relation to validation and information literacy stand alone as justifications, but also moderate connections with social equity initiatives; understanding these relationships among them, and reasons for aspects of internationalization are key. Additionally, it is helpful to think of information literacy in relation to internationalization as more than a student learning objective; a library that facilitates information fluency can increase information literacy throughout the college, and it is throughout the college where the library wants its internationalization role to increase. The next chapter describes where exactly internationalization must take place for this to happen, both in a physical location sense, and throughout the organizational structure and culture of campus.

References

Amsberry, D. (2009). Using effective listening skills with international patrons. *Reference Services Review*, *37*(1), 10–19.

Baron, S., & Strout-Dapaz, A. (2001). Communicating with and empowering international students with library skills set. *Reference Services Review*, *29*(4) 314–326.

Becker, L. K. W. (2006). Globalisation and internationalisation: Models and patterns of change for Australian academic librarians. *Australian Academic & Research Libraries*, *37*(4), 282–298.

Bordonaro, K., & Rauchmann, S. (2015). Internationalization in German academic libraries: Moving beyond North American perspectives. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, *15*(4), 677–697.

Chan, K. P., Colvin, J. B., Vinyard, M., Leach, C., Naumann, M. A., & Stenis, P. (2015). Libraries across the sea: Using a virtual presence and skilled student assistants to serve students abroad. *Journal of Library Administration*, *55*(4), 278–301.

Clarke, R. I., & Kim, Y.-I. (2018). The more things change, the more they stay the same: Educational and disciplinary backgrounds of American Librarians, 1950–2015. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, *59*(4), 179–205, 27 pp.

Delgado-Márquez, B., Escudero-Torres, M., & Hurtado-Torres, N. (2013). Being highly internationalised strengthens your reputation: An empirical investigation of top higher education institutions. *Higher Education (00181560)*, *66*(5), 619–633.

Downey, K. (2013). Why did we buy that? New customers and changing directions in collection development. *Collection Management*, *38*(2), 90–103.

Ferraro, G. P., & Briody, E. K. (2017). *The cultural dimension of global business* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hubbell, L. (2015). Students aren't consumers. *Academic Questions*, *28*(1), 82–89.

Ibraheem, A. I., & Devine, C. (2016). Saudi students, American academic library: A survey. *Library Review*, *65*(4/5), 267–280.

IFLA (2018), "Core Values", https://www.ifla.org/about/more (accessed on 18 April 2021).

Iheanacho, P. C. (2008). A plan for making the University of Delaware's Morris Library more accessible to students from developing countries. Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations (Publication No. 3324456).

Jackson, P. A., & Sullivan, P. (Eds.). (2011). *International students and academic libraries: Initiatives for academic success*. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries.

Jiao, S., Zhuo, F., Zhou, L., & Zhou, X. (2009). Chinese academic libraries from the perspective of international students studying in China. *International Information & Library Review*, *41*(1), 1–11.

Kline, L. S., & Rod, C. M. (1984). Library orientation programs for foreign students: A survey. *Rq*, *24*(2), 210–216.

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *8*, 5–31.

Koenigstein, D. (2012). Alleviating international students' culture shock and anxiety in American academic libraries: Welcome, Ahlan Wa Sahlan, Anyeong Hae Sae Yo, Bienvenidos, Huan ying, Sanu Da Zuwa, Shalom, Swaagat hai. *Library Philosophy & Practice*, *14*, 78–83.

Kutner, L. (2009). Think locally, act globally: Understanding home Institution library engagement among study-abroad students. *College & Research Libraries*, *70*(2), 158–176.

Kutner, L. (2010). Study-abroad programs as information producers: An expanding role for support of our students studying abroad. *Journal of Library Administration*, *50*(7/8), 767–778.

Lombard, E. (2016). Information fluency: Not information literacy 2.0. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *42*(3), 281–283.

Martin, J. A., Reaume, K. M., Reeves, E. M., & Wright, R. D. (2012). Relationship building with students and instructors of ESL: Bridging the gap for library instruction and services. *Reference Services Review*, *40*(3), 352–367.

McCarthy, J. P., & Ortiz, J. T. (2010). Globalisation in academic libraries: A reflective comparison of academic libraries at Cork, Ireland, and Chihuahua, Mexico. *Library Management*, *31*(7), 505–520.

OECD (2020), "International student mobility" (indicator), https://doi.org/10.1787/4bcf6fc3-en (accessed on 8 November 2020).

Riggs, D. E. (1997). What's in store for academic libraries? Leadership and management issues. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *23*(1), 3–8.

Sarkodie-Mensah, K. (1989). Foreign students and U.S. academic libraries: a case study of foreign students and libraries in two universities in New Orleans, Louisiana (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations. (OCLC: 20848887)

Shiyi, X. (2012). Canadian academic library support for international faculty: Library experience and information needs of Chinese visiting scholars at the University of Western Ontario. *Partnership: The Canadian Journal of Library & Information Practice & Research*, *7*(2), 1–14.

Song, Y., & Lee, J. (2012). Mobile device ownership among international business students: A road to the ubiquitous library. *Reference Services Review*, *40*(4), 574–588.

Whitehurst, A. P. (2010). Information literacy and global readiness: Library involvement can make a world of difference. *Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarian*, *29*(3), 207–232.

Yunshan, Y. (2009). New thoughts on library outreach to international students. *Reference Services Review*, *37*(1), 7–9.

Yusuke, I., & Bartlett, J. C. (2014). Are librarians equipped to teach international students? A survey of current practices and recommendations for training. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *40*(3/4), 313–321.

3 Where does internationalization occur?

After answering why an academic library should internationalize, this book's contention is that where exactly internationalization should take place needs identified. The first questions to answer are, "Where does internationalization happen in a particular college?", and "Where should it happen?" These questions are somewhat more expansive for those few colleges with overseas campuses. Knight's (2004) model acknowledges the possibility of a college having to administer education in a foreign nation, and literature shows the library can conceivably be part of such administration (e.g., Salaz, Kayo, Houlihan, & Birch, 2016); however, for the vast majority of colleges in operation, including those observed for this study, there is no overseas campus. Where then becomes a more specific matter of where within the domestic operation.

Some are concerned that academic libraries do not adequately support or align with their colleges' internationalization (Bordonaro & Rauchmann, 2015; Buttlar, 1994; Kline & Rod, 1984; Marcus, 2003; Sarkodie-Mensah, 1992). However, there are also impressive examples of things libraries do that support at least some aspects of internationalization, albeit mostly singular aspects. A combination of factors could contribute to libraries that are not as internationalized as they wish to be, including where in the overall college structure and strategic plan they reside. That is the focus of this chapter: given that none of the schools considered in this study had overseas campuses, internationalization was a matter of the domestic library, and where those libraries resided within the college structure and strategy was a factor in a library's ability to internationalize both within and externally to the rest of campus and, in some cases, the surrounding community.

Libraries have both internal and external internationalization considerations. While there is the internationalization of the library itself in terms of its resources and services (internal), to possess the sort of holistic internationalization to which this book subscribes, it is just as important that the library supports the college's overall internationalization efforts, and possibly the surrounding community (external). In fact, similar to the internationalization/information literacy relationship described in the last chapter, the internal/external relationship is also codependent: to effectively support external internationalization, the library must be internally internationalized; yet, to internally internationalize, the library likely needs the college's support, and if it is

DOI: 10.4324/9781003128878-3

to earn it then likely must demonstrate how it can support the college's internationalization. Therefore, as this chapter will describe, academic library internal and external internationalization should align with a college's mission and vision; however, as this study showed, that is not always the case.

A problem at some of the schools in this study was that the library operation was misconceived at organizational levels. For example, not all academic libraries were as "academic" as others, even when they were perceived as such, or at least resided within an academic division. Some of these libraries served what this chapter describes as academic purposes (e.g., information literacy facilitation; resource repository), but others seemed to serve what are described as administrative purposes (e.g., space for social gathering; showcase for admissions). As Clark (1998) indicated, which purpose will best facilitate academic library internationalization at a given college must be determined by consensus, and this study indicated that not all campuses share consensus regarding their libraries: not just in terms of internationalization, but overall purpose. Internationalization can support academic or administrative library purposes, and either library purpose can support internationalization; however, this study indicated that their demands differ both in terms of internal and external operations, and trying to be all things to all stakeholders was not always effective.

This is where effective library administration is crucial. Although what happens on the frontlines (e.g., reference; circulation; collection development) is crucial to internationalization, determining what are the library's roles, and administering and advocating on behalf of the library and its ability to support the college to executives ultimately determines those frontlines, including where they lay. Administration must also ensure library personnel understand their role: as will be described, some in this study either showed little realization about whether they served academic or administrative purposes or had conflicting understanding about it in relation to internationalization.

In addition to positioning the library for a more intentional internationalization approach, and assume a pivotal role in college internationalization plans, administrators must also make clear through policy and culture what that purpose is for personnel. Even if it is a dual purpose, which this study observed to be ineffective, it must be clarified. Additionally, external understanding is also necessary: many outside the libraries in this study either did not or could not fathom the library's importance to overall college internationalization, and part of the problem could be this misconception.

This chapter addresses the where of academic library internationalization in terms of its administration, both inside the library itself and externally among stakeholders. The focus is on domestic libraries due to the fact that none of the academic libraries in this study were affiliated with colleges that had overseas campuses: since this is the case with the majority of colleges, academic library internationalization is ironically a much more common proposition at home than abroad.

The first section describes two major models and missions this study identified that academic libraries assume – academic and administrative – where they impact internationalization, where internationalization can impact them

within the library, and the roles of library and college missions in the process. It also identifies problems that can emerge with inconsistent or inappropriate academic or administrative focus.

The second section describes where internationalization is administered at library and executive levels in a college's organizational structure, along with approaches to leadership that depend on where the library resides in relation to internationalization. The importance of advocacy on the part of library leadership is stressed, along with building consensus about library purpose among all stakeholders, including and especially library personnel.

The succeeding sections then focus on themes from the literature. The third section considers specific strategies for internationalizing the library on holistic levels; additionally, the dilemmas that arise where the library internationalization vision differs from that of its college are discussed. The fourth reemphasizes the importance of collaboration: where on campus it is most important and with whom it is discussed, along with the idea once again that it depends upon the library's model and/or mission in relation to the college's organizational structure. Although none of the case study colleges had overseas branches, brief consideration of academic library internationalization under such circumstances is briefly described. Finally, challenges that exist to internationalization are reviewed, including how the geographical location of a campus can be a factor.

Models and mission

Studies showed that different perceptions of the academic library exist on the parts of campus stakeholders in relation to internationalization (Cope & Sanabria, 2014; Dawes, 2019; Gruber, 2018; Gullikson, 2006; Joswick & Stierman, 1995; Kelly, 2019; Mangrum & Foster, 2020; Meredith & Mussell, 2014; Oguz & Assefa, 2014; Shen, 2013; Sornam, Priya, & Prakash, 2013; Yang, 2000). Primary research for this book substantiated this lack of consensus: although stakeholder perceptions varied regarding the library in general, in terms of internationalization the indication was that it was not an instrumental department. According to Clark (1998), such perception poses problems.

Problems associated with academic library internationalization at colleges in this study appeared in part due to library divisional assignment in relation to the overall college internationalization plan. Of course the college must actually pursue internationalization in order to address the problem; although the colleges in this study claimed to, evidence suggested it was sometimes misconceived or poorly administered. Additionally, most personnel outside the library did not recognize the library's role or potential in internationalization; even in the cases of the exceptions, those who saw potential benefits to library involvement were unmotivated to pursue it. Again, this could have been due to the organizational structures on which the colleges operated overall, not just in terms of internationalization. If the library and departments or colleagues relevant to internationalization reside in different divisions, then

collaboration can be more difficult; there seemed to be disconnects at the libraries due to these artificial organizational boundaries.

One of the challenges is where best to position the library within its college's organizational structure. However, before divisional assignment is made, the library's purpose should first be determined: is it indeed academic, or in reality more of an administrative department? Although libraries of interest for this book are all technically "academic" in that they reside within a college, not all of those studied seemed to serve academic purposes, even when they had mission statements that stressed an academic support purpose and resided within their college's academic affairs division. This contradiction between operation and mission was not an issue of deliberate duplicity or unethical machination: simply a misperception about the library's overall role and purpose. If clarified and properly aligned, then both internally within the library and externally to the campus community it would become easier to fulfill or develop a meaningful mission statement and, along with it, a model for operation.

Cynics, like the author of this book, might scoff at such a rationale: "We have no control over where the library is placed". Regardless of how true that may be, research for this book indicated that it is imperative for the library to be well aligned within its college to be effective in any respect, including internationalization. The model and mission should philosophically align with the library's role in the college, and its internationalization within the frameworks of that model and mission. At this point, it is important to further distinguish between academic and administrative libraries as observed in this book.

Examples of activities associated with an academic purpose include curricular integration, library instruction, and faculty status for librarians. Such libraries are involved in the teaching, learning, and research that transpires in a college, and the collaboration that, according to the literature and research for this book is so important to internationalization, is with faculty and other academic support personnel (e.g., writing center). One particular model that matches well with such an academic purpose is the learning commons, which offers potential for the collaboration described as information fluency in Chapter 2. Instead of only librarians working to facilitate information literacy, other academic support colleagues ae involved. Learning commons are often championed by innovative library personnel unafraid to collaborate and eliminate artificial organizational boundaries. Examples include learning commons that house the writing center; the entire information literacy cycle can conceivably be facilitated in such an arrangement where library and writing center personnel collaborate. Based on interviews, it is likely that not all participants in this study would agree that the learning commons was an improvement, the belief being that there was value in organizational and pedagogical boundaries which learning commons eliminate.

An academic library that serves more administrative ends would not focus as much on information literacy, or in-depth research collaboration with faculty; in fact, their primary collaboration would be with more business-oriented

personnel (e.g., enrollment services, student living). Such libraries are not heavily involved or recognized as providing serious academic support, but more on providing spaces to gather or hold events. Such libraries in this study tended to focus more on aesthetics than research, and customer service than teaching (e.g., hours of operation); they are more like study halls or social gathering hotspots, with little evidence of information fluency.

To help further illustrate the difference between academic and administrative library purposes, it might help to look at it through the lens of an administrative office like student enrollment. To an office trying to increase international student enrollment, a library with a more academic purpose could be seen to serve retention efforts (i.e., help current students maintain academic eligibility through academic support); whereas, if serving a more administrative function, the expectation might be that it offers extended hours and attractive spaces that could appeal to prospective students.

Divisional assignments for libraries in this study outside academic affairs were related to administration and student living. Interestingly, all the libraries in these nonacademic divisions had academic-focused missions. This could be a problem, especially in terms of internationalization; the problem is amplified if the college's overall internationalization is similarly misconceived. Just as academic libraries are not always "academic", not all college internationalization is "academic", contrary to what the artifacts (mission statements and strategic plans) might indicate. It was obvious at some colleges in this study that internationalization was more about revenue generation than academics. Therefore, libraries in administrative divisions would be better positioned to play a role in such college internationalization; however, their missions and models should match their actual divisional assignments in those cases.

For the record, administrative internationalization is not a criticism. In fact, according to Knight (2004), it is a valid internationalization objective. However, both the college and the library should be more conscious about their priorities. If properly administered, then the library can plan events and programing that attract stakeholders, including potential donors. If the library does not have the resources to facilitate such purposes, then internationalization offers justification for additional funding, maybe even renovation: an academic library can be a strong recruitment draw for international students given their fondness for it as a place to socialize (Albarillo, 2018; Bordonaro, 2004).

Many librarians invested in information literacy will likely cringe at such administrative purposes. To be fair, though, it is hard to argue that a pleasant setting where stakeholders of different cultures can congregate and mingle, that encourages both domestic and international stakeholders to interact beyond classroom transactions, does not accentuate the internationalization experience of a campus, and possibly the surrounding community, especially in one that is rural or secluded.

The trend at most libraries seemed to be to attempt to fulfill both academic and administrative purposes. For example, one university library claimed in its mission that it focused on curricular support, but practice indicated it put

more emphasis on being a social gathering place. Another library had different sections of the building designated for more social types of activities, but also promoted scholarship and resource sharing on an international scale; while worthwhile initiatives, they seemed to lack coherence, and could potentially confuse personnel, particularly faculty, about library priorities. Trying to be all things to all stakeholders can also be a problem for library personnel: without synchronous personnel understanding of the library's role, internationalization efforts can be compromised (more on this in Chapter 5).

Lack of consensus was a problem at yet another university library in this study. For the most part, it was seen across campus, including its personnel, as a repository; yet that was not its purpose within the university strategic plan, which was to infuse information literacy within the curriculum. This library was unable to adequately meet that purpose, in large part because of little collaboration with faculty which the literature showed was necessary for such a purpose. Further, none of the library's artifacts explicitly addressed internationalization; thus, the library's internationalization was one by default of its repository image, a common trend observed by Bordonaro and Rauchmann (2015). Its internationalization amounted to collecting foreign content it would have collected regardless of the university's plans. Ironically, according to one of the internationalization personnel interviewed at this university, this was not even what stood out about the library in terms of its internationalization appeal. When asked how the library helps internationalization, the respondent replied that the building was "pretty" and would "look good during a tour of the campus".

Potential confusion can also occur with new executive leadership. At times, new leaders have agendas that differ from what might be best at their new college; a symptom of this is an emphasis on strategic plan over mission. At one school, the plan called for an increase in international student enrollment; although the library had a more academic mission, it felt pressured into abandoning it for a more customer-driven administrative model that strove to increase student numbers, similar to the misconceived administration mandate described by Downey (2013). The importance of a strategic plan cannot be understated; however, if it is not mission-driven, then it is difficult to justify, especially for purposes of internationalization.

There needs to be consensus regarding mission and purpose when deciding what role the library plays in a college's internationalization plans. This issue obviously has implications for the academic library beyond internationalization; however, hopefully this study shows that internationalization can illuminate these problems in new and interesting ways. When a college administers its library according to strategic plan rather than mission (a risky proposition given strategic plans change every few years and/or with different executive administrations), the cost can be literally high. One library in this study underwent a multimillion dollar renovation to address more administrative initiatives (e.g., attract prospective students, including international; generate revenue with cafes, community meeting halls); the executive who championed this purpose left, and their successor wanted to return to a more academic

purpose. Now the college has a large library building, but little infrastructure for it to support curricula. The newly renovated building looked impressive on that executive's vita and enabled them to get another job, but it created a mess for sincere stakeholders invested in that library's mission, and by extension internationalization. This example illustrates the importance of sound leadership inside and outside the academic library.

Leadership and organization

If not properly positioned by administrative leaders, the library is unlikely to make a significant difference in internationalization. Administrative and strategic alignments at some libraries studied for this project were not well suited to internationalization. If divisional assignment was determined by current executive leadership, then it is presumable that they had a deliberate purpose for the library; if determined by a former regime, though, then purposeful alignment should no longer be assumed. Some libraries in this study seemed to be operating with new demands, but within old divisional assignments that did not best position them to meet those demands. One would hope that the library is deliberately given a divisional assignment based on college understanding of why, along with well-conceived plans for how it will operate. However, it appeared that some libraries were, again, operating within antiquated division assignments, or assigned to a division because no other division wanted it, or the college did not know what to do with it. In such scenarios, strong leadership in the library itself is crucial, especially in terms of internationalization.

As Chapter 2 hopefully affirmed, internationalization can offer an opportunity for undervalued academic libraries to demonstrate their importance. Unfortunately, research on this book indicated that internationalization was not a top priority among library leaders. Although most interviewed agreed that it should be a priority, both in terms of internal operations (e.g., collection development; personnel training) and externally in support of college efforts, few strongly advocated for it.

Strong advocacy includes outreach and restructuring. Outreach at the administrative level would include other administrators. For example, in the case of an academic purpose, outreach to deans persuading them to help facilitate collaboration between library personnel and faculty. Restructuring includes more deliberate accommodation of internationalization, explicit alignment of missions, strategic plans, or policies with college internationalization as the primary goal. The library administrators interviewed lamented the lack of support the college provided the library, but most also admitted that they did not do enough themselves to impress upon executive leadership the library's value to internationalization. One reason was that there were other more immediate priorities for which they had to appeal to executives for support. This is a key dilemma: advocate for something long term that may or may not get support or focus on immediate demands that must presently be accommodated (e.g., database subscriptions; interlibrary loan expenses).

Internationalization does not demand the immediate attention that other academic library initiatives require. Additionally, if approached holistically it is not a singular, finite task that once completed no longer requires attention. It requires commitment. Confounding commitment was the sense that when library administration did not get the college support it needed to resolve even the immediate, finite issues a sense of defeatism discouraged expending energy into advocating for anything, let alone something as opaque as internationalization. The feeling seemed to be that if executives will not even support what are seemingly fundamental operational demands, then what is the point of appealing to them for something that does not have current obligations associated with it?

It is in such discouraging environments where transformational leadership on the part of library administration is needed more than ever. It might seem that the college will not allow for such leadership, but that is exactly what is needed to overcome the problem. For internationalization to occur requires transforming the library's image, not only on the parts of those outside but, as was the case for some libraries in this study, among library personnel themselves. In fact, internationalization could be a vehicle to the type of organizational perception shift Clark (1998) prescribed for higher education success.

According to one library director, executives at their college were confused about internationalization in general, including the library's role. While the college associated internationalization as better preparing its students through a global learning experience in its stated mission, the greatest emphasis was transacted through various enrollment offices rather than through academics. In fact, its divisional assignment of internationalization activities contradicted its own mission and strategic plan that emphasized academics: the offices were subdepartments of the enrollment services division. The director believed this also confused the library's ability to support internationalization. Some would criticize this college's internationalization priorities; however, based upon what this study observed, they would have little ground given their own college's realities.

The library at the above college was not included in enrollment's internationalization plans. However, it seemed the fault of the library itself as much as any other group. Library personnel seemed to have little motivation to become involved in internationalization; the library was seemingly content to operate per usual as justified by its mission of supporting the college's curriculum and students – Bordonaro and Rauchmann's (2015) internationalization by default comes to mind. It was as if they felt entitled to whatever role they were given and were not obliged to align themselves with the campus reality. However, when asked directly if they liked the idea of internationalization, they indicated yes, along with showing a willingness to participate more actively in it. This aligned with the literature regarding personnel motivation (Amsberry, 2009; Hoffman & Popa, 1986; Jiao, Zhuo, Zhou, & Zhou, 2009; Yusuke & Bartlett, 2014). It would seem personnel want to internationalize; all they need is the proper direction and culture.

There also seemed to be a misconception on the part of library personnel about how they felt they were perceived by international office colleagues. They assumed the rest of the campus understood what services, resources, and skills they offered; how they actually were perceived was mostly as a place with lots of books where librarians tell people to be quiet. Academic libraries in this study offered much more of value than just books that could support their colleges' internationalization efforts; however, the personnel were not proactive in making that known. Maybe colleagues needed to be reminded or educated, especially at colleges where high personnel turnover is an issue. This is where transformational leadership on the part of library administration is again necessary; in fact, one library director in this study mentioned their most important role was reminding their personnel of the importance of internationalization to their survival. Although this could be seen as somewhat of a transactional technique, the director wanted colleagues to take internationalization seriously for the sake of the entire college which would certainly more visionary.

In short, if the library is to overcome divisional or perceptional obstacles to internationalization, then it must first convince its own personnel of its value. This includes everyone having an accurate understanding of the library's role. What is more, internationalization must be a fundamental transformation, not exclusive to a solitary, finite initiative. Library administration for schools in this study must eliminate apathy over the disregard many personnel believe they suffer on the part of the entire college (indifference can work as a psychological defense against disappointment) and replace it with hope that their skills and contributions can be recognized, utilized, and appreciated. One library administrator tried to transform their personnel in this way but gave up due to resistance. They cannot quit: if internationalization is to succeed, then library administrators must convince personnel of its importance.

It is this book's contention that if the necessary transformation among personnel occurs, then intentional internationalization has a better chance. This would involve acknowledging what is already done well, even if inadvertently by default, and impressing the point that academic libraries are predisposed to internationalization (e.g., sources that present diverse thinking; facilitate information literacy). Library administration can then adjust policies to specifically accommodate internationalization, and make it a major, explicit part of the strategic plan.

Specific strategies

Saw, Lui, and Yu (2008) described library internationalization from planning to implementation stages. Much like Knight (2004), they identified international trends, government and institutional policies, information and communication technology, and new teaching and learning techniques as both opportunities for and challenges to library internationalization. Most colleges in this study struggled with one or other aspects of Saw, Lui, and Yu's findings.

Riggs (1997) recognized value in the changes required by internationalization. Restructuring policies, organizational hierarchy, philosophical approach, and training, with emphases on quality and technology can pivot the library in new directions that better align with the college. He believed library resources and services must reflect internationalization priorities, and like other scholars (e.g., Buttlar, 1994) even suggested a librarian be designated to exclusively attend to internationalization as a process. Example of a designated position: a major university library not included in this study had an international partnerships librarian that helped integrate language-specific research support in liberal arts' courses and connected collection development with international enrollment personnel to collaboratively acquire content. Instead of different library personnel making disparate connections, such a position can establish relationships and formal partnerships, and facilitate library integration into internationalization operations, library content into campus operations, as well as training. Additionally, such a role could impress upon external colleagues the importance of information literacy to all internationalization efforts (e.g., study abroad; faculty and student recruitment strategies; data-driven executive decision-making). With one person or department coordinating these efforts, assessment would also be more feasible, and likely more meaningful, per Whitehurst's concern (2010).

The designated internationalization librarian suggestion would have been very useful for colleges in this study, none of which had such a position. However, it would not have been feasible for most given the internationalization realities at the colleges; even though the college professed desire to internationalize, it did not allocate appropriate resources to do so.

Some library personnel in this study felt a greater obligation to their profession than to any particular college. This sense of obligation led them to advocate for internationalization for its own sake, even if it did not align with college mission, vision, or implementation. A good example was one college that determined to internationalize despite little motivation to do so in light of the direction and culture of the college. Thus, a disconnect existed: the library did not see itself exclusively serving the college, but instead more general higher education and academic librarianship principles. The thinking was,

> As a library first, and department of College X second, we have an obligation to increase our students', and the surrounding community's exposure to different cultures and ways of thinking. If our current executive administration does not recognize the responsibility we all have in this regard, then we cannot simply submit and follow suit.

Therefore, instead of following the enrollment-motivated direction of the college toward its regional students, the library adjusted collection development policy. Although this was only one singular initiative, not the holistic internationalization to which this book subscribes, it was a huge perceptional shift in identity and responsibility – a minor rebellion.

It is hard not to admire such conviction and devotion to internationalization. However, in any hierarchical organization, there is also the principle, and one could argue obligation, that personnel respect roles assigned by executive leadership. Granted, in higher education, especially at colleges that rely on shared governance, this includes advocating for change, or what is best for the overall organization; however, does it give license to go rogue, and disregard the direction of the rest of the campus in the event the advocacy fails? Such a course is unlikely to facilitate internationalization, at least at colleges where executives have more power (like those in this study). In such a scenario, a campus that already did not have much regard for internationalization might actually be hostile to it due to the impertinence of the insubordinate department.

Whether it is creating one position or department, or adjusting all positions and departments, the point is that deliberately administering the library with internationalization in mind will more likely make it a meaningful, realistic process. Even if only some of Riggs's prescriptions are adopted, without some deliberate administration, the academic library is neither likely to adequately internationalize, nor support the college in its internationalization.

Neal (2001) described internationalization as an entrepreneurial venture, resembling more of an administrative process than an academic one. His focus was on digital services, but also included approaches that align well with Knight's model despite her seemingly academic description. To effectively internationalize, he argued that libraries must redefine physical space, intellectual infrastructure, personnel expertise, and understand all factors that influence innovation (e.g., geography, economics, history). Neal's idea of changing intellectual infrastructure aligns with this book's reconceptualization of information literacy beyond its traditional library instruction context, and the focus on entrepreneurship might have appealed at colleges where the internationalization intent was to generate revenue.

Duderstadt (2009) argued that the global, knowledge-driven economy requires new workforce skills, and that colleges are obligated to provide students these skills in order for them to compete. By extension, academic libraries need to support their institutions in these efforts. Along with Knight and others, Duderstadt believed that the impact of governments on national higher education sectors' internationalizations is significant, and also recognized that a more holistic approach to internationalizing the college is necessary. A possible implication was that the library should diverge from the college if the college did not have an adequate internationalization mission or strategy. The thinking here is similar to the case study library referred to above that was determined to internationalize despite its college's lack of commitment.

This idea of the academic library going rogue is fascinating, if not feasible. There are dire risks associated with it, but also unique opportunities. It should first be established that what is suggested here is deliberate divergence from a college plan or mission: libraries frequently diverge from their colleges (e.g., content does not align with curriculum; services do not support

enrollment trends). Similar to internationalization by default, this could be termed misalignment by default. Such inadvertent divergence is often the result of incompetent administration; library personnel may not mean to defy the college mission, but do not realize how best to support it, nor are given proper direction. Accurately interpreting college mission, and aligning library mission with it, is a major aspect of leadership, and one that is often taken for granted, especially within the context of internationalization as observed for this book.

What would be different about deliberate divergence is that it stems from awareness for the need to internationalize coupled with the college's inability or refusal to do so. It suggests that library administration might be more visionary and competent than executive administration. This would not be unprecedented: stories abound of subordinates being more competent than their superiors. However, as already established, there is little room for insubordination in any hierarchical organization, and colleges in this study tended to be very committed to their hierarchies.

This tendency could be even more evident in nations Hofstede (2001) would refer to as "hierarchical". Rather than go through all the reasons why different libraries studied for this book should not go rogue, it is more relevant to realize the likely result of such insubordination – alienation by college executive leadership. The libraries studied for this project probably could not afford to inadvertently drift from their college support function lest they alienate themselves; to do so deliberately would likely accelerate the process. Eventually, the library administrations could be replaced altogether, along with their internationalization agendas, rendering such efforts moot, and possibly further diminishing the library.

There are instances when insubordination can bring rewards. Obviously, a phenomenon like academic library internationalization could create opportunities for the entire campus; if the library did things on its own and proved itself correct before the proverbial hammer slammed down from on executive high, then maybe it would eventually gain even more patronage and influence than if it had followed custom and obeyed hierarchy. As it was, abiding by hierarchy did not seem to pay off for libraries in this study. It is hard to imagine, if innovative and well executed, that the library could not demonstrate how important internationalization is, not only to the college, but the communities it serves, even the higher education sector at large. Thus, in this instance, by pursuing its own agenda, not only would the library benefit itself, but it would be for a worthy cause, and it would have more strongly validated its importance than if it had simply followed the chain of command. Not only is this an interesting proposition that questions the rationale behind libraries obediently aligning with the college, but it also raises ethical implications: is an academic library beholden to its college, or does it have a greater responsibility beyond it?

Duderstadt aligned with other scholars on the importance of technology to internationalization. "Technology" within the context of internationalization can manifest itself in many ways (e.g., personnel usage; student usage;

content repository; job skill preparation). Be it for administrative or academic purposes, technology is significant to internationalization in terms of facilitating information literacy. It can also offer job skill training of the more entrepreneurial nature Duderstadt and Neal propose, especially in developing nations. One library filled an internationalization role with its website: it stored scholarship on behalf of its stakeholders (mostly faculty, but there were also some student works), and allowed open access. This was quite an accomplishment given the lack of university technological support, and can set an example for any academic library, even those with many resources. However, as will be discussed later in the chapter, technology can also be an obstacle to internationalization.

All of these strategies could work to validate the library's importance to the college. Although validation should probably not be the primary reason to internationalize, for the library to do its part, it must be taken seriously by the college, specifically executive leadership, but also other campus stakeholders with social capital or authority in terms of internationalization. Regardless of strategy, one thing is clear, both from primary research and the literature review: collaboration is key.

Collaboration

This section was originally intended for Chapter 5 and accommodating stakeholders. However, given the collaboration realities at some of the colleges selected for this study, it seemed more appropriate this chapter. Without administrative motivation/facilitation, meaningful, sustainable collaboration is less likely to occur at some colleges. Many of the personnel interviewed for this study preferred to operate out of silos than collaborate; administrators would have to either bribe or force them.

The main focus in the literature concerning collaboration is with faculty, particularly English and ESL instructors (Baudino, Johnson, & Northwest Missouri State, 2016; Cope & Black, 1985; Feldman, 1989; Goudy & Moushey, 1984; Houlihan, Walker, Wiley, & Click, 2017; Ibraheem & Devine, 2016; Ishimura, Howard, & Moukdad, 2007; Kline & Rod, 1984; Jackson, 2005; Jackson & Sullivan, 2011; Li, McDowell, & Wang, 2016; Love & Edwards, 2009; Martin, Reaume, Reeves, & Wright, 2012; May Ying, 2003; Norlin, 2001; Osborne & Poon, 1995; Sheu & Panchyshyn, 2017). However, as already established, faculty are not the only stakeholders with whom library personnel should collaborate; other academic support colleagues are important to library internationalization efforts (e.g., international office, IT personnel, instructional designers), especially to facilitate the type of information fluency described in Chapter 2.

Those who work in the particular college equivalents of the international studies or enrollment offices can be particularly valuable partners, especially as relates to international students (Love & Edwards, 2009; Rosenzweig & Meade 2017; Sheu & Panchyshyn, 2017). Sheu and Panchyshyn (2017) explored collaboration between a library and its university's Office of Global

Education. The library hosted an international student reception to help students become more comfortable with the library. Their study described that global education colleagues helped with food selection and scheduling, which were important factors in students' satisfaction. Although that study aligns more with administrative goals, there is also potential for better academic programming in terms of learning about the students in a less formal setting – working with campus internationalization colleagues increased library personnel information literacy in terms of its stakeholders.

Collaboration with international office colleagues was very weak at the schools in this study. It was not due to animosity, or even feelings of territoriality: the libraries and their internationalization colleagues simply did not realize the value they offered one another. At one college the library complained that it hosted a similar event as that described by Sheu and Panchyshyn, but few stakeholders attended; at the same college, an international office colleague mentioned in response to library efforts to internationalize that, "It had better be good because students don't have a lot of time to waste". Hardly a ringing endorsement for that department's perception of what the library can do in terms of internationalization. Again, this is not the case everywhere, especially at name brand schools with significant endowments. However, at libraries studied for this project, which operated at colleges and universities more reflective of typical settings (e.g., not internationally known; relatively modest endowments), little collaboration with these colleagues existed.

There are different manifestations of such offices as the aforementioned Office of Global Education. It depends on the college: some of these departments are strictly administrative (e.g., enrollment; helping students process visas and permits), while others are more academic (e.g., ESL programs); however, there are also colleges that blur the lines. For example, one would think an ESL department would ordinarily align with academics, yet one university's ESL department was under the enrollment division even though it was comprised of instructors who taught classes. Additionally, some of the colleges studied did not even have such offices despite alluding to internationalization in their artifacts. This reemphasizes the importance of the library understanding its college's reality and realizing the implicit intentions that perhaps underlie artifacts: just because a college states that it is "global" does not make it so.

Collaboration with international office colleagues also presents long term opportunities. To use retention as an example: once the library proves its value to internationalization efforts as realized through retention, it might then generate enthusiasm among enrollment colleagues to advocate for a library renovation that could actually be a selling point that appeals to prospective international students. Such a library would serve a holistic enrollment purpose in a college more concerned about the fiscal rather than academic values of the library and international students.

There were also examples of librarians collaborating with student organizations to help international students feel more comfortable (Baudino, Johnson, & Northwest Missouri State, 2016; Lampert, Dabbour, & Solis,

2005). Organizations such as the student government association can be valuable to library internationalization efforts, especially at colleges where meaningful shared governance is a reality. One way to facilitate this collaboration is through the equivalent of the campus library committee; some of the libraries in this study had college committees that allowed for representation of all campus stakeholders, including a student government appointment, to have a voice on library matters. These committees were not taken seriously by student representatives at some of these schools; their attendance was low, and they offered few suggestions other than "be open all the time".

This is not an indictment of student government, even those seemingly derelict in their duties. Perhaps the library committee is only a formality to which the library personnel themselves pay little heed. However, if the committee and shared governance processes are legitimate, then the library and student government can work together on ways to increase academic library internationalization, and not just in relation to international students. Meaningful programs and events can be planned to facilitate internationalization for all stakeholders, and student government representatives can use their influence with their constituents to inform about what the library can do to help increase global awareness and marketability; this becomes even more meaningful when international students are represented. In cases where the library committee is a nonfactor, such internationalization activity could actually vitalize it.

Depending on the college and library mission, there are also opportunities to collaborate with the community. Example: one case library for this study employed a librarian who offered information literacy lessons to refugees at a local nonprofit institute. In the process, the librarian was able to learn about their backgrounds, and inform university colleagues about it in the event some of these refugees or their children eventually enrolled at that university. This librarian's work received little recognition on that campus, but such community collaboration might work better at other campuses if library administration promotes it and shows its value to the college mission and/or strategic plan.

International branches

Although none of the colleges in this study had international satellites, some of the more endowed colleges are expanding operations overseas (Salaz, Kayo, Houlihan, & Birch, 2016). Many of these colleges are supported by their host nations in hopes that they can improve the economy and society. Salaz, Kayo, Houlihan, and Birch contended that these overseas branch libraries support the same mission as the main library in the home nation. This aligns with this book's holistic internationalization: just as all domestic operations should work seamlessly toward internationalization than in a disparate manner, they should also do the same when in different geographical locations. Despite alignment with mission, and consistency in support, the authors contend that international branch libraries face unique challenges

depending on the host nation's overall technology acumen, and interactions with stakeholders who speak different languages and/or abide by different customs.

In addition to library involvement with college overseas campuses, there are also international partnerships, exchanges, and degree programs that should be supported. Kutner (2009) focused on study-abroad students' use of their home libraries. Kutner (2010) then conducted another study that expanded upon study-abroad library support for student library use to student information production that benefits their host nation communities. Kuntz (2005) also investigated library study-abroad support, including library personnel collaboration and exchange (to be further discussed in Chapter 5).

Internationalization challenges

Academic library internationalization is not only a matter of where within the college, or where in terms of it being a domestic or overseas operation. The actual geographical location where the library resides can impact the where that underlies internationalization (McCarthy & Ortiz, 2010). More developed nations with more global economies and greater amounts of diversity are likely to have colleges, and by extension academic libraries, better suited to addressing internationalization than those in more isolated or less affluent ones. Thus, a cycle emerges that impacts internationalization at a national level: those colleges that need to internationalize the most in a particular country are often those not well disposed to it (e.g., do not attract many international visitors; residents generally are not culturally aware), thus do not put as much emphasis on internationalization, but it is exactly in such regions and nations where academic libraries capable of supporting such efforts are most needed.

Eghe-Ohenmwen (2015) acknowledged the need and opportunity for libraries to accommodate internationalization, and that such accommodation is as important to overall college survival as to library image. She further held that academic library internationalization is even more critical for colleges in what she considered developing nations because the high quality information sources provided by academic libraries is paramount to development across sectors, not just within higher education or at a particular college.

Eghe-Ohenmwen noted that many obstacles exist to internationalization in poorer nations, especially funding. Many colleges rely on government support, especially in less affluent nations, and if the government does not have or will not allocate money then the entire college suffers; she surmised that this is an even greater obstacle for private colleges since governments typically do not support them at the same levels as public colleges. This relationship between funding and national affluence aligns with Knight (2004) and the impact of federal government. It is not necessarily that academic libraries, or colleges in general, choose not to internationalize – they simply do not have necessary funding. This certainly held true at colleges studied for this book.

Lack of funding leads to two other obstacles Eghe-Ohenmwen cited: technology and personnel. The technology needed to Locate information that can help nations internationalize is difficult to obtain because of the lack of funding. Additionally, even if and when technology becomes available, it takes time and effort for people to effectively use it. Those in poorer nations do not have the technology context that allows for easy adaptation to such things as online databases (Iheanacho, 2008); therefore, in addition to obtaining technology, academic libraries must help stakeholders become comfortable using it. Ability to train did not seem to be a problem at libraries included in this study; money and incentive for training was sometimes an issue, but not personnel ability or interest to learn.

Eghe-Ohenmwen particularly stressed the importance of cultural awareness and sensitivity training. Although sensitivity was also a training issue in other studies associated more with developed nations (e.g., Hilary, Cooper, Flierl, Somerville, & Chaudhary, 2018), being sensitive to the challenges of any user from any nation, in any nation, needs to be impressed upon library personnel. For example, one library in this study from an African nation experienced friction among stakeholders from different tribes – it was important to recognize why that friction existed and learn to celebrate the differences rather than condemn or ignore. In this way, the library can serve as a model for other sectors in nations that suffer civil unrest.

Whether it is being sensitive to someone's lack of technological acumen, or in the case of an international student from an affluent nation, their disappointment over the lackluster technology available (as was the case for one international student in a rural library in this study), or even personal habits or behaviors, to help users attain information literacy and fully realize the library's potential they must be made to feel welcome.

Like Eghe-Ohenmwen, Okiy (2010) noted the importance of academic library internationalization at a national level, especially in a nation trying to globally transform. Like others (Duderstadt, 2009; Eghe-Ohenmwen, 2015; Neal, 2001; Riggs, 1997) she contended that the library must better equip students for academic and professional success in a global environment, including vocational support beyond the college curriculum. Such an approach would likely benefit from collaboration between the library and personnel in a college's career services department. In the event there is no such department, as was the case for some of the colleges in this study, it provides an opportunity for the library to assume an additional role; library administration might create a new model that directly trains students in different technological or information capacities in addition to supporting academic department curricula. This is much like a learning commons, but with a more vocational type of information fluency.

Uwhekadom and Olawolu (2013) also wrote about academic library internationalization in a nation that struggles to implement it. They found that technology mediates internationalization success, particularly that which offers information access and faculty collaboration opportunities (e.g., learning management software). They noted that without effective technology,

internationalization is an unrealistic goal. They were also concerned about library personnel's ability to handle internationalization and stressed the importance of retraining. This last suggestion would be useful to many of the libraries studied for this book; again, they were not averse to training but lacked incentive or opportunity.

When considering the above studies, it becomes unsurprising that libraries at the very few so-called elite colleges (e.g., huge endowments; R1 University Carnegie status; high rankings in popular media) seem to be more internationalized than the majority. This is unsurprising given overall discrepancies between the colleges themselves and their graduates (Piketty & Goldhammer, 2020). Piketty has written about the threats concerning global inequality and ironically one of the major sectors he identifies as contributing to it is higher education. This is ironic given that so many of the so-called elite schools profess social equity in their missions and through individual works by their personnel; yet primary research for a different study outside this book indicated they are very elitist in their own hiring practices, and in terms of appointments onto governing bodies. The networking advantages already available to students from these few brand name colleges compared to the less fortunate peer majority is evident and could increase. The advantages of internationalized libraries at those few schools can only work to widen the gulf about which Piketty warns. This is not to suggest that they not be allowed to internationalize; however, maybe if they were so concerned about social equity, they might help less privileged institutions in their internationalization, or at the very least share the wealth.

Library leadership must advocate for itself to colleagues across campus on its internationalization role. This also includes internally convincing library personnel of the importance of internationalization. It is difficult to imagine any college being opposed to internationalization, but advocacy will be more challenging at colleges where currently there is no deep investment. However, research showed that it is also challenging for libraries to convince colleges that are already invested in internationalization to take seriously what the library offers if they do not already do so; if the library suffers a diminished image, the challenge for library administration then becomes to convince stakeholders of its value. This necessitates effective advocacy and leadership, including understanding where within the college structure and campus facility to effectively direct this leadership. Where in turn, is dependent on the library's model and mission in relation to the overall college organizational structure.

Academic library internationalization requires transformation. While a diplomatic transformation built upon strategic transactions may be slower and less dramatic than going rogue, it likely stands a better chance. Experience and logic inform that when any department confronts or opposes organizational hierarchy in higher education it is often dismissed, or outright penalized. The library would likely be no exception. Again, effective transformational leadership can strike the right balance of innovative provocation and academic support.

The notion of transformational leadership offers a good segue into the next chapter, where the terms transformational and transactional are applied differently but parallel to leadership to help describe answers to the question of who in this book's academic library internationalization framework – "who" as in who the stakeholders are. Rather than categorize them by culture or nation, which is controversial, the next chapter offers a different lens through which to understand them; it is more general as it categorizes according to overall domestic or international status, and also functional in that it subcategorizes according to library perception and/or usage.

References

Albarillo, F. (2018). Super-diversity and foreign-born students in academic libraries: A survey study. *Portal: Libraries & the Academy*, *18*(1), 59–91.

Amsberry, D. (2009). Using effective listening skills with international patrons. *Reference Services Review*, *37*(1), 10–19.

Baudino, F., Johnson, C., & Northwest Missouri State University (Eds.). (2016). *Brick & Click Libraries: An Academic Library Conference Proceedings*, 16th, Maryville, Missouri, November 4, 2016.

Bordonaro, K. (2004). The use of an American college library by ESL students: an exploratory study in the utilization of resources and language learning (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations. (OCLC: 57439794)

Bordonaro, K., & Rauchmann, S. (2015). Internationalization in German academic libraries: Moving beyond North American perspectives. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, *15*(4), 677–697.

Buttlar, L. (1994). Facilitating cultural diversity in college and university libraries. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *20*(1), 10.

Clark, B. R. (1998). *Creating entrepreneurial universities: Organizational pathways to transformation*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Cope, J., & Black, E. (1985). New library orientation for international students. *College Teaching*, *33*(4), 159–162.

Cope, J., & Sanabria, J. E. (2014). Do we speak the same language? A study of faculty perceptions of information literacy. *Portal: Libraries & the Academy*, *14*(4), 475–501.

Dawes, L. (2019). Faculty perceptions of teaching information literacy to first-year students: A phenomenographic study. *Journal of Librarianship & Information Science*, *51*(2), 545–560.

Downey, K. (2013). Why did we buy that? New customers and changing directions in collection development. *Collection Management*, *38*(2), 90–103.

Duderstadt, J. J. (2009). Possible futures for the research library in the 21st century. *Journal of Library Administration*, *49*(3), 217–225.

Eghe-Ohenmwen, A. (2015). Best practices for repositioning, towards global competitiveness in academic libraries of privately-owned universities (ALPUS) in Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *6*(13), 50–52.

Feldman, D. (1989). The international student and course-integrated instruction: The ESL instructor's perspective. *Research Strategies*, *7*(4), 159–166.

Goudy, F. W., & Moushey, E. (1984). Library instruction and foreign students: A survey of opinions and practices among selected libraries. *Reference Librarian*, *10*, 215–226.

Gruber, A. M. (2018). Real-world research: A qualitative study of faculty perceptions of the library's role in service-learning. *Portal: Libraries & the Academy*, *18*(4), 671–692.

Gullikson, S. (2006). Faculty perceptions of ACRL's Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *32*(6), 583–592.

Hoffman, I., & Popa, O. (1986). Library orientation and instruction for international students. The University of California-Davis experience. *Rq*, *25*(3), 356–360.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Houlihan, M., Walker Wiley, C., & Click, A. B. (2017). International students and information literacy: A systematic review. *Reference Services Review*, *45*(2), 258–277.

Hilary, H., Cooper, L., Flierl, M., Somerville, M. M., & Chaudhary, N. (2018). The role of the university library in supporting international student transition: Insights from an Australian-American case study. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *44*(5), 582–594.

Ibraheem, A. I., & Devine, C. (2016). Saudi students, American academic library: A survey. *Library Review*, *65*(4/5), 267–280.

Iheanacho, P. C. (2008). A plan for making the University of Delaware's Morris Library more accessible to students from developing countries. Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations (Publication No. 3324456).

Ishimura, Y., Howard, V., & Moukdad, H. (2007). Information literacy in academic libraries: Assessment of Japanese students' needs for successful assignment completion in two Halifax universities. *Canadian Journal of Information & Library Sciences*, *31*(1), 1–26.

Jackson, P. A. (2005). Incoming international students and the library: A survey. *Reference Services Review*, *33*(2), 197–209.

Jackson, P. A. & Sullivan, P. (Eds.). (2011). *International students and academic libraries: Initiatives for academic success*. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries.

Jiao, S., Zhuo, F., Zhou, L., & Zhou, X. (2009). Chinese academic libraries from the perspective of international students studying in China. *International Information & Library Review*, *41*(1), 1–11.

Joswick, K. E., & Stierman, J. K. (1995). Perceptions vs. use: Comparing faculty evaluations. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *21*(6), 454.

Kelly, S. L. (2019). Faculty perceptions of librarian value: The moderating relationship between librarian contact, course goals, and students' research skills. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *45*(3), 228–233.

Kline, L. S., & Rod, C. M. (1984). Library orientation programs for foreign students: A survey. *Rq*, *24*(2), 210–216.

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *8*, 5–31.

Kuntz, P. S. (2005). *Libraries of Rovigno/Rovinj Istria/Istra, Croatia: European Border Cultures*. Online Submission. Online Submission. Retrieved from https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=sso&db=eric&AN=ED491476&site=ehost-live.

Kutner, L. (2009). Think locally, act globally: Understanding home Institution library engagement among study-abroad students. *College & Research Libraries*, *70*(2), 158–176.

Kutner, L. (2010). Study-abroad programs as information producers: An expanding role for support of our students studying abroad. *Journal of Library Administration*, *50*(7/8), 767–778.

Lampert, L. D., Dabbour, K. S., & Solis, J. (2005). When it's all Greek: The importance of collaborative information literacy outreach programming to Greek Student Organizations. *Research Strategies*, *20*(4), 300–310.

Li, X., McDowell, K., & Wang, X. (2016). Building bridges: outreach to international students via vernacular language videos. *Reference Services Review*, *44*(3), 324–340.

Love, E., & Edwards, M. B. (2009). Forging inroads between libraries and academic, multicultural and student services. *Reference Services Review*, *37*(1), 20–29.

Mangrum, S., & Foster, H. A. (2020). Student and staff perceptions of university library usage: Comparing reality to interpretation of space usage. *Journal of Access Services*, *17*(3), 130–143.

Marcus, S. (2003). Multilingualism at the reference desk. *College & Research Libraries News*, *64*(5), 322.

Martin, J. A., Reaume, K. M., Reeves, E. M., & Wright, R. D. (2012). Relationship building with students and instructors of ESL: Bridging the gap for library instruction and services. *Reference Services Review*, *40*(3), 352–367.

May Ying, C. (2003). Helping hands: Serving and engaging international students. *Reference Librarian*, *38*(79–80), 383–393.

McCarthy, J. P., & Ortiz, J. T. (2010). Globalisation in academic libraries: A reflective comparison of academic libraries at Cork, Ireland, and Chihuahua, Mexico. *Library Management*, *31*(7), 505–520.

Meredith, W., & Mussell, J. (2014). Amazed, appreciative, or ambivalent? Student and faculty perceptions of librarians embedded in online courses. *Internet Reference Services Quarterly*, *19*(2), 89–112.

Neal, J. G. (2001). The entrepreneurial imperative advancing from incremental to radical change in the academic library. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, *1*(1), 1–13.

Norlin, E. (2001). University goes back to basics to reach minority students. (cover story). *American Libraries*, *32*(7), 60.

Oguz, F., & Assefa, S. (2014). Faculty members' perceptions towards institutional repository at a medium-sized university: Application of a binary logistic regression model. *Library Review*, *63*(3), 189–202.

Okiy, R. B. (2010). Globalization and ICT in academic libraries in Nigeria: The way forward. *Library Philosophy & Practice*, *12*, 1–10.

Osborne, N. S., & Poon, C. (1995). Serving diverse library populations through the specialized instructional services concept. *The Reference Librarian*, *51*, 285–294.

Piketty, T., & Goldhammer, A. (2020). *Capital and ideology*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Riggs, D. E. (1997). What's in store for academic libraries? Leadership and management issues. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *23*(1), 3–8.

Rosenzweig, J. W., & Meade, Q. H. (2017). Checking out the library: Partnering for outreach to short-term international students. *Journal of Library Administration*, *57*(4), 375–388.

Salaz, A. M., Kayo, C. Houlihan, M., & Birch, S. (2016). The future of U.S. university international branch campus libraries. *College & Research Libraries News*, *77*(11), 551–554.

Sarkodie-Mensah, K. (1992). Dealing with international students in a multicultural era. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *18*(4), 214–216.

Saw, G., Lui, W. W., & Yu, F. (2008). 2010: A library odyssey. *Library Management*, *29*(1/2), 51–66.

Shen, L. (2013). There is no association between subject liaisons' perception of their work and faculty satisfaction with their liaisons. *Evidence Based Library & Information Practice*, *8*(4), 142–144.

Sheu, F., & Panchyshyn, R. S. (2017). Social introduction to library services for international students. *Library Review*, *66*(3), 127–143.

Sornam, S. A., Priya, K., & Prakash, M. (2013). Faculty perception on library facilities: A survey on NAAC accredited autonomous arts and science colleges in Coimbatore City. *Library Philosophy & Practice*, 1–13.

Uwhekadom, E. E., & Olawolu, O. E. (2013). Globalization, information technology and higher education in Nigeria: The roles of library professionals. *African Higher Education Review*, *7*(1), 79–87.

Whitehurst, A. P. (2010). Information literacy and global readiness: Library involvement can make a world of difference. *Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarian*, *29*(3), 207–232.

Yang, Z. Y. (Lan). (2000). University faculty's perception of a library liaison program: A case study. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *26*(2), 124.

Yusuke, I., & Bartlett, J. C. (2014). Are librarians equipped to teach international students? A survey of current practices and recommendations for training. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *40*(3/4), 313–321.

4 Who are the stakeholders?

This chapter revolves around the question of "who?". As in, "Who are the stakeholders in academic library internationalization?". Potentially, everyone; however, the potential for no one to invest also exists (the previous chapter hopefully illustrated the importance of well-conceived administration in building interest). Scholars like Knight (2004), who consider higher education internationalization at the sector and individual institutional levels might include government officials and business leaders as stakeholders. Even authors cited in this book who viewed it through the narrower lens of the library, might include such people depending upon the nation and the relationship of government to higher education that exists within it (e.g., Eghe-Ohenmwen, 2015; Okiy, 2010; Uwhekadom & Olawolu, 2013). However, for academic libraries observed in this study that operate with arguably inadequate budgets, whose colleges and nations do not place much relative value in them (as evidenced by the amount of attention and confidence given), the stakeholders impacted the most by internationalization are students.

A good portion of the literature specifically dealt with student perceptions of, and preferences for the library with focus on international students (Arishee, 2000; Bilal, 1988; Datig, 2014; Ferrer-Vinent, 2010; Fu, Emanuel, & Shuqin, 2007; Gale, 2006; Lin, 2006; Natowitz, 1995; Nzivo & Chuanfu, 2013; Puente, Gray, & Agnew, 2009; Sackers, Secomb, & Hulett, 2008; Shaffer, Vardaman, & Miller, 2010; Tahir, 2007; Tam, Cox, & Bussey, 2009). This focus centered mostly on students from nations responsible for much of the study-abroad enrollment seen around the world (e.g., China, Saudi Arabia). One pivotal notion the literature impresses upon readers is that if the academic library wants to successfully internationalize, or support internationalization efforts, then it must implement approaches to librarianship different from traditional ones. This includes not operating by default (Bordonaro & Rauchmann, 2015), especially in how it approaches understanding stakeholders (Natowitz, 1995).

Although studies show the importance of understanding international students, debate exists about what types of "understanding" are appropriate. Some argue cultural and linguistic understandings are key; others counter that such acknowledgment could lead to stereotypes. Both arguments have merit: it seems logical that understanding someone's culture and language

DOI: 10.4324/9781003128878-4

can help when developing library resources and services for them to use; as a byproduct, it could also increase one's own cultural awareness (helpful to internal library internationalization for both technical and public services). However, it is also possible that such knowledge might lead to assumptions that not only mislead how best to serve stakeholders, but actually offend them (Swain, 2004). Although this was not something readily apparent at libraries included in this study, the rationale is plausible, especially the idea of offending people in nations where racism and nationalism are problems.

Some, like Yunshan (2009), contend that it is imperative to differentiate among nations when understanding stakeholders. His rationale was sound and well intended: is a person from France who is doing an analysis of European colonialism going to Identify with the topic in the same manner as someone from Ghana? However, concerns about stereotypes must be acknowledged, not only for ethical reasons, but also practical ones: again, not all people act according to cultural stereotypes (e.g., one person from Ghana might admire European culture, while another could perceive it as robbing tribal identities).

Understandings and acknowledgments regarding specific heritages may help internationalization to some degree (Yunshan, 2009), but also raise concerns on the parts of scholars (e.g., Lund, 2004, Swain), practitioners approached during research for this book (including reviewers), and in some cases stakeholders themselves. For example, one librarian shared a story about their attempt to pleasantly engage an international faculty member by demonstrating interest in the person's homeland but was rebuffed. The librarian suspected it might have had a little to do with the faculty member's perception of them in terms of both profession and gender, but mostly this faculty member did not want to be singled out based on anything other than faculty status.

This book tries to balance the two concerns. While it does not want to offend or cause discomfort, the literature is clear about the importance of accounting for international stakeholders. Therefore, it considers stakeholder groups according to two general categories – domestic or international. Additionally, primary research indicated that library usage depends more on individual behavior than nationality. Despite the fact that many studies acknowledge common and observable tendencies among people from a given nation (e.g., Jiao, Zhuo, Zhou, & Zhou, 2009), it was this study's impression that ultimately each individual has their own perceptions and preferences that can differ from what might be associated with or expected in terms of their nationality.

The idea that people from the same nation will not behave in the same manner is obvious when considering diverse nations like India and the United States (What exactly is American culture? Is there only one?); however, analyses of different data sets (e.g., student research papers; library user surveys) indicated this individual usage pattern to be the case even with stakeholders from what would be considered more culturally homogenous nations (e.g., Japan, Saudi Arabia). Therefore, this book's position on stakeholders aligns with its position on academic libraries and information literacy in general: as

is the case with library missions and information literacy frameworks, even though there are often common attributes (e.g., support college mission; facilitate information literacy), individual cases still differ, sometimes in important ways (e.g., perceptions about race or gender).

To describe these usage patterns, in addition to the international/domestic categorization, this book uses the subcategories transactional and transformational to help describe stakeholders. This dichotomy is commonly associated with leadership studies, but some of the general characteristics that distinguish transformational from transactional leaders were also observed in terms of library stakeholders.

A transactional leader often thinks in the short term and is concerned more about singular goals. Such leaders are not as concerned about how something is achieved, only that it be achieved – product over process. Leadership scholars generally condemn such short-term, ends-justify-the-means leadership, and warn that it is unsustainable, and often ineffective even in the short term (Bennis, 2009; Burns, 1978). Just as a transactional leader is more concerned about "getting it done", so too are library stakeholders who adopt transactional library usage patterns or perceptions. For example, there were several accounts of both international and domestic stakeholders approaching library personnel for help finding sources with the expectation that the personnel would do the actual research for them (e.g., find article that met assignment requirement); thus, when the personnel instead wanted to show them how to use a database to Locate for themselves, it was not what transactional stakeholders preferred.

In contrast, transformational leaders concern themselves more with developing an overall approach to leading rather than focusing on one particular goal. They cultivate mindsets for success intended to increase capacity to accomplish many goals and are willing to sacrifice a temporary transaction for a better, longer term process (Bennis, 2009; Burns, 1978). Just as a transformational leader is more motivated by sustainable success than singular task completion, so were transformational library stakeholders more motivated to cultivate a mindset of learning than to simply complete one task. An example was an international student who was not following the directions for an assignment with which one particular librarian was familiar. When the librarian mentioned it, the student informed them that they were not doing the research just to complete the assignment, but for their own, personal learning.

In short, transactional stakeholders would likely prefer to get things done without so much concern for long-term implications, including relationships, with library personnel or information. Transformational stakeholders might have a wider frame of reference: implications regarding personnel, and themselves and their long-term learning capacity, might matter just as much, if not more than completing whatever task that involves the library at that given moment.

One way some social scientists describe cultures is by distinguishing between those that focus on relationships versus those more preoccupied with accomplishment (Greif, 1994; Hofstede, 2001; Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010).

This might also be helpful in understanding stakeholder perception of the library within the transactional/transformational dynamic: relationship focus could involve that with library personnel. Another relationship could be in terms of information literacy; for example, understanding one's relationship to data or information (e.g., primary, secondary, tertiary sources), and ultimate Use. Information literacy is a process and a relationship that definitely leads to transformation and cannot be acquired through transaction alone (Lombard, 2010a).

According to the context of how this book uses the terms transactional and transformational, some might be tempted to classify certain nations to one or the other according to collective cultural tendencies like the above relationship example. For instance, another cultural dichotomy often considered is individualism versus communalism (Hofstede). An argument could be made that it runs parallel to the transactional/transformational dynamic, with communal being more transformational, and individualistic more transactional. To ultimately determine would likely require a factor analysis beyond only library usage; however, in terms of the descriptive nature of this study, the indication was that some stakeholders waver from collective characteristics associated with culture or nationality. For example, a stakeholder from one nation that would be considered more communal was actually very transactional in their approach to the library. Therefore, it is probably not very useful to assume that someone from a country that is classified more as "relationship-oriented" will automatically want to pursue one with the library; or that a librarian from a nation considered more "individualistic" will have no interest engaging in community service.

Unlike leadership scholarship, which prefers transformational, this book is not recommending one stakeholder approach over another. For example, if a person simply wants a call number for a particular book title, then it may be better to simply complete the transaction (i.e., provide the number) than insist on a library catalog demonstration and a tour of the stacks. There may be no need for transformation at that point of interaction. This chapter is simply describing in broad terms a way to understand stakeholders in relation to internationalization as opposed to assuming things based on culture or nationality. It is important to understand how stakeholders perceive the library, including goals and expectations, and this study found the transformational/transactional distinction useful within the international/domestic categories without offending entire groups. Also, unlike national or cultural characteristics, individuals can go back and forth between transactional and transformational library approaches: a stakeholder might want to transact one moment, transform at another, or even transact multiple times for the sake of overall transformation.

The rest of this chapter considers stakeholders according to the four major groups identified in this study: students, faculty, administrators, community members. Additionally, major themes identified from literature related to academic library internationalization were used to further understand them (e.g., culture, communication), and also how they might be misunderstood (plagiarism, technology).

Stakeholder groups

Students

Studies tend to focus on international student struggles involving culture, technology, communication, and plagiarism (Albarillo, 2017; Amsberry, 2009; Burhans, 1991; Feldman, 1989; Herring, 2014; Ibraheem & Devine, 2016; Iheanacho, 2008; Ishimura, Howard, & Moukdad, 2007; Koenigstein, 2012; Li, 2006; Macdonald & Sarkodie-Mensah, 1988; Onwuegbuzie, Jiao, & Daley, 1997; Patton, 2002; Rosenzweig & Meade, 2017; Swain, 2004; Wang & Frank, 2002; Wayman, 1984; Zimerman, 2012). However, research for this book found that both domestic and international students can struggle for many different reasons within the context of internationalization.

One main reason domestic students used the library in this study was for class requirement. However, a few saw opportunities based upon professional aspiration; college students and prospective college students are now inundated with the concept of internationalization (e.g., frequently hearing and seeing terms like "global community" or "global economy") in primary and secondary school, and the media. Many have learned that it is to their professional advantage to broaden their horizons beyond limits of their own national experiences. There are also domestic students genuinely engaged in ideas associated with internationalization for transformational rather than transactional reasons – they truly want to learn about and understand other cultures.

Kumar and Suresh (2000) explained the importance of libraries understanding the cultural and economic implications associated with international students. Many scholars agreed that if the library does not better understand international students in such ways then "library anxiety" can emerge (e.g., Koenigstein, 2012). Again, this is not exclusive to international students, especially the economic implications (many domestic students can feel anxious about having to use the library); however, when the student is overwhelmed by everything else around them being new, the anxiety can be amplified.

Providing resources that cater to international student preferences could improve overall perception. The literature and research for this study indicated that multimedia can help in this regard (Buckner & French, 2007; Han & Hall, 2012; Li, McDowell, & Wang, 2016; May Ying, 2003; Mei Jing et al., 2009).

It is unfeasible to have a collection that adequately represents all the world's nations or cultures, especially at the colleges in this study with limited budgets. However, according to some library personnel interviewed, having at least a decent collection of materials from those nations represented by a school's international students improved their perceptions of the library. One circulation staff member recounted how grateful an international student was that the library had videos from their homeland.

Faculty

Faculty outlook seemed more transactional than transformational in terms of academic library internationalization at colleges included in this study. Library personnel were sometimes frustrated by individual faculty research agendas and believed when they did not get what they wanted (e.g., more journal access), they had no interest in collaboration, something paramount to holistic library internationalization. This is understandable: most of these colleges required faculty to publish in peer-reviewed publications, which requires systematic literature reviews. If the library cannot support their research, then their perception might be that the library is inept or does not care; thus, there would be little motivation to invest in the library, especially for something like internationalization that requires serious commitment.

There seemed to be little difference between domestic or international faculty in terms of collaboration and internationalization. Although understanding their cultures and nationalities might be useful in some instances, especially for those with more transformational mindsets, for the more transactional, if the library cannot satisfy their scholarship needs, then it might lead to indifferent or even negative perceptions of the library.

Not much is written about international faculty in the academic library literature, but what is published in the general higher education literature is not encouraging. Most studies deal with how many international faculty are teaching in the United States (Colleges…, 2017a, 2017b; Desruisseaux, 1994), or their academic or personal characteristics (Ayala, 2018; Kim, Twombly, & Wolf-Wendel, 2012; Kim, Wolf-Wendel, & Twombly, 2011; Munene, 2014). However, Muene observed disturbing trends; he found they are mostly recruited for highly technical fields (e.g., engineering), and described isolation, discrimination, stereotypes, and even physical abuse as problems. Although this is only one country, it might become the case on a more global scale in the future as more colleges attempt to internationalize, especially if domestic stakeholders hold nationalistic beliefs or preferences.

Shiyi (2012) observed that international faculty constitute a relatively small proportion of the library user community and are sometimes shortchanged relative to other internationalization stakeholders. The focus of her study was Chinese faculty at Canadian colleges, but its overall conclusion that academic libraries need to more carefully consider international faculty when creating resources and planning services is well taken for overall purposes of internationalization. If libraries do not do a better job of it, then library anxiety could be a problem for these faculty in addition to the already stressful experience that accompanies relocation to a foreign country.

Administrators

Academic library internationalization for administrators revolved around one of two motivations: curricula or enrollment. Some administrators viewed internationalization as a way to enhance the curriculum and develop in their

students a sense of "global citizenry" as expressed in many institutional artifacts. However, those who viewed it more from a business perspective seemingly wanted to increase enrollment, particularly the international student population. Again, this is not a criticism: enrolling international students can be a good thing for a college looking to internationalize, especially in terms of exposing domestic students to people from different countries (Attwood & Tahir, 2007). As Chapter 3 hopefully impressed, this purpose needs to be acknowledged simply and honestly.

According to the interviews, most administrators at the schools in this study probably shared both aspirations. The problem is their missions only alluded to the academic aspiration; the fact that enrollment, and by extension money were also factors could distract from the academic mission. Regardless of which motivation, how administrators view internationalization in general will likely determine their perceptions and preferences of the library's role in it. Those who see internationalization as an academic endeavor will hopefully perceive the library in a support role, especially as relates to information literacy. Those who see it in terms of enrollment would likely prefer the library to at the very least provide spaces for international students to use, or even as an enticement to enroll at the college – the library described in the last chapter that was renovated for that very purpose comes to mind.

Community

Some of the colleges in this study had strong ties with their surrounding communities. In fact, these colleges were actually reflective of the communities they served, including employing several local people. In terms of internationalization, more isolated and often rural communities do not have as many opportunities (McCarthy & Ortiz, 2010); thus, there is great potential for a college's academic library to play a role in community internationalization. In fact, depending on the college mission, and amount of community outreach in place, this might be the expectation; it was at a couple of colleges, albeit more singular, in nature.

For the most part, there was not much serious library involvement in community internationalization in this study, other than the one case described last chapter involving information literacy instruction for refugees. This could have been attributed to perception, both the community's and the library's perceptions of one another, than inability or unwillingness. For the libraries' part, they did not recognize much interest from the community to internationalize; perhaps the communities assumed the same about them. This emphasizes the need for outreach and marketing, something that will be further discussed next chapter.

Culture

The vast majority of studies that focus on the struggles of stakeholders in academic library internationalization revolve around international students,

specifically those from Middle Eastern, Asian, and Latin American nations studying in Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom, or United States. This is hardly surprising given that the majority of countries that host international students are English-speaking, and some of the major nations that supply international students include China, India, Japan, and Saudi Arabia (International Students, 2020; OECD, 2020).

Koenigstein (2012) found that culture shock was a common problem for international students in American academic libraries. To alleviate, the author recommended librarians be aware of differences between domestic and international students in terms of educational systems, class participation, and academic success, and accordingly adjust services. Sackers, Secomb, and Hulett (2008) and Li (2006) echoed these sentiments, by especially considering differences in communication styles. Based on a study of East Asian library clientele, Li found if these differences are not accommodated, especially in terms of library reference, then misunderstandings and academic problems can result.

Internationalization as applied to domestic students involved meeting curricular objectives, and/or preparing for study abroad. Their biggest cultural struggle seemed more an issue of the transaction/transformation variety: e.g., using the best resources to find information rather than the most convenient. Although some students might spend a lot of time in the library, it is often for its space than for its resources or information sources. The idea that students want to learn for learning's sake is not a safe assumption. Example: many brilliant resources were created by library personnel to increase student information literacy in colleges in this study, but the usage statistics were low.

As for faculty, beyond their connection with students not much is written in terms of academic library internationalization. Research for this book detected little between domestic and international faculty; the main struggle for both as previously discussed, was lack of resources in relation to research agendas. Again, faculty from nations that one might characterize as more transformational sometimes acted in transactional ways, and vice versa; thus, as with other stakeholders, faculty should be accommodated on an individual basis, and not categorized according to perceived heritage.

Although the transformational/transactional dynamic is described in this book as an individual trait, it is possible the college where the library serves is also a factor. Perhaps executive leadership cultivates transformational or transactional organizational culture that sets the tone for the entire campus. An indication of this was seen at a couple of colleges in this study, as there seemed to be more emphasis on strategic plans, specifically short-term objectives (e.g., increasing international student enrollment) than missions (e.g., cultivating a "global citizen").

Although the literature does not proclaim that academic library personnel are perceived as inferior, the fact that the library typically requires significant revenue yet does not bring in nearly as much should probably not be dismissed in terms of administrative perception. This perception, coupled with status and hierarchy perceptions described by anthropologists, makes it possible for misunderstandings and even resentment toward library colleagues.

Add to this the academic support nature of their work (i.e., not typically a degree-conferring department), those for whom status is important might not perceive the library as important to internationalization efforts (Hofstede, 2001; Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010).

Another factor is gender. According to Burhans (1991), the fact that most library personnel were mostly middle-aged females could be an obstacle in some cultures or nations; although this article is dated, demographic characteristics of librarians have not dramatically changed. The issue of gender is nothing new in academic librarianship but, given the nature of internationalization, provides yet another layer of complication, especially in terms of collaboration. Since collaboration rests upon the premise of equality, if administrators and faculty consider themselves superior to library personnel, then it practically negates it. Research for this book indicated that although they may allow for simple transactions with the library, many are not interested in collaborating with library personnel on more transformational endeavors like internationalization.

In terms of the surrounding community, the nation or specific location where the college is located can determine an academic library's role (McCarthy & Ortiz, 2010). Not just in terms of transaction versus transformation, but also wealth: poor communities could likely benefit more from academic library internationalization than others. As cited by authors in the last chapter, it might be a national responsibility rather than a library preference (Eghe-Ohenmwen, 2015; Okiy, 2010; Uwhekadom & Olawolu, 2013).

Communication

Some studies found that while international students hold the library as a department in high esteem, specifically the content it contains, the same does not always apply to library personnel (Ibraheem & Devine, 2016; Kline & Rod, 1984; Martin, Reaume, Reeves, & Wright, 2012; Sarkodie-Mensah, 1989). Research for this book validated these findings (however, to stakeholders, the building as a space seemed more important than the content). Communication could be a major factor in this negative impression (Ibraheem & Devine, 2016; Sarkodie-Mensah, 1989).

There are several communication barriers that can arise. The most obvious involves second language struggles on the parts of international stakeholders (Sarkodie-Mensah, 1992). However, domestic stakeholders can also struggle in terms of communicating what they need in an internationalization context. This goes back to the Chapter 2 discussion on information literacy: if a student is pursuing information on a global issue with which they are unfamiliar and lacks the necessary cultural context to understand how to adequately research it, then it will also be difficult for them to initially explain what kind of sources they need, or what they hope to learn. For example, a freshman at one college researched the ramifications of the COVID-19 pandemic on an African government's economic policy: the student lacked theoretical background and contextual familiarity with the continent, so much so that they could not even explain how they wanted to proceed.

Communication will likely be a bigger problem for international stakeholders. In addition to the more implicit information literacy struggle described above, surface language itself can be an obstacle (Baron & Strout-Dapaz, 2001; Iheanacho, 2008; Sarkodie-Mensah, 1992). As already noted, most international students are from nations that speak different languages (e.g., Chinese, Hindi, Arabic) to the ones that enroll the most international students (i.e., English). Few of these languages share anything in common, not only in terms of surface characters, but deeper meaning and purpose.

Struggle to communicate is a major issue in any global enterprise. However, the problem is amplified within the higher education sector, and particularly in an academic library where learning depends on reading, listening, writing, and speaking. Most library personnel take great pains to make things clear, and what they say or write might work well for many domestic stakeholders, but not necessarily international ones. If the library tries to accommodate international students as a group, then Yunshan's (2009) point that not all international students are the same (including the languages they speak) emerges. However, unless the library has directions written in all the different languages their stakeholders speak (the most observed for this study was one library that had material in four different languages), then some will be at a disadvantage unless their host nation language skills are solid.

Even if an academic library were to write things in their international stakeholders' own languages, there is no guarantee that it would be an accurate translation. One need look no further than Google Translate for an example of how difficult it is to translate even common words or phrases. Terms used to facilitate usage that comprise academic library vernacular are hardly common, especially compared to the types of language skills and vocabulary that is taught in foreign language studies (e.g., they probably do not teach library jargon as part of the curriculum). Thus, attempting to transact what might be taken for granted as the most simplistic of library tasks could be a struggle (Abdullah, 2000, Iheanacho, 2008).

Although verbal communication receives the most attention in the literature, the importance of body language is well documented in general communication sources. In fact, some studies claim body language is more important than spoken or written communication; one estimate declared that body language accounts for over 50 percent of communication (e.g., Mehrabian, 1972). Such estimates generally come from studies concerning communication between people who speak the same language and share a national heritage. Consider that over 50 percent of communication is body language, and those who share common cultures often misinterpret messages among themselves, and one can imagine how difficult it is to interpret body language in addition to the verbal communication between people from different nations.

Sometimes major distractions occur due to misperceived body language. One librarian shared an incident where his body posture was perceived as inappropriate by a female international student. He believed that the miscommunication could very well have turned into a major incident had he not

immediately ended the interview and asked a female colleague for assistance. Not only was the incident awkward, but he was also concerned that it left a negative impression about the library in the student's mind that could have future repercussions.

Argument exists about whether or not body language, unlike verbal, is universal among people. However, some studies provide compelling evidence that it differs, if only slightly and in certain contexts (Carpenter, 2007; Humphries, 2012; Signs of respect, 2006). What this could mean is that even if the cues only slightly differ, then communication can become even more of a struggle, especially among those who practice what is referred to as contextual communication, some of which relies on body language (Wibbeke & McArthur, 2014). The results could be problematic for both transactional and transformational stakeholders.

Somewhat related to both verbal and body language is the idea of active and passive communication (Wibbeke & McArthur, 2014). Some cultures and languages use more active communication (i.e., direct, to the point); whereas passive communication is more indirect. According to Wibbeke and McArthur, passive communication aligns with older, more homogenous cultures where shared heritage provides contextual, intuitive understanding. In such cultures, there is no need to be direct because thoughts are often already understood; in fact, being direct could likely be considered immature or even rude. Whereas active languages suit nations with diverse cultures that lack the same heritage and context of older ones; it is easier for people in such nations to understand each other when they are explicit with their surface communication.

One goal of passive communication is to preserve a person's dignity ("save face") and also an intention to communicate other aspects related, in addition to the actual information being explicitly communicated (e.g., how important is it; who is affected; what the roles of the people involved are). One could argue that in passive communication, surface information transacted through words is not as consequential as indirect, underlying meaning. Passive communication is reliant on cultural context; for it to be effective requires common understanding among those using it (Wibbeke & McArthur, 2014).

This active/passive communication dichotomy would likely cause more struggle for international stakeholders than domestic ones. Domestic stakeholders and library personnel would be generally accustomed to the communication pattern in their nation; obviously there will be exceptions, especially in diverse nations like Brazil, and those with minority populations like the United States where the primary language has negative cultural and historical overtones for some (Pennycook, 1998), but there will at least be more instances of familiarity if not compatibility when interacting in an academic library in the student's home nation. International stakeholders, on the other hand, may not have much familiarity with the communication expectations in a new country, and can struggle to accomplish what they need in relation to the library. Even if the person comes from a nation that primarily

uses passive communication and the host nation in which they are studying or working also practices it, they are operating on different contextual communication planes due to culture. In light of this, communication might be even more difficult for the international passive communicator in another passive communication nation: with the elimination of cultural, intuitive familiarity, two passive communicators have little to cling to in terms of context.

The research did not observe exact instances of the sorts of potential communication breakdowns described above, but it is easy to picture examples. To illustrate: imagine an international student, who also happens to be more transactional and whose communication is an active style, studying overseas where passive communication is the pattern. The student might struggle to communicate with library personnel due to the differences in expectations and perceptions that accompany communication. If aligned with the general tendencies of their transactional nature, the student could become frustrated; it may appear to them that the staff are not forthcoming, that they are evading answering questions the student needs answered to complete their work. This frustration, in turn, might be evident to personnel (whose passive communication is very sensitive to voice tone and facial expression), and a bias toward future interactions with the student might result. The student did not mean to be rude, and the library personnel did not mean to evade; they just communicate differently from one another.

Now imagine a student from a nation that communicates passively interacting with library personnel with more active communication styles. The student might think the library personnel want them to fail by requiring them to ask clear, direct questions, while only providing binary yes/no responses. The library personnel might consider the student in this scenario lazy and/or needy and perceive them as wanting to be provided with something beyond what the personnel think they should impart.

Again, no exact instances of this were observed, but some library personnel interviewed believed they should teach stakeholders to do for themselves rather than do everything for them. In their attempts to guide stakeholders in the right direction to complete library tasks, they believed they were doing their professional duties by maintaining "academic standards" or "professional distance". There was an underlying implication of frustration if this did not occur. A person's reluctance to proceed individually and dissatisfied appearance might frustrate the staff, which could devolve into disappointment or even embarrassment; again, "saving face" is one of the most important objectives of communication in some cultures. Thus, not only could it become a struggle to get work done, but also a personally and emotionally draining experience for such a student.

Faculty are not likely to suffer the same communication struggles as students. Domestic faculty will be more familiar with and accustomed to library communication; even international faculty might be spared the issues with which their student counterparts struggle simply because they have been involved in higher education in a professional capacity. However, while it is

often assumed that international faculty will be able to speak the language of the nation in which they work, this was not always the case. Ironically, the language speakers who could struggle most are English-speakers (ironic because English is commonly adopted by so many nations). Although many libraries in this study where English was not the primary language had English versions of their websites (Bordonaro and Rauchmann observed the same thing), not all the personnel spoke English; therefore, this could create a barrier to effective library usage, especially if the faculty had questions beyond answers provided on the website.

One might insist that the idea of any faculty struggling to communicate is an absurd concern, as communication is usually a requirement in any job advertisement. Supposedly a college would not hire a faculty member who is not competent in the language that is used to teach at that school. However, it has been going on for some time, and instances of international faculty with inadequate language skills will likely rise along with internationalization (Munene, 2014).

Plagiarism

Plagiarism demands a section within this chapter because of the significant literature about it in relation to internationalization and stakeholders. The focus is yet again international students, especially those whose languages differ from the host nation (Amsberry, 2010; Baron & Strout-Dapaz, 2001; Lipsett, 2004; Lund, 2004; Swain, 2004; Zimerman, 2012). However, reasons for plagiarism are not always clear cut. The literature implies that international students are more susceptible to plagiarism than other library stakeholders, but most of these studies define and analyze the issue in English-speaking nations. The number of domestic students who plagiarize did not seem noticeably different than international peers when collecting data for this project. Regardless, literary consensus is that language and culture can cause international student plagiarism for reasons other than that typical for domestic students. Despite the lack of cases observed, primary research for this booked aligns with that thinking.

It is difficult enough to adhere to the numerous prescriptive details of a typical citation manual in one's own language let alone have to adjust and process it in a second language. As if that were not enough, there is a plethora of different styles available; an international student could struggle, but not just because of language. Based on the literature and primary research for this book, there is indication that in addition to language there can be cultural obstacles that arise from lack of contextual or intuitive familiarity with the philosophical underpinnings of intellectual property itself.

Some students might struggle with the general idea educators and scholars in proprietary cultures take for granted, that ideas are owned by individuals or groups. Such students might see nothing wrong with copying and pasting someone else's words without acknowledgment (Lund, 2004). The thinking is that the reader will benefit from the idea the same as the student who

plagiarized, and that the student could not have worded it better than the author. It is well documented that in some cultures the notion of people owning an idea makes little sense. To some ideas independently exist; to assign ownership of an idea to one individual is almost arrogant on the part of the person who believes they hold exclusive rights to it. In short, the idea of intellectual property, a prominent industry in the West (particularly those nations whose colleges enroll the most international students), can be a bizarre proposition.

Perhaps a new definition is required for plagiarism in an internationalization context, one that accounts better for intention. Such a definition could possibly better inform college policy regarding matters of plagiarism and students. Additionally, it might set an example for internationalization outside higher education: there is considerable angst among proprietary nations over intellectual piracy. Granted, some piracy is likely intentional; however, based upon the struggles some students have conceptualizing intellectual property as evidenced through the citation process, perhaps there truly is a cultural disconnect among the nations vilified for it.

Plagiarism is a complex and often confusing topic on both philosophical and pedagogical terms. For someone who does not speak the language well, understanding what faculty and/or librarians teach regarding it could be a challenge. Add to this that not everyone who teaches about research views plagiarism, or its citation subtheme, the same way (Lombard, 2010b); One instructor's "citation breakdown" might be another's "cheating". Such conflicting perceptions, and their accompanying instructions can confuse solid domestic students with mastery of the language; imagine what the international student who is not as fluent must overcome.

What is and what is not plagiarism can be debated, as well as interpretation of citation styles. There are literally hundreds of styles, but they all basically share two intentions: acknowledge original author; provide enough information for reader to find cited source. However, their mechanics vary (e.g., one style might prescribe underlining journal titles, while a different style prescribes italics; some use endnotes, others parenthetical in-text). Many students do not even understand the point of having more than one citation style, let alone reasons for the hundreds in existence. In addition, there are different editions of these styles; what applies in one might not apply in an earlier one. Thus, even if it were possible to memorize a style, unlikely for international students who struggle to memorize everyday vocabulary, there would be little point: one instructor for one class might require one edition, but another instructor require a different edition, or an altogether different style. Additionally, the syntax citation styles are awkward, and contradict conventions of natural language. Grappling with these issues could lead to library anxiety: even if students are not ultimately accused of plagiarism, if they fail to correctly cite, then they can still lose composition points. It can create pressure and stress, especially for students who need certain grade point averages to maintain government-sponsored scholarships.

In some countries citation is not a concern. It is not that they dismiss it, there just is not the perceived purpose for it in some cultures that there is in others (Baron & Strout-Dapaz, 2001). Think about why people believe they must cite in the first place: many would answer to avoid plagiarizing, but that is not, nor should be the motivation – the fact that it sometimes is could be part of the problem. Plagiarism can be a byproduct of ineffective or no citation, but again the purpose of citation itself is twofold: acknowledge and navigate. Without this realization struggles with citation can emerge among domestic and international students. If a person does not understand why they must do something, then they are likely to struggle doing it.

Little difference was found between domestic and international faculty in terms of plagiarism or citation. Copyright and acknowledgment of authors is a significant part of the higher education culture, particularly in doctoral programs. This is not to suggest that it does not happen (unfortunately, some faculty plagiarize); however, the main struggle for faculty in terms of internationalization was helping students avoid it. The expectation that faculty can or will help might be unfounded, just as it was for Evaluate in Chapter 2. For example, an engineering professor teaching a graduate course on statics and dynamics does not have much time to get through all the content and besides, they may believe that students should know how to cite before they enter class. However, if there are international students enrolled who are unfamiliar with, or unable to conceptually grasp intellectual property, then by not addressing it faculty are setting them up for failure, not only in class, but possibly the entire program, maybe even professionally in future (e.g., accused of fraud; laying groundwork for intellectual piracy).

Adding to the problem is if faculty forget the two true purposes of citation themselves – acknowledgment, navigation. The bottom line is if faculty do not ensure that students can properly cite, especially international students without familiarity, including why they must cite, then the possibilities of their coming away with inaccurate and/or solely negative perceptions increases. “Plagiarism is bad”, but since the instructor did not explain why, there is not much incentive to go through a lot of tedious work to avoid it; from this perspective, there is no positive reason to cite, only negative consequences if one does not cite.

One study participant observed that citation was more associated with avoiding plagiarism. Additionally, many librarians and faculty focus more on following to a tee conventions of whatever citation style the journal editor for which they had submitted articles prescribed. This mentality could transfer to their teaching in that they simply tell the student to "follow the rules". An actual example of this was once observed before this study was undertaken: a student was literally pursuing a faculty member down the corridor, citation manual in hand, trying to get an answer from them regarding how to cite a particular source. The professor's reply while shuffling hastily away was, "It's all in the book!". This particular incident had no internationalization context, but if it had then the consequences could have been even more negative.

Besides "it is all in the book" not being an adequate response in an internationalization context, it is simply incorrect in any context. "It" is not all in any one of the many books. As already mentioned, there are hundreds of citation styles, not including their multiple editions, and not even the more common and prominent style manuals account for every possible citation scenario. They are called citation "styles" rather than citation "rules" for a reason: they provide general guidelines with specific examples to illustrate how to cite the sorts of sources likely to be encountered in the fields or disciplines the different styles purport to guide.

As regards the library, this hearkens back to Li's (1998) point about support being reliant on what happens in the classroom. If faculty are not properly preparing students for citation, then the library could have a difficult time supporting them during the Use component of information literacy. This pedagogical inadequacy can be amplified with international students, especially those from more passive communication cultures studying in active communication environments: if they become aware that people in the host nation speak more in literal terms, they then might expect it all to literally "be in the book". When they do not find an exact reference to their particular citation dilemma, in addition to insufficiently interpreting the guidelines, they may also suffer the underlying anxiety about being accused of plagiarism.

Perhaps it is on the issue of plagiarism where Li's contention about classroom can be combined with the persistent call for collaboration. Persuade faculty that citation should consistently come under the realm of the library, that the library has more time to dedicate to it than subject experts; additionally, advocate for the library to ensure students understand that it is indeed the place for citation support, and that they will be expected to use it for that purpose, among others. This already happened at some colleges in this study – faculty were more than pleased to pass responsibility for citation on to library personnel, and it seemed to benefit faculty in terms of time, students in terms of support, and the library in terms of validation. The library can be a saving grace in this context, especially if it can better understand those who struggle with citation and its philosophical foundations. However, the idea of library authority on matters of plagiarism is not without drawbacks, as will be discussed in the next chapter.

Technology

Technology, as a good thing for facilitating internationalization among stakeholders, and also as a challenge, has already been covered in previous chapters. However, in terms of understanding library stakeholders, the literature gives it additional consideration. Struggles with library technology that domestic students encounter will not likely emanate from internationalization, save in nations without much technology access (Eghe-Ohenmwen, 2015; Okiy, 2010; Uwhekadom & Olawolu, 2013). On the other hand, struggles with technology can differ greatly for international students. When they

study in a nation that is well developed in terms of technology, unless they come from similar backgrounds, then it can pose serious obstacles (Iheanacho, 2008). Again, this is not something preordained due to cultural constructs; it is more a matter of a given nation's affluence (Eghe-Ohenmwen, 2015; Okiy, 2010; Uwhekadom & Olawolu, 2013).

Technological barriers can vary in degree. For some stakeholders it can simply be the new language or different formats that the technology presents (e.g., screen displays; readers having to adjust from right to left orientations). However, others may not have much experience with web applications in general, even basic keyword searching. Additionally, the different types of resources, including the online library catalog (Abdullah, 2000) and the various article databases to which academic libraries often subscribe, have different search screens, fields, and arrangements for displaying results. For students with little or no experience with such technology, they may lack the intuitive context needed to effectively switch between resources. For example, one library catalog in this study referred to keyword searching as "Word Search" and controlled vocabulary searching as "Browse", but one of the subscription databases referred to the same two search types differently (i.e., "Keyword" and "Thesaurus"). Add to this dozens of other databases using different jargon, and those unfamiliar with the system can be stymied.

There can also be the opposite problem: international stakeholder accustomed to more, or higher-level technology than the host academic library supports (Arishee, 2000; Song & Lee, 2012). This, too, is an obstacle in that the stakeholder may not have anticipated the less advanced technology; to find information may take longer than expected, and if the person approaches research on transactional terms, then this can be especially aggravating.

Domestic faculty will often be familiar with the library technology, especially if they earned a doctoral degree. The major problem in terms of internationalization (and librarianship in general) goes back to their influence on students. For example, a faculty member who completed their degree at a major research institution with several libraries assumed the one college library where they now worked had the same resources, and required students use technology without first ensuring that it was actually available – it was not. This likely frustrated students upon discovery, and probably did little for their perceptions of the library.

Having access to the types of technology the library offers could be very useful to community stakeholders outside the college. Depending on the community, there might be a serious need for the sorts of technology an academic library provides and, with support from personnel, could improve quality of life for many residents (Eghe-Ohenmwen, 2015; Okiy, 2010; Uwhekadom & Olawolu, 2013). Such access and support would not only serve community interests but could also directly benefit the college in terms of enrollment (e.g., the positive experience might inspire admission applications).

The literature for the most part focuses on the technological struggles of stakeholders in academic library internationalization. This is understandable, and in line with the other literature foci: if stakeholders are not struggling, then

there is not as much need for concern; in fact, it is more important to focus on providing more technology that can facilitate stakeholder success at even greater levels. Again, research for this book aligned with the observations of Eghe-Ohenmwen (2015), Okiy (2010), and Uwhekadom and Olawolu (2013), in that the library's location was an indicator of stakeholder technology prowess. In countries where there were not many, domestic stakeholders struggled; in those where there was an abundance, they did not struggle. The same thing applied to international stakeholders: those from technologically-endowed nations or regions used technology effectively; those without background struggled.

The library personnel interviewed for this book showed extreme differences in whom they perceived as their stakeholders within internationalization. There were few instances of concerted efforts to train personnel in matters of stakeholder internationalization despite internationalization being a college objective. There seemed to be little evidence of stereotyping on the part of library personnel interviewed. There was one noteworthy exception: some personnel at one library associated stealing with one particular group of international students. The personnel made light of it with their words, but given the context and their body language, one sensed mild resentment toward the group in question. It also seemed these personnel did not even realize they were stereotyping: the perception observed was that they were being magnanimous in their ability to make light of it. Overall levels of stakeholder understanding were difficult to gauge unless one measures success in terms of effort; again, some personnel as individuals and libraries as a whole put more effort into it than others.

Hopefully, this chapter will help readers more fully realize who their stakeholders are, along with the potential challenges they face within academic library internationalization. Such understanding can help libraries accommodate stakeholders, which is the focus of the next chapter.

References

Abdullah, A. S. (2000). Factors affecting international students use of the online catalog and other information sources. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations (Publication No. AAT 9973229).

Albarillo, F. (2017). Is the library's online orientation program effective with English Language Learners? *College & Research Libraries*, *78*(5), 652–674.

Amsberry, D. (2009). Using effective listening skills with international patrons. *Reference Services Review*, *37*(1), 10–19.

Amsberry, D. (2010). Deconstructing plagiarism: International students and textual borrowing practices. *Reference Librarian*, *51*(1), 31–44.

Arishee, J. (2000). Personal and cultural values as factors in user satisfaction: A comparative study of users of library services (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations. (OCLC: 48482768)

Attwood, R., & Tahir, T. (2007). UK fails to integrate overseas students. *Times Higher Education Supplement*, *1814*, 4.

Ayala, L. S. (2018). Foreigners and inclusion in academia. *Hypatia*, *33*(2), 325–342.

Baron, S., & Strout-Dapaz, A. (2001). Communicating with and empowering international students with library skills set. *Reference Services Review*, *29*(4) 314–326.

Bennis, W. (2009). *On becoming a leader*. New York: Basic Books.
Bilal, D. M. (1988). Library knowledge of international students from developing countries: A comparison of their perceptions with those of reference librarians (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations. (OCLC: 19620291)
Bordonaro, K., & Rauchmann, S. (2015). Internationalization in German academic libraries: Moving beyond North American perspectives. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, *15*(4), 677–697.
Buckner, T., & French, T. (2007). International students and the academic library: How one library is working to make its international students feel at home. *Kentucky Libraries*, *71*(2), 8–11.
Burhans, S. (1991). *Serving the Information Needs of the International and Minority Students at the Small College Library: A Librarian's View*. *Annual Meeting of the Central States Communication Association*. Chicago.
Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.
Carpenter, S. (2007). Unspoken accents. *Scientific American Mind*, *18*(4), 13.
Colleges with the highest percentages of nonresident aliens on the full-time instructional staff, Fall 2015. (2017, August 18). *Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. 14.
Colleges with the highest shares of nonresident-alien teaching-staff members. (2017, August 18). *Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. 11.
Datig, I. (2014). What is a library?: International college students' perceptions of libraries. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *40*(3/4), 350–356.
Desruisseaux, P. (1994, November 23). *59,981 scholars from abroad teach or study in U.S. Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A40.
Eghe-Ohenmwen, A. (2015). Best practices for repositioning, towards global competitiveness in academic libraries of privately-owned universities (ALPUS) in Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *6*(13), 50–52.
Feldman, D. (1989). The international student and course-integrated instruction: The ESL instructor's perspective. *Research Strategies*, *7*(4), 159–166.
Ferrer-Vinent, I. J. (2010). For English, Press 1: International students' language preference at the reference desk. *Reference Librarian*, *51*(3), 189–201.
Fu, Z., Emanuel, J., & Shuqin, J. (2007). International students and language preferences in library database use. *Technical Services Quarterly*, *24*(4), 1–13.
Gale, C. (2006). Serving them right? How libraries can enhance the learning experience of international students: A case study from the University of Exeter. *SCONUL Focus*, *39*, 36–39.
Greif, A. (1994). Cultural beliefs and the Organization of Society: A historical and theoretical reflection on collectivist and individualist societies. *Journal of Political Economy*, *102*(5), 912–950.
Han, N., & Hall, S. L. (2012). Think globally! enhancing the international student experience with LibGuides. *Journal of Electronic Resources Librarianship*, *24*(4), 288–297.
Herring, D. N. (2014). A purposeful collaboration: Using a library course enhancement grant program to enrich ESL instruction. *Reference Librarian*, *55*(2), 128–143.
Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
Hofstede, G., Hofstede, J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind. Revised and expanded* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
Humphries, C. (2012). Not raving but frowning. *New Scientist*, *215*(2874), 40–43.
Ibraheem, A. I., & Devine, C. (2016). Saudi students, American academic library: A survey. *Library Review*, *65*(4/5), 267–280.

Iheanacho, P. C. (2008). A plan for making the University of Delaware's Morris Library more accessible to students from developing countries. Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations (Publication No. 3324456).

International Students (2020), *Migration Data Portal*, https://migrationdataportal.org/themes/international-students (accessed on 8 November 2020).

Ishimura, Y., Howard, V., & Moukdad, H. (2007). Information literacy in academic libraries: Assessment of Japanese students' needs for successful assignment completion in two Halifax universities. *Canadian Journal of Information & Library Sciences*, *31*(1), 1–26.

Jiao, S., Zhuo, F., Zhou, L., & Zhou, X. (2009). Chinese academic libraries from the perspective of international students studying in China. *International Information & Library Review*, *41*(1), 1–11.

Kim, D., Twombly, S., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2012). International faculty in American universities: Experiences of academic life, productivity, and career mobility. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, *2012*(155), 27–46.

Kim, D., Wolf-Wendel, L., & Twombly, S. (2011). International faculty: Experiences of academic life and productivity in U.S. universities. *Journal of Higher Education*, *82*(6), 720–747.

Kline, L. S., & Rod, C. M. (1984). Library orientation programs for foreign students: A survey. *Rq*, *24*(2), 210–216.

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *8*, 5–31.

Koenigstein, D. (2012). Alleviating international students' culture shock and anxiety in American academic libraries: Welcome, Ahlan Wa Sahlan, Anyeong Hae Sae Yo, Bienvenidos, Huan ying, Sanu Da Zuwa, Shalom, Swaagat hai. *Library Philosophy & Practice*, *14*, 78–83.

Kumar, S., & Suresh, R. (2000). Strategies for providing effective reference services for international adult learners. *Reference Librarian*, *33*(69/70), 327–336.

Li, S. D. (1998). Library services to students with diverse language and cultural Backgrounds. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *24*(2), 139–143.

Li, Z. (2006). Communication in academic libraries: An East Asian perspective. *Reference Services Review*, *34*(1), 164–176.

Li, X., McDowell, K., & Wang, X. (2016). Building bridges: Outreach to international students via vernacular language videos. *Reference Services Review*, *44*(3), 324–340.

Lin, S. (2006). Perceptions of U.S. academic library services of first-year graduate students from Taiwan: A photo elicitation study (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations. (OCLC: 607091718)

Lipsett, A. (2004). Flattery does not translate into all cultures. *Times Higher Education Supplement*, (1665), 3.

Lombard, E. (2010a). *Pursuing information literacy: Roles and relationships*. Oxford: Chandos.

Lombard, E. (2010b). Primary and secondary sources. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *36*(3), 250–253.

Lund, J. R. (2004). Plagiarism: A cultural perspective. *Journal of Religious & Theological Information*, *6*(3/4), 93–101.

Macdonald, G., & Sarkodie-Mensah, E. (1988). ESL students and American libraries. *College and Research Libraries*, *49*(5), 425–431.

Martin, J. A., Reaume, K. M., Reeves, E. M., & Wright, R. D. (2012). Relationship building with students and instructors of ESL: Bridging the gap for library instruction and services. *Reference Services Review*, *40*(3), 352–367.

May Ying, C. (2003). Helping hands: Serving and engaging international students. *Reference Librarian*, *38*(79–80), 383–393.

McCarthy, J. P., & Ortiz, J. T. (2010). Globalisation in academic libraries: A reflective comparison of academic libraries at Cork, Ireland, and Chihuahua, Mexico. *Library Management*, *31*(7), 505–520.

Mehrabian, A. (1972). *Nonverbal communication*. New Brunswick: Aldine Transaction.

Mei Jing, L., Li, S., Womack, R., Wu, C., & Tao, Y. (2009). Celebrating diversity, welcoming the world: Developing a Chinese Webpage at Rutgers University Libraries. *CALA Occasional Paper Series*, (5), 2–11.

Munene, I. I. (2014). Outsiders within: Isolation of international faculty in an American university. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, *19*(4), 450–467.

Natowitz, A. (1995). International students in U.S. academic libraries: Recent concerns and trends. *Research Strategies*, *13*(1), 4–16.

Nzivo, C. N., & Chuanfu, C. (2013). International students' perception of library services and information resources in Chinese academic libraries. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *39*(2), 129–137.

OECD (2020), "International student mobility" (indicator), https://doi.org/10.1787/4bcf6fc3-en (accessed on 8 November 2020).

Okiy, R. B. (2010). Globalization and ICT in academic libraries in Nigeria: The way forward. *Library Philosophy & Practice*, *12*, 1–10.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Jiao, Q. G., & Daley, C. E. (1997). *The Experience of Non-Native English-Speaking Students in Academic Libraries in the United States*. Paper presented at the *Annual Conference of the Mid-South Educational Research Association*, 26th, Memphis, TN, November 12–14, 1997.

Patton, B. A. (2002, May 1). International Students and the American University Library. Master of Arts Thesis, Biola University.

Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the Discourses of Colonialism (the Politics of Language)*. London: Routledge.

Puente, M. A., Gray, L., & Agnew, S. (2009). The expanding library wall: Outreach to the University of Tennessee's multicultural/international student population. *Reference Services Review*, *37*(1), 30–43.

Rosenzweig, J. W., & Meade, Q. H. (2017). Checking out the library: Partnering for outreach to short-term international students. *Journal of Library Administration*, *57*(4), 375–388.

Sackers, N., Secomb, B., & Hulett, H. (2008). How well do you know your clients?: International students' preferences for learning about library services. *Australian Academic & Research Libraries*, *39*(1), 38–55.

Sarkodie-Mensah, K. (1989). Foreign students and U.S. academic libraries: A case study of foreign students and libraries in two universities in New Orleans, Louisiana (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations. (OCLC: 20848887)

Sarkodie-Mensah, K. (1992). Dealing with international students in a multicultural era. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *18*(4), 214–216.

Shaffer, C., Vardaman, L., & Miller, D. (2010). Library usage trends and needs of international students. *Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarian*, *29*(2), 109–117.

Shiyi, X. (2012). Canadian academic library support for international faculty: Library experience and information needs of Chinese visiting scholars at the University of Western Ontario. *Partnership: The Canadian Journal of Library & Information Practice & Research*, *7*(2), 1–14.

Signs of respect. (2006). *Industrial Engineer: IE*, *38*(4), 14.

Song, Y., & Lee, J. (2012). Mobile device ownership among international business students: A road to the ubiquitous library. *Reference Services Review*, *40*(4), 574–588.

Swain, H. (2004). I could not have put it better – So I won't. *Times Higher Education Supplement*, *1646*, 62.

Tahir, T. (2007). Britain gets vote of foreign students. (cover story). *Times Higher Education Supplement*, *1813*, 1.

Tam, W., Cox, A. M., & Bussey, A. (2009). Student user preferences for features of next-generation OPACs: A case study of University of Sheffield international students. *Program: Electronic Library and Information Systems*, *43*(4), 349–374.

Uwhekadom, E. E., & Olawolu, O. E. (2013). Globalization, information technology and higher education in Nigeria: The roles of library professionals. *African Higher Education Review*, *7*(1), 79–87.

Wang, J., & Frank, D. G. (2002). Cross-cultural communication: Implications for effective information services in academic libraries. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, *2*(2), 207–216.

Wayman, S. G. (1984). The international student in the academic library. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *9*(6), 336–341.

Wibbeke, E. S., & McArthur, S. (2014). *Global business leadership* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Yunshan, Y. (2009). New thoughts on library outreach to international students. *Reference Services Review*, *37*(1), 7–9.

Zimerman, M. (2012). Plagiarism and international students in academic libraries. *New Library World*, *113*(5/6), 290–299.

5 How to accommodate stakeholders

Despite the title, the purpose of this chapter is more a continuation of the preceding chapter on understanding stakeholders. It attempts to describe the "how" and "what" of academic library internationalization as it really happened at colleges studied for this book. A relevant if not interesting sidenote on the word "accommodate": more than one person advised against using it in context of internationalization, especially stakeholders. The concern was that it would be seen as patronizing or presumptive given the worries about assumptions people make about international students, specifically that they are characterized according to their learning deficits more than anything else. Such intentions are obviously admirable and important: if this study showed anything, then it is to avoid any assumptions about anything to do with internationalization, especially as applies to stakeholders. However, and ironically, this concern here is misplaced for the very same reason it exists.

While words proved important to academic library internationalization in many instances, especially those involving any kind of communication, the process ultimately depends on action. Words, especially those in higher education mission and vision statements, often bore little resemblance to reality. Additionally, if too much concern is placed on the words, then it might distract from implementing worthwhile resources and services; libraries might be too focused on not offending people with poor word choices than focusing on enacting best policies or programs to address internationalization. Not everyone will agree on words or policy, but at least more will get done if the focus is policy and procedures.

Further, it seemed that those who took offense to the word "accommodate" in this context did so for reasons associated with the English language's cultural and historical correlations to oppression and inequity (Pennycook, 1998). However, the word "accommodate" and its synonyms translate differently into other languages; thus, to imply that one English word is better suited for internationalization purposes in itself reveals linguistic bias. Why not use a word from a different language?

The point is when it comes to a subject like internationalization, which is often controversial, it helps to keep things in perspective. To use writing as an analogy: to fairly evaluate writing, one must consider the entire passage rather than one word or sentence. For a library to accommodate its

DOI: 10.4324/9781003128878-5

stakeholders, in terms of internationalization or anything else, requires accommodation of themes identified in the literature and research for this book, no matter how it is ultimately worded; additionally, the intentions behind, and effectiveness of the accommodation should be considered as a whole.

A final note: it is suspected that those opposed to the word "accommodate" in relation to stakeholders were also thinking in terms of international students. An unintentional bias once again emerges, in that international students are the sole focus of academic library internationalization. This is forgivable given that most of the literature on or related to the topic focuses only on them, along with singular aspects of internationalization. However, internationalization as described in this book is a holistic process that should accommodate all stakeholders, domestic and international, and not only students. Therefore, if it is not insulting to "accommodate" domestic stakeholders in terms of internationalization, then it should not be insulting to their international counterparts. This is an important message to impart before proceeding with the question of how.

One challenge to stakeholder accommodation is that many libraries are unaccustomed to working within an internationalized environment. To do so, and accommodate stakeholders, requires additional perspectives and skills (Becker, 2006; Bordonaro, 2004). As already discussed, most scholars seem to believe it is necessary to accommodate for culture and language, with some in favor of actually hiring personnel for the primary purpose of working with international students (Buckner & French, 2007; Buttlar, 1994; Li, McDowell, & Wang, 2016; McKenzie, 1995; Mei Jing et al., 2009; Riggs, 1997). Others would counter that such accommodation does international stakeholders no favors in that they should learn to adapt to the native environment (e.g., Cope & Black, 1985).

This is where the issue of immersion emerges. This book recognizes two types: partial and full. Partial immersion involves gradual acclimation to library resources and services; full means no accommodations are made. This dichotomy was an underlying factor in practically all aspects of internationalization in research for this book. Both rationales have merit.

Some in the literature were concerned that accommodations, especially for international students, prevented them from reaping the full benefits of study abroad (Cope & Black, 1985). In fact, they might consider accommodation an insulting presumption of inability (Puente, Gray, & Agnew, 2009; Song & Lee, 2012). Still others might contend that accommodation is not even a library issue, and that more will ultimately depend on what happens in the classroom regardless of library efforts (Li, 1998). However, most in the literature seemed to favor partial immersion, a gradual acclimation to the library which includes at least some accommodation for stakeholders.

Research for this book indicated that immersion is often two different conversations. One is pedagogical: can supplying international stakeholders with familiar content in an effort to gradually build their comfort with the library

ultimately lead to information literacy, or will it discourage them from adapting to the foreign environment, which could threaten their information literacy? Another is perceptional: does making someone feel welcome, being inclusive, help them better adjust and by extension succeed, or does it promote stereotypes about them and their deficits? Again, the literature overall would prefer the partial, gradual approach; part of the thinking is that initial familiarity with at least some of the content might encourage international students to eventually use the library for more academic purposes. This also seemed to be the case at libraries included in this study.

Although this book adheres to the contention that it depends on the individual, experience and rationale indicate that gradual immersion is more effective than full, at least in terms of information literacy. For example, an international student with limited comprehension of the host language is given a research assignment: how can the student hope to achieve any level of information literacy without educators being sensitive to language limitations? Such sensitivity is technically accommodation. Perhaps they will eventually master the language, but if they fail enough classes before then, it might not matter as they could be sent home, which was the case for many students dependent on scholarships. This might seem a transactional rather than a transformational motivation, and full immersion advocates would probably lay claim to their philosophy being more transformational overall; however, this book counters that it sometimes takes a transaction or two before one can begin to transform.

Again, this book favors partial immersion. This partiality is not only extended to international stakeholders in terms of culture and language, but also domestic stakeholders in terms of accommodating limited frames of reference, especially for those brought up in nationalistic or patriotic environments. They might struggle with the broader perspective required to become information literate in the more global reality in which people now operate. Rather than judge, assume, or ridicule, as often seems to happen by those who feel enlightened, it is more effective to accommodate for limitations. Patience is indeed the word, and a major part of the accommodation this chapter supports. Patience and understanding are likely the best ways to build that all important trust on which internationalization depends.

Research for this book revealed that faculty have mixed feelings regarding immersion. Even those who prefer partial over full might not agree to what degree of accommodation should be provided. Two second language instructors from the same department interviewed for this study disagreed with the statement that the library should accommodate international students. One encouraged the library to provide content from the international students' homelands (e.g., entertainment movies, newspapers) thinking that familiarity would make immersion into language and culture easier to process. The other considered it more of a crutch, that gradual immersion is like a gateway drug that starts off innocently, but ultimately makes students dependent on such resources. They fear students will abandon meaningful immersion for the sake of convenience (e.g., desiring only library instructions written in their

native language). Again, research for this book indicated that it depends on the individual stakeholder. Some will cling to their own culture if given the opportunity; others might want to adapt but need extra help to acclimate. This was not really an international/domestic nor transactional/transformational distinction, because again, sometimes even those who seek the sort of transformation that accompanies information literacy might need initial help. Using resources in their native language in the beginning of their acclimation does not mean they want to simply transact a task: they just need help overcoming a language or cultural challenge.

Regardless which immersion philosophy a library adopts, research indicated that the decision should include stakeholder input (e.g., faculty, administration, students), and be deliberate and strategic in relation to overall internationalization. An immersion decision based on majority consensus aligns with Li (1998): she would probably subscribe to the efficacy of library internationalization if it aligned with faculty pedagogy and college curricula.

In terms of more administrative concerns regarding immersion, the library by itself would not likely increase international admissions (Lombard, 2012), but how it accommodates the students could play a key role in terms of retention. Here again is where collaboration is useful: library personnel should coordinate with international office colleagues to understand student expectations. If the library partially accommodates for language and culture, but the students expect full immersion, then the library might not just disappoint, but offend. On the flipside, if partial immersion accommodation is expected but not provided, a retention problem could arise.

The issue of accommodation in relation to immersion decisions presents ethical dilemmas related to concerns raised in Chapter 3. Should the library do what it believes to be ethical regardless of college consensus? Imagine a college that adopts a full immersion philosophy for its international stakeholders (i.e., neither library nor any department is to accommodate them in terms of language or culture). This contradicts what most library literature suggests, and arguably the principles on which many library associations operate (e.g., IFLA and advocacy). Should it defy the college, and do what it thinks best to accommodate stakeholders? As already discussed, going rogue could be dangerous given the nature of college organizational hierarchy, but it might be the ethical thing to do.

An example of this dilemma was observed in one of the case studies. It was a university that enrolled international students even when they were unprepared for the academic rigor the university demanded. It offered an ESL (English as a Second Language) program, but it was not part of the academic division, nor were students who needed the instruction required to first enroll. Ironically, the vice president of academic affairs would not allow colleges to compromise standards – full immersion was the unwritten philosophy, and the university did not want faculty or academic support going beyond what it did for domestic students. The library officially followed suit, but unofficially and inconsistently; for some international students, individual personnel went beyond what they would do for domestic students (e.g., one

circulation staffer allowed students to use the office scanner to create copies of their documentation when no one else was around; another proofread papers). According to them, they did these things because they found it unethical to enroll students without ensuring they had a reasonable chance of success. Those who chose to follow university policy would not have completely disagreed with this thinking and were not bad people because they did not feel the same way as their more accommodating colleagues; they simply believed it was better for the greater good of students to facilitate full immersion, and also keep the library out of trouble with executive leadership. Regardless of who was right or wrong – it is debatable – holistic internationalization was compromised due to inconsistent accommodation.

The rest of this chapter considers accommodation within the context of the literature, specifically its themes of resources and personnel. In terms of resources, the literature focused on the library building itself, the content it provides (which was a major association made with internationalization during primary research for this book), and policy, including reference and interlibrary loan. The personnel themes were in large part related to library instruction and personnel training that allows the library to provide better resources and services to international students. Primary research for this book detected the underlying dilemma of immersion throughout these themes. Additionally, more about plagiarism is discussed, including advantages and disadvantages of the library becoming more involved at campus level. The last personnel theme deals with the importance of marketing.

Two additional sections inspired more by primary research are also included: faculty accommodation and open educational resources (OER). Although all faculty have a stake in academic library internationalization, the literature focus was international faculty. The literature paints a bleak picture for international faculty in higher education in general; however, aspects of internationalization present opportunities for the library to accommodate them in ways that could benefit the entire campus. Although OER was not often associated with internationalization in the literature, it lends itself to library accommodation in terms of students and faculty, and in ways that can increase internationalization beyond institutional or even sector boundaries.

Resources

One of the main literature foci was how libraries accommodate through resources (Abdullah, 2000; Buckner & French, 2007; Burhans, 1991; Buttlar, 1994; Han & Hall, 2012; Irving, 1994; Li, 1998; Li, McDowell, & Wang, 2016; Marcus, 2003; May Ying, 2003; McKenzie, 1995; Mei Jing et al., 2009; Mood, 1982; Ruleman & Riley, 2017; Schomberg, & Bergman, 2012; Ury & Baudino, 2005). Bordonaro and Rauchmann (2015) found that the resources provided by the library are the main ways in which they are perceived as contributing to internationalization; this was validated by research for this book, including by those who worked in the libraries. Unfortunately, other services that could help internationalization were often unrecognized.

A concern among internationalization scholars is that library accommodation does not support the parent institution's needs (Kline & Rod, 1984; Sarkodie-Mensah, 1992). Although Buttlar (1994) found that 92% of libraries surveyed allocated funds specifically for "cultural diversity", that survey was conducted many years ago, and cultural diversity can mean many different things. Research for this book showed that the library must understand the true extent of a college's internationalization commitment before acquiring or developing internationalization resources. As has already been discussed, simply because a college believes or states that it wants to internationalize does not necessarily mean it is truly committed to it. For example, some colleges in this study claimed in their mission statements that they wanted to make their students "responsible global citizens". However, the curricula and programming reflected little commitment to internationalization; there was little study abroad, and the liberal studies programs were nationalist in content. To invest in resources that supported this statement would have taken away from what the library truly needed to provide given the situation at its university; this per Downey's (2013) concern.

If a college is indeed serious about internationalization, then the library can adjust policies to better support it. In cases where internationalization is academic as opposed to administrative in intent, collaboration with faculty is imperative: understanding program and course objectives and working with faculty to acquire and/or build content will allow the library to support student success. As described in the last chapter, even transactional students ambivalent to internationalization want to graduate; if the library provides content that facilitates good grades, then students are more likely to use it.

In addition to the actual content a library provides, the format in which it is provided can also be a factor. Studies show that digital books, videos, and LibGuides were preferred among international students compared to more traditional resources (Buckner & French, 2007; Han & Hall, 2012; Li, McDowell, & Wang, 2016; May Ying, 2003; Mei Jing et al., 2009). Li, McDowell, and Wang (2016) illustrated this preference in their efforts to accommodate international students through vernacular language videos; the videos were created to help students familiarize themselves with the library.

In addition to a preference for such videos over more traditional formats, the literature indicated that if the videos are in the students' native languages, it helps them to better learn how to use the library for their academic success. Ferrer-Vinent (2010) showed that some second language international students prefer resources in both their own language and the host nation language; that way they can acclimate, while still having somewhat of a safety net. At one university studied for this book, the feelings were mixed: while some international stakeholders preferred newer technology over traditional formats, others preferred the traditional, including person-to-person interaction. What was ironic was that national origin did not seem to be much of a factor in these cases, despite earlier understandings about national levels of technological acumen. It seemed in this case more a matter of the actual

content itself than the stakeholder. Another note for concern: the fact that most involved in this process would associate the library content mostly with books could be troubling when considering the circulation statistics at schools in this study.

Other stakeholders aside from international students would likely respond just as positively to new formats given the increasing reliance on "apps" and mobile technology. Again, it depends on the individuals: for example, some domestic students, even in technologically endowed nations, might struggle if they come from poor urban or rural communities. As has been illustrated throughout this book, technology can be a great facilitator of internationalization, but libraries need to be cautious in what ways and to what purposes they implement it (Eghe-Ohenmwen, 2015; Okiy, 2010; Uwhekadom & Olawolu, 2013).

The library building itself can be a pivotal resource to internationalization (Graubart, 1995; Hoffman & Popa, 1986; Koenigstein, 2012; May Ying, 2003; Moeckel & Presnell, 1995; Onwuegbuzie, Jiao, & Daley, 1997). Well-conceived spaces promote information fluency, and/or socialization or interactions conducive to internationalization in ways that appeal to both those in favor of full or partial immersion, or academic or administrative models.

Some academic libraries are becoming glorified social halls, where collaborating with personnel who deal with student residency arrangements and activities would be at least as, if not more important than, collaborating with faculty. Deliberate programming (e.g., speakers; events) and spacing for students to gather (e.g., study rooms; tutoring spaces) are examples of how a well designed building can facilitate internationalization, especially given the seeming affinity international students have for the library as a place to study and meet (Albarillo, 2018; Bordonaro, 2004; Onwuegbuzie, Jiao, & Daley, 1997).

In addition to international students, if done properly then such utilization of the library building can also benefit domestic students. Hosting multicultural events and foreign speakers would be an excellent way to broaden domestic student perspectives and align their college experience with internationalization objectives. If students already enter the library to rest or study between classes, then it might be possible to pique their interest with multicultural displays or programs.

There could also be deliberate space arrangement that would encourage domestic and international stakeholders to mingle. Interacting with others besides those of one's own culture provides an opportunity for a more multicultural experience (Attwood & Tahir, 2007). Breaking down barriers and facilitating interactions among domestic and international stakeholders, including the surrounding community, could be a pivotal component of any college's internationalization plans, and the library offers an excellent building in which to make this happen. An international faculty member at one of the colleges included in this study remarked how gratifying it is to speak with domestic students about things outside class; they believed it was a different

dynamic than conversing with colleagues. In this sense, the library potentially offers a setting that can break down international/domestic status boundaries as well as college classification boundaries (e.g., students and faculty can interact on different terms).

Providing space for some groups to meet for cultural or religious purposes could also serve partial immersion. For example, one college referred to in Chapter 3 had a significant international Muslim student population, but in the nation in which the college was located Muslims were a small minority, and the closest mosque was over 200 kilometers away. Devout Muslims must pray five times a day, and there are not always convenient places on campuses for it. Therefore, this library provided prayer space for Muslim stakeholders (e.g., including a map which indicated the direction of Mecca). Not only did students take advantage of this room but some from the surrounding community also used it on occasion.

Regardless of domestic or international stakeholder accommodation, space accommodation would likely benefit from serious collaboration with colleagues involved with student living, and in the case of international students, offices that focus on internationalization. One international office professional noted that academic library stakeholders are busy and have many obligations and pressures; the implication being there had better be proper incentives for their attendance or participation. Primary research for this book validated this observation as many students were not interested in learning how to use the library without transactional benefit. Thus, having people involved in internationalization efforts advocate for the building's value might motivate stakeholders to use it for something other than a social or study hall.

Contrary to the literature focus on technology, the content most associated with internationalization during primary research for this study was the old-fashioned book, particularly those written in foreign languages. This most notably included internationalization colleagues outside the library, when or if they thought about the library and its role in internationalization. Library personnel also seemed to believe providing books in their international students' first languages was their main internationalization role, if any. The question becomes, how much should be dedicated to expanding the collection to accommodate international stakeholders (Downey, 2013)?

The library can and does support internationalized curricula through its content, including books written by foreign authors (Natowitz, 1995). To illustrate using a college library in London: in addition to its British literature collection, titles and authors from outside the United Kingdom are also necessary to provide domestic students an internationalization experience. The thinking is that having broad, multicultural exposure is required for a "global citizen" and makes a person more competitive upon graduation. Although this seems like common sense, and the notion aligned with most thinking observed during interviews, primary research indicated a disproportionate number of domestic authors within academic libraries where English was the primary language.

Some might accuse such libraries of cultural bias (and often do). However, it could also be argued that it is more a matter of availability. It should come as no surprise when English titles dominate academic libraries; after all, it is English language presses that dominate what is published (Stockemer & Wigginton, 2019). Note: this book is not suggesting that publishers intentionally try to exclude non-Western scholars (in fact, they do a good job of trying to encourage diversity, including the one that published this book), but the overall publishing and research reality perpetuates the cycle. This ironically presents yet another justification for internationalization, especially in higher education.

It is unfair to simply assume a library has no interest in internationalization because few of its books are not in foreign languages. Another problem could relate to Evaluate: even if it is possible to add foreign titles, quality may suffer due to library personnel unfamiliarity with the culture, history, or languages on which the books are based. This is not an issue of bias, but competence.

To help further illustrate, one university not included in this study had an East Asia Library collection with three exceptionally qualified librarians dedicated to Chinese, Japanese, and Korean scholarship. As impressive as this collection was, even it did not account for much of the other Asian scholarship; this particular university was doing well with three librarians covering three of the world's most prestigious literary traditions compared to libraries which are more typical of academic library reality. However, it would be nearly impossible for any library to be expert on all Asian scholarship and literature. Many do not or cannot even attempt it, thus truly illustrating the challenge of accommodating content in terms of internationalization. The example of this university, with its multibillion dollar endowment and international brand recognition, still being unable to comprehensively accommodate Asian cultures reemphasizes the struggles for typical colleges with far fewer privileges.

Collecting culturally diverse content is not the dilemma for many academic libraries outside Europe and English-speaking nations. The Western canon was often viewed as necessary for academic library collections around the world. For some libraries, it was often easier to obtain titles from English-speaking nations than to find native scholarship; thus, these libraries technically accommodated the internationalization resource needs of domestic students, but such internationalization was obviously by default of their less than ideal circumstances than intentional strategy. However, it does provide a unique opportunity for such libraries to expand their roles in college internationalization, even beyond their own colleges – as will be discussed later in the OER section.

Interlibrary loan was identified in the literature as an accommodation challenge for international students (Irving, 1994; Ruleman & Riley, 2017). Irving found that they struggle with the process, and recommended clear, simple procedures. Ruleman and Riley's concerns were more about usage: they observed that international students frequently attempted to borrow textbooks through

the library instead of paying for them, which drains an interlibrary loan department in terms of public services, copyright clearance, and overall time and effort. They eventually established a reserve section specifically for textbooks their library owned, and directed all stakeholders, rather than single out international students, to use it instead of requesting textbooks.

The potential for students to try and save money on textbooks by borrowing them from the library has posed problems to effective collection management and interlibrary loan since the phenomenon of exorbitant textbook prices reached newsworthy relevance. In light of these textbook costs, it is more surprising that there are not even more common and severe problems than those cited in the literature. In this ironic instance it might actually be a good thing if students are not as savvy with how the library operates, or more theft and saturation of borrowing capacity could emerge. There is no cultural tendency one can associate with this sort of desperation. Lack of money is a shared cultural attribute among most students everywhere. Students who are the most financially desperate, domestic or international, will likely be more motivated to find creative ways to fund textbook demands.

In terms of violating the law, some stakeholders might be more at risk for unintentional reasons. Based upon discussions in the last chapter concerning intellectual property, some stakeholders might not comprehend copyright laws or customs, thus making them more susceptible to violations. One circulation assistant recounted an example of a student photocopying an entire interlibrary loan book. Sidenote: during the recount of this story, the assistant seemingly found significance in the fact that the violator was an international student. To avoid potential stereotyping like this, it becomes even more imperative that appropriate, feasible policies to manage privileges, and effective underlying procedures to ensure compliance are in place to best accommodate stakeholders and avoid collective animosity toward groups.

Personnel

Just as academic library policy should govern content, reasonable policies should guide library personnel. Marcus (2003) recounted a disagreement at a reference desk over whether or not a librarian should accommodate an international student in their own language. The immersion dilemma: should librarians speak to international students in the host nation language, thus requiring them to learn and improve their communication, or ensure their information literacy needs are met, including communicating in a language they best understand? One reviewer for this book thought it should be the student's decision. Regardless of whether that is right or wrong, it is unrealistic: Downey (2013) stressed the importance of staying true to mission; to do so requires consistency. Unless the library can ensure personnel are able to communicate in all stakeholder languages during all possible interactions, problems can emerge when it is not accommodated (e.g., personnel who cannot are perceived as uncooperative; students who speak a language that is not one of the ones accommodatedmet might feel discriminated against).

What is interesting about the incident Marcus shared was the disagreement did not occur between library personnel and external stakeholders, but between two librarians. Which reinforces the point that in addition to stakeholders, library internationalization requires understanding by its own personnel. The type of model and culture in place certainly will influence how library personnel approach internationalization; however, because internationalization is literally and figuratively a foreign concept to some, it is important to be explicit in its regard rather than assume consensus exists. There is nothing wrong with professional disagreement of the type Marcus described, but consistent delivery of services when dealing with external stakeholders (e.g., reference desk) should be in place. Disagree at the departmental meeting, not at a public service point.

According to the literature and research for this book, most library personnel seem to favor partial immersion. Again, what they favor is not always feasible in terms of budget. This is especially relevant at a college with diverse international student enrollment. For example, it is unreasonable to expect library personnel to learn all the different languages of international stakeholders. Even if they did at one point in time, political and diplomatic machinations can wreak havoc on international enrollment and working visas; a college might accept international students from one nation for a couple years, or hire faculty, then a political shift occurs at national levels, immigration statuses are impacted, and fewer students from that nation are able to attend, or faculty teach. This was a major problem for at least one college included in this study.

Although it is always useful to understand a foreign language, learning one with the intention to serve a specific student population may not indefinitely serve its purpose. Not only is it unfeasible to expect library personnel to learn languages according to enrollment and hiring trends, even more so is the idea of hiring them based on language needs: imagine a library hiring someone because of their ability to speak the language of a currently significant international group; if enrollment and hiring initiatives regarding that nation change in favor of a different nation, the library cannot in good conscience replace the person because the language they speak is no longer in demand.

Here is one of many ways international student workers become valuable to academic library internationalization (Baudino, Johnson, & Northwest Missouri State University, 2016; Rosenzweig & Meade, 2017; Sheu & Panchyshyn, 2017). If a school hires some who represent other stakeholders from their country, then accommodation of their languages is possible without the dilemmas that would arise from hiring full-time personnel for that purpose. International students can also help library personnel create innovative displays or learning modules for which they might otherwise be dependent on an inaccurate translation tool or have to hire an expensive agency.

Ferriss (2016) highly recommended hiring international students for public service interactions, even at schools where few international students are enrolled. Placing them at public service points requires them to interact more with others besides those from their own countries: this

benefits their own acculturation and would likely earn approval of full immersionists on campus. It also makes the library more approachable to other international students, especially if there are not that many; even if they are not from the same country, they have their international status in common.

A librarian interviewed for this book included one of the international student workers in their library instruction. This student spoke the language and was from the same nation as the students enrolled in the class. It was not a particularly successful venture, but more due to lack of information literacy about that culture on the librarian's part. The student worker was female, and the class consisted of young, immature males; according to the student worker, their culture frowned upon females being vocal or authoritative. A more successful example at the same school, had a student worker assigned to translate a web page into their language for other students who shared that language; this met with success, as the page was well received and heavily used. The lesson learned: just as important as utilizing international student potential is being informed on how best to use it; another example of information literacy applied to library internationalization for the benefit of personnel development.

Many personnel stated in this study that interacting with their international students was the most fulfilling and useful aspect of the internationalization experience. They enjoyed learning from these students as much as teaching them, and on many occasions the students became ambassadors for the library to other international students.

The potential contributions to domestic stakeholders of hiring international students cannot be overstated. Although there might be misunderstandings at public service points (e.g., the circulation desk), cultivating patience for and consideration of those from other cultures is an important skill in the global market for all stakeholders. While international student workers facilitate internationalization in ways by default, the more deliberate and strategic the library is in utilizing them, the more benefits they can provide. As it was, the benefits international students provided at the schools studied were mostly by default rather than design; thus, greater potential rarely materialized beyond what would be described as standard operating procedure.

Library instruction received significant attention in literature related to internationalization. Many studies illustrated examples of specialized instruction geared for international students, with special attention given to cultural awareness and sensitivity (Albarillo, 2017; Allen, 1987; Amsberry, 2009, 2010; Ball & Mahony, 1987; Boers, 1994; Burhans, 1991; Chan et al., 2015; Ferriss, 2016; Gale, 2006; Greenfield et al., 1986; Helms, 1995; Hoffman & Popa, 1986; Houlihan, Wiley, & Click 2017; Hurley, Hegarty, & Bolger, 2006; Iheanacho, 2008; Jackson, 2005; Jackson & Sullivan, 2011; Koehler & Swanson, 1988; Lopez, 1983; McLean, 1978; McSwiney, n.d.; Mood, 1982; Muroi, White, & San Diego State University, 1990; Ormondroyd, 1989; Osborne & Poon, 1995; Sarkodie-Mensah, 1992; So, 1994; Tsai, 1988; Welch

& Lam, 1991; Yusuke & Bartlett, 2014; Zimerman, 2012). The two major foci of these studies were: personal character traits, including attitude, demeanor, and sensitivity; how instruction is delivered, including class size, lesson difficulty, supplements, timing within the academic term, and language delivery.

If international students are offended or distracted by a librarian, then learning is compromised. Gender can be an issue in this regard (Burhans, 1991); the example of the female international student worker in the previous passage comes to mind. The way a librarian presents themselves can also impact domestic student perception, but unless it is in a very diverse nation (e.g., United States, India), the same concerns regarding international students are not likely to be as pronounced.

The importance of curricular integration was also acknowledged (Albarillo, 2018; Feldman, 1989; Ormondroyd, 1989), along with need for collaboration. Both Feldman and Ormondroyd believed that directly connecting instruction with the course would likely increase engagement among domestic and international students. Again, this internationalization approach is no different than what is recommended in overall academic librarianship. However, literature does indicate that pedagogical skills can impact some international students much differently than domestic peers. For example, students from some cultures might be intimidated by library personnel who try to single them out by asking them questions. Such approaches as the Socratic Method can be effective but may not be well received by those who feel uncomfortable with individual attention in public forums. The student addressed might feel they lose face if they cannot respond in a way they perceive to be correct or appropriate (Hofstede, 2001). There was even a case when a librarian complimented a student during an instruction session for second language students and the same student became visibly agitated this person feared that the group was shamed due to their individual acknowledgment.

Formality is another concern. According to Hofstede and others, some cultures are more formal or informal than others. Although his book subscribes to the notion of the individual in terms of accommodation, it is easy to imagine that library personnel who do not act accordingly could be a distraction. An example of this occurred when a librarian informally addressed students who may have expected what Hofstede would describe as power distance.

Communication can also be an issue. As discussed in the previous chapter, some cultures are characterized by passive communication; thus, if the librarian attempts to be straightforward and concise, this can be misinterpreted as abrupt and rude. The roles can also be reversed (passive interpreted as evasive or dishonest): thus, it might be helpful to keep in mind communication patterns; if students do not directly answer questions posed during instruction, rather than assume they are nonparticipative, library personnel should consider that it is possibly the students' communication pattern. The same dynamics need to be recognized when teaching students who practice more active communication; they may prefer library personnel get to the point (Wibbeke & McArthur, 2014).

Finally, as already discussed, students from affluent nations generally are more comfortable with technology than those from poor nations. Library

personnel should be sensitive to this when demonstrating how to use technology within an internationalization context. In addition to demonstrating it, they should help those with less technology acumen become as comfortable with it as possible and motivate as well as instruct them; rather than launching straight into the demonstration, library personnel might provide basic access and navigation instructions.

One example for this study of how a librarian addressed this issue was through collaboration with faculty. The librarian asked the instructor what the purpose or the goal of the assignment was, and then shared what technology was needed. The instructor then determined student competency and informed the librarian before the presentation; the librarian then accordingly planned what had to be covered in terms of the technology before specific subject content was addressed. They avoided losing time, putting students in awkward positions of having to admit ignorance in public, and also the possibility of academic failure.

Another major literature focus was personnel training, specifically cultural awareness and sensitivity regarding international students (Amsberry, 2009; Ball & Mahony, 1987; Chan et al., 2015; Ferriss, 2016; Greenfield et al., 1986; Hoffman & Popa, 1986; Houlihan, Wiley, & Click 2017; Hurley, Kostelecky, & Townsend, 2019; Kumar & Suresh, 2000; Mood, 1982; Natowitz, 1995; Sarkodie-Mensah, 1992; Welch & Lam, 1991; Yusuke & Bartlett, 2014). Some studies mentioned that library personnel welcomed such training (Amsberry, 2009; Hoffman & Popa, 1986; Jiao, Zhuo, Zhou, & Zhou, 2009; Yusuke & Bartlett, 2014), while no literature indicated they were resistant to it. This was also the case during primary research with a few exceptions, those being more indifference than objection; however, despite interest, most library personnel mentioned there was not much opportunity or encouragement to pursue such training.

Although the concern about biases, intentional or unintentional, that can emerge if library personnel receive cultural training about a particular group is justifiable, some literature indicates that better understanding and appreciation of international stakeholders gives library personnel a better chance of supporting them. This certainly would be the case in the library instruction scenarios described above. If nothing else, it might help personnel realize there is more to accommodation than simply providing books in international student languages.

Although the sensitivity theme from the literature might not be as applicable or relevant to domestic stakeholder accommodation in some nations, cultural awareness training could be helpful in terms of supporting a college's internationalized curriculum, especially during reference interactions. The more knowledge library personnel have about different cultures or nations, the better they can provide resources and services. Such knowledge would also be helpful if the goal is to integrate within the curriculum. Specifically, it might help with the Evaluate limitation discussed in the previous section on content: with more training about culture and language, library personnel might better assess international additions to their collections.

Enrollment in actual classes offered by the college would serve as excellent training for purposes of curricular integration. Not only could library

personnel learn more about the actual subject content that comprises the curriculum, thus increasing their own information literacy, but better understand what the student specifically needs in relation to the class (e.g., course outcomes and assignments). If not feasible because of conflicting schedules or time restraints, perhaps approaching faculty about providing workshops in areas of their expertise could enable library personnel to better support course objectives. Imagine what this could also mean for faculty/library relations: by attending their classes or workshops, library personnel demonstrate appreciation for faculty expertise. This would have been beneficial at many of the schools observed in this study where gulfs between library personnel and faculty were evident; such acknowledgment and interaction could have facilitated collaboration.

Another training emphasis was listening. Amsberry (2009) found that careful listening in terms of language patterns and accents can be useful when accommodating students. Research for this book found that some second language students might have excellent vocabularies, but if the accent is underdeveloped then they might not make themselves clear; in fact, the more words, the greater the chance for misunderstanding in such an instance.

Listening training should also include accommodating active versus passive communication patterns. When dealing with stakeholders with different communication patterns, library personnel should try not to insist on their own patterns; in the case of passive communicators, listen carefully to what the stakeholder says and try to understand possible meanings beyond surface words. With active communicators, it is important to say exactly what is meant, as directly and clearly as possible, and also listen carefully to best ensure what they say is understood – they likely do not want to repeat themselves. In short, Sarkodie-Mensah (1992) explained that academic librarians should better understand international users at both the surface language level (in this case English pronunciation) and deeper levels (e.g., cultural mores as related to language patterns and usage).

Understanding body language is also important. In addition to literature on the subject, research for this book revealed that students interpret and exhibit it in different ways. At one university studied for this book, specific training about the body language of people from one particular nation was provided to college personnel. Misunderstandings and mistrust had been developing before the problem was addressed, including the library: "They shook their heads when they meant 'yes'".

Amsberry (2009) also found that the attitudes of library personnel mediate their ability to understand international students. The listener's attitude, experience, and knowledge of international stakeholders can affect their perceptions and, by extension, ability to listen. A possible implication of this is that training about communication in itself is not enough – library personnel also need an overall positive attitude concerning internationalization to effectively accommodate stakeholders.

There is much written about plagiarism, some of it discussed in the preceding chapter in terms of understanding stakeholders. In terms of how to

accommodate them, libraries in this study took differing views on the best ways to help stakeholders, particularly students, avoid it: some focused on the citation mechanics; others also addressed copyright as a subpart of intellectual property; some did not assume a role. It can be argued that citation is something that is or should be associated with librarianship; in fact, library databases often provide citations in their records. The literature stresses the importance of collaboration between library personnel and faculty in matters of plagiarism, and research for this book validated it. Not only can library resources and services help students effectively cite, but also save faculty time.

Unlike faculty who are often confined to one department, library personnel work across the college. Thus, they can see what struggles the students endure during the citation process, detect warning signs for inadvertent plagiarism, and facilitate clear, consistent dialogue regarding it (Michalak & Rysavy, 2020). Depending upon outreach, the library may also be better situated to work with other campus colleagues (e.g., international office personnel) to provide more particular support for international students. In such capacities, the library can consistently inform the campus at an overall institutional level about plagiarism, and perhaps assess it per Whitehurst (2010). Colleges observed for this study might have benefited from such an arrangement.

This type of role would not come without potential drawbacks. It is one thing to provide guides and instruction about the citation process; it is another to be involved with preventing and detecting plagiarism at a formal, curricular level. Once it evolves from support to administration, the library could potentially be associated with influencing student enrollment status (e.g., determine a student has plagiarized which then facilitates dismissal), and also how instructors must teach their classes (e.g., require library instruction during class time rather than make it optional). How involved in policing does the library want to become? How much do students and faculty actually want them involved? Support is appreciated, but prescription might not be.

Correcting a faculty member on how they teach citation or evaluate plagiarism might serve transactional purposes at a given moment. However, it could also jeopardize collaborative relationships for the long term. Library personnel sometimes observe poor instruction on the part of instructors; many do not confront them out of respect and concern for future collaboration. How to best accommodate faculty and students in terms of preventing plagiarism as one aspect of internationalization could offer unique struggles beyond simple policies and procedures.

The last point from the literature for this section is that library personnel should not assume potential stakeholders will become actual stakeholders when it comes to internationalization. Research for this book showed the library's value to internationalization was not something commonly recognized, yet little to no marketing was done to inform external colleagues. Providing content and services, whether by default or intention, makes little difference if stakeholders are unaware of them.

The literature notes the importance of marketing to accommodate international students (Baudino, Johnson, Park, & Northwest Missouri State University,

2013; Cuiying, 2007; Helms, 1995; Mood, 1982; Schomberg & Bergman, 2012; Wei, 1998). However, when marketing to them, or any stakeholder, it is important that information be clear, and on their terms (Cuiying, 2007). Cuiying worked as an International Students Information Librarian, and found that students' cultural characteristics, language proficiency, learning styles, and subjects of interest should inform library marketing. Here again is the benefit of international student workers: when a library cannot afford an International Students Information Librarian, especially one as skilled as Cuiying, not only can they inform marketing tactics geared toward their communities, but they can also provide word-of-mouth marketing about what the library offers.

Faculty accommodation

There is little written about academic library internationalization exclusive to faculty. This is unsurprising given that they are often indirectly associated with the collaboration theme, thus considered by default more a means to an end in terms of student accommodation. Domestic faculty's top priority seemed to be content that supported their scholarship; they were uninterested in the library's role for anything other, including internationalization.

It was surprising that more was not available on international faculty. The sparse literature that was available regarding library accommodation of them indicates there is a need when coupled with what general literature in higher education depicts about their situations (Muene, 2014). Much of the same accommodation that applies to domestic faculty also applies to them, but the library can offer services in addition that could be of interest. Although not a traditional role for the library, it could help an international faculty member with personal adjustments similar to the information literacy outreach that the library described in Chapter 2 provided to refugees (e.g., resources about places to live, things to do, services of interest).

Faculty moving to Western, English-speaking nations (context of most studies), are sometimes given little support from the college for their adjustment. They may be well trained in their fields and understand how higher education works in general (less likely for new graduates), but studies indicate they are often less prepared for daily living outside campus (Muene). In addition to regular services provided to all faculty, the library could also assume a role in helping their personal acclimation; a partial immersion for faculty members. Some libraries already do this sort of thing for all faculty new to the campus and community; however, something more deliberate for international faculty might alleviate the added stress they endure as foreigners.

Obviously not all international faculty are the same (e.g., some did not appreciate such librarian proactivity), but offering personal adjustment services could cultivate relationships and generate greater library investment. If international faculty felt a sense of personal gratitude, they might advocate for the library, or even share knowledge of their homeland with library personnel; in such a capacity, they could be just as valuable as international student workers to library internationalization.

Open education resources (OER)

Although OER (open education resources) is not currently associated with academic library internationalization, research for this book indicates possibilities for connecting the two. It is gaining momentum in the United States because of its potential to help lower student textbook costs; instead of requiring students to buy expensive textbooks, OER is a movement currently led by librarians to produce and provide access to scholarship in an open access environment with little to no cost (some publishers also utilize aspects of OER). There are different OER options (e.g., online/partially online; no cost/reduced cost), but in the end, students save money, and libraries that facilitate OER can become more prominent on their campuses (Vogus, 2019). Note: OER should not be confused with the overall notion of open access; it could be considered an example, but the open access phenomenon is broader in scope.

It also offers faculty additional scholarship opportunities and can increase the multicultural content of a library. The Boyer Model describes different types of scholarship, three of which include what it refers to as application, integration, and teaching (Boyer, 1990); these comport well with OER scholarship, especially at places where teaching is the focus over research. The library could serve an information fluency role by connecting and advising faculty and campus technologists to produce meaningful scholarship, then make it accessible through a well-conceived cataloging system. For example, one university library in this study posted faculty scholarship on its website. This is also happening at many colleges in terms of consortiums that expand access beyond one institution (e.g., the Open Education Network in the United States).

As already discussed, most scholarship is dominated by European and English-speaking nations. Those who culturally and/or nationally do not reside within that sphere are at a disadvantage; if a library in a poorer nation facilitated OER for its faculty, then it would ensure their scholarship was available. Thus, OER benefits students by saving them money, faculty in terms of meeting tenure and promotion criteria, and scholarly discourse in general by breaking down cultural, geographical, and/or economic barriers. It could boost library efforts to expand the collection to meet college internationalization demands, and also increase the incentive for faculty to collaborate.

For OER to be effective requires a well-conceived model. Probably the most important criterion is critical evaluation of the actual resources; yet again, the importance of Evaluate as an information literacy component for library personnel. If source quality is low, then arguments for OER are voided. Here is yet another opportunity for collaboration with faculty: in addition to making their OER scholarship available, library personnel could also use faculty expertise to evaluate OER before approving them; for colleges where service is a faculty requirement in addition to teaching and research, this offers excellent faculty incentives.

Accessibility is also crucial: no matter how high in quality OER may be, if not reasonably accessible, they serve little purpose. Library personnel are arguably the best trained to catalog and classify OER in ways that users can

locate and use. A virtual platform, like a website, would probably work well because it allows for metadata and translation; however, for those in nations with limited technology, such a platform could present its own problems as already discussed throughout the chapters.

Although libraries are arguably the best suited departments to administer OER, it would be wise to also collaborate with information technology and instructional design colleagues. They are experts in terms of digital formatting, integration within learning management systems, and also design. Such collaboration could be the epitome of college information fluency. The academic library can play a major role in facilitating OER because of its tradition of developing and administering repositories; in so doing, it can play a pivotal role in what could be a significant boon to a college's internationalization, and make a positive impression on faculty, students, administrators, and possibly the surrounding community.

Reconsider the point made in Chapter 1 about literature that focuses on global sharing databases. Already these networks offer the infrastructure to permit access and borrowing, and play important parts in library internationalization (Billings, 2000; Case & Jakubs, 1999; Clausen, 2015; Dougherty, 1985; Miller & Zhou, 1999; Miller, Xu, & Zou, 2008; Paulus, 2013; Rader, 2002; Smiraglia & Leazer, 1999; Somerville, Cooper, Torhell, & Hashert, 2015; Steele, 1993; Taler, 2018). Imagine if these databases incorporated OER; not only would this further OER objectives, it would also provide an example of internationalization beyond institutional, or even national levels. By having OER internationally accessible, faculty scholarship would be accessible to anyone with Internet options, and scholarly information superior to the dot-com sites that currently dominate would conceivably have increased influence. This could have major implications in all sectors around the world, and the academic library could be a huge part of it. There are few better singular examples of internationalization than global holdings databases like WorldCat; incorporate OER into that model, and the academic library becomes much more than an afterthought.

Effective accommodation of stakeholders is arguably the main purpose of most academic libraries. Internationalization raises the stakes, and creates new questions as to how to accommodate, and also opportunities. A significant portion of how well academic libraries accommodate their stakeholders depends on how well they understand them (per Chapter 4); This definitely seemed the case at libraries studied for this book. Again, the theme of intention emerges: it is not enough to simply accommodate stakeholder internationalization by default of content – it requires deliberate, strategic effort. And as already noted in the beginning of this chapter, it requires collaboration, and also trust – on the parts of all stakeholders, especially on issues associated with immersion. It is extremely difficult to accommodate library stakeholders without trust in any context, but research for this book indicated that unlike other factors, lack of trust can be a more serious obstacle in terms of holistic or even singular aspects of internationalization. This notion of trust, among others, will be reconsidered in the next chapter within this book's conclusion.

References

Abdullah, A. S. (2000). Factors affecting international students use of the online catalog and other information sources. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations (Publication No. AAT 9973229).

Albarillo, F. (2017). Is the library's online orientation program effective with English Language Learners? *College & Research Libraries*, *78*(5), 652–674.

Albarillo, F. (2018). Super-diversity and foreign-born students in academic libraries: A survey study. *Portal: Libraries & the Academy*, *18*(1), 59–91.

Allen, M. B. (1987). *Information literacy, the library and the basic reader/writer*. *Conference on Composition and Communication*. Atlanta.

Amsberry, D. (2009). Using effective listening skills with international patrons. *Reference Services Review*, *37*(1), 10–19.

Amsberry, D. (2010). Deconstructing plagiarism: International students and textual borrowing practices. *Reference Librarian*, *51*(1), 31–44.

Attwood, R., & Tahir, T. (2007). UK fails to integrate overseas students. *Times Higher Education Supplement*, (1814), 4.

Ball, M. A., & Mahony, M. (1987). Foreign students, libraries, and culture. *College and Research Libraries*, *48*(2), 160–166.

Baudino, F., Johnson, C., Park, S. G., & Northwest Missouri State University (Eds.). (2013). *Brick & click libraries: An academic library symposium*, 13th, Maryville, Missouri, November 1, 2013.

Baudino, F., Johnson, C., & Northwest Missouri State University (Eds.). (2016). *Brick & click libraries: An academic library conference proceedings*, 16th, Maryville, Missouri, November 4, 2016.

Becker, L. K. W. (2006). Globalisation and internationalisation: Models and patterns of change for Australian academic librarians. *Australian Academic & Research Libraries*, *37*(4), 282–298.

Billings, H. (2000). Shared collection building: Constructing the 21st century relational research library. *Journal of Library Administration*, *31*(2), 3–14.

Boers, G. G. (1994). Designing a library instruction program for international students. *Georgia Librarian*, *31*(4), 92–96.

Bordonaro, K. (2004). The use of an American college library by ESL students: an exploratory study in the utilization of resources and language learning (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations. (OCLC: 57439794)

Bordonaro, K., & Rauchmann, S. (2015). Internationalization in German academic libraries: Moving beyond North American perspectives. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, *15*(4), 677–697.

Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Buckner, T., & French, T. (2007). International students and the academic library: How one library is working to make its international students feel at home. *Kentucky Libraries*, *71*(2), 8–11.

Burhans, S. (1991). *Serving the information needs of the international and minority students at the Small College Library: A librarian's view*. *Annual Meeting of the Central States Communication Association*. Chicago.

Buttlar, L. (1994). Facilitating cultural diversity in college and university libraries. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *20*(1), 10.

Case, M., & Jakubs, D. (1999). Building the global collection world class collection development: A chronicle of the AAU/ARL Global Resource Program. *Journal of Library Administration*, *28*(1), 6380.

Chan, K. P., Colvin, J. B., Vinyard, M., Leach, C., Naumann, M. A., & Stenis, P. (2015). Libraries across the sea: Using a virtual presence and skilled student assistants to serve students abroad. *Journal of Library Administration*, *55*(4), 278–301.

Clausen, B. E. (2015). Think globally, act locally: A library perspective. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, *15*(3), 389–392.

Cuiying, M. (2007). Marketing academic library resources and information services to international students from Asia. *Reference Services Review*, *35*(4), 571–583.

Cope, J., & Black, E. (1985). New library orientation for international students. *College Teaching*, *33*(4), 159–162.

Dougherty, R. M. (1985). Research libraries in an international setting: Requirements for expanded resource sharing. *College and Research Libraries*, *46*(5), 383–389.

Downey, K. (2013). Why did we buy that? New customers and changing directions in collection development. *Collection Management*, *38*(2), 90–103.

Eghe-Ohenmwen, A. (2015). Best practices for repositioning, towards global competitiveness in academic libraries of privately-owned universities (ALPUS) in Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *6*(13), 50–52.

Feldman, D. (1989). The international student and course-integrated instruction: The ESL instructor's perspective. *Research Strategies*, *7*(4), 159–166.

Ferrer-Vinent, I. J. (2010). For English, press 1: International students' language preference at the reference desk. *Reference Librarian*, *51*(3), 189–201.

Ferriss, J. (2016). Integrating international students through the library experience. *Christian Librarian*, *59*(1), 7–9.

Gale, C. (2006). Serving them right? How libraries can enhance the learning experience of international students: A case study from the University of Exeter. *SCONUL Focus*, (39), 36–39.

Graubart, M. (1995). Orientation sessions in Israeli academic libraries. *Research Strategies 13*(3), 165–175.

Greenfield, L., et al. (1986). Educating the world: Training library staff to communicate effectively with international students. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *12*(4), 227–231.

Han, N., & Hall, S. L. (2012). Think globally! Enhancing the international student experience with LibGuides. *Journal of Electronic Resources Librarianship*, *24*(4), 288–297.

Helms, C. M. (1995). Reaching out to the international students through bibliographic instruction. *The Reference Librarian*, *51–52*, 295–307.

Hoffman, I., & Popa, O. (1986). Library orientation and instruction for international students. The University of California-Davis experience. *Rq*, *25*(3), 356–360.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Houlihan, M., Wiley, C. W., & Click, A. B. (2017). International students and information literacy: A systematic review. *Reference Services Review*, *45*(2), 258–277.

Hurley, D. A., Kostelecky, S. R., & Townsend, L. (2019). Cultural humility in libraries. *Reference Services Review*, *47*(4), 544–555.

Hurley, T., Hegarty, N., & Bolger, J. (2006). Crossing a bridge. *New Library World*, *107*(7/8), 302–320.

Iheanacho, P. C. (2008). A plan for making the University of Delaware's Morris Library more accessible to students from developing countries. Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations (Publication No. 3324456).

Irving, S. (1994). Addressing the special needs of international students in interlibrary loan: Some considerations. *Reference Librarian*, *81*, 111–117.

Jackson, P. A. (2005). Incoming international students and the library: A survey. *Reference Services Review*, *33*(2), 197–209.

Jackson, P. A. & Sullivan, P. (Eds.). (2011). *International students and academic libraries: Initiatives for academic success*. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries.

Jiao, S., Zhuo, F., Zhou, L., & Zhou, X. (2009). Chinese academic libraries from the perspective of international students studying in China. *International Information & Library Review*, *41*(1), 1–11.

Kline, L. S., & Rod, C. M. (1984). Library orientation programs for foreign students: A survey. *Rq*, *24*(2), 210–216.

Koehler, B., & Swanson, K. (1988). ESL students and bibliographic instruction: Learning yet another language. *Research Strategies*, *6*(4), 148–160.

Koenigstein, D. (2012). Alleviating international students' culture shock and anxiety in American academic libraries: Welcome, Ahlan Wa Sahlan, Anyeong Hae Sae Yo, Bienvenidos, Huan ying, Sanu Da Zuwa, Shalom, Swaagat hai. *Library Philosophy & Practice*, *14*, 78–83.

Kumar, S., & Suresh, R. (2000). Strategies for providing effective reference services for international adult learners. *Reference Librarian*, *33*(69/70), 327–336.

Li, S. D. (1998). Library services to students with diverse language and cultural backgrounds. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *24*(2), 139–143.

Li, X., McDowell, K., & Wang, X. (2016). Building bridges: Outreach to international students via vernacular language videos. *Reference Services Review*, *44*(3), 324–340.

Lombard, E. (2012). The role of the academic library in college choice. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *38*(4), 237–241.

Lopez, M. D. (1983). Chinese spoken here: Foreign language library orientation tours. *College & Research Libraries*, *44*(8), 267–269.

Marcus, S. (2003). Multilingualism at the reference desk. *College & Research Libraries News*, *64*(5), 322.

May Ying, C. (2003). Helping hands: Serving and engaging international students. *Reference Librarian*, *38*(79–80), 383–393.

McKenzie, D. E. (1995, May 1). Survey of Library and Information Needs of the International Students at Kent State University. (ED309410).

McLean, D. D. (1978). Library user education for the international student: A feasibility study. (ED197702).

McSwiney, C. (n.d.). Transnational programs graduate qualities, information literacy and the response and role of the University Library: A report to the University Librarian. Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations.

Mei Jing, L., Li, S., Womack, R., Wu, C., & Tao, Y. (2009). Celebrating diversity, welcoming the world: Developing a Chinese Webpage at Rutgers University Libraries. *CALA Occasional Paper Series*, (5), 2–11.

Michalak, R., & Rysavy, M.D.T. (Eds.). (2020). *Academic plagiarism: Librarians' solo and collaborative efforts to curb academic plagiarism*. New York: Nova Science Publishers.

Miller, R. G., Xu, H., & Zou, P. X. (2008). Global document delivery, user studies, and service evaluation: The Gateway experience. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *34*(4), 314–321.

Miller, R. G., & Zhou, P. X. (1999). Global resource sharing: A Gateway model. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *25*(4), 281–287.

Moeckel, N., & Presnell, J. (1995). Recognizing, understanding, and responding: A program model of library instruction services for international students. *The Reference Librarian* (51), 309–325.

Mood, T. A. (1982). Foreign students and the academic library. *Rq*, *22*(2), 175–180.
Muene, I. I. (2014). Outsiders within: Isolation of international faculty in an American university. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, *19*(4), 450–467.
Muroi, L., White, P., & San Diego State University (1990). *Library research guide for international students* (2nd ed.). (ED286524).
Natowitz, A. (1995). International students in U.S. academic libraries: Recent concerns and trends. *Research Strategies*, *13*(1), 4–16.
Okiy, R. B. (2010). Globalization and ICT in academic libraries in Nigeria: The way forward. *Library Philosophy & Practice*, *12*, 1–10.
Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Jiao, Q. G., & Daley, C. E. (1997). *The experience of Non-Native English-Speaking Students in Academic Libraries in the United States*. Paper presented at the *Annual conference of the mid-south educational research association*, 26th, Memphis, TN, November 12–14, 1997.
Ormondroyd, J. (1989). The international student and course-integrated instruction: The librarian's perspective. *Research Strategies*, *7*(4), 148–158.
Osborne, N. S., & Poon, C. (1995). Serving diverse library populations through the specialized instructional services concept. *The Reference Librarian* (51), 285–294.
Paulus, A. R. (2013). North American Coordinating Council on Japanese Library Resources. *Interlending & Document Supply*, *41*(2), 36–42.
Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the discourses of colonialism (the politics of language)*. London: Routledge.
Puente, M. A., Gray, L., & Agnew, S. (2009). The expanding library wall: Outreach to the University of Tennessee's multicultural/international student population. *Reference Services Review*, *37*(1), 30–43.
Rader, H. B. (2002). Information literacy 1973–2002: A selected literature review. *Library Trends*, *51*(2), 242–259.
Riggs, D. E. (1997). What's in store for academic libraries? Leadership and management issues. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *23*(1), 3–8.
Rosenzweig, J. W., & Meade, Q. H. (2017). Checking out the library: Partnering for outreach to short-term international students. *Journal of Library Administration*, *57*(4), 375–388.
Ruleman, A. B., & Riley, C. (2017). Serving the textbook needs of international students through course reserves. *Journal of Access Services*, *14*(2), 46–52.
Sarkodie-Mensah, K. (1992). Dealing with international students in a multicultural era. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *18*(4), 214–216.
Schomberg, J., & Bergman, B. (2012). International students' use of a library's media collection. *Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services*, *36*(3/4), 121–126.
Sheu, F., & Panchyshyn, R. S. (2017). Social introduction to library services for international students. *Library Review*, *66*(3), 127–143.
Smiraglia, R. P., & Leazer, G. H. (1999). Derivative bibliographic relationships: The work relationship in a global bibliographic database. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, *50*(6), 493–504.
So, S. (1994). International Students and American Academic Libraries: An Empowering Relation. (ED ED369403).
Somerville, M. M., Cooper, L., Torhell, C., & Hashert, C. (2015). At home in the world. *IFLA Journal*, *41*(4), 326–335.
Song, Y., & Lee, J. (2012). Mobile device ownership among international business students: A road to the ubiquitous library. *Reference Services Review*, *40*(4), 574–588.

Steele, C. (1993). Millennial libraries: Management changes in an electronic environment. *Electronic Library*, *11*(6), 393–402.

Stockemer, D., & Wigginton, M. J. (2019). Publishing in English or another language: An inclusive study of scholar's language publication preferences in the natural, social and interdisciplinary sciences. *Scientometrics*, *118*, 645–652.

Taler, I. (2018). Globalization of area studies: An analysis of collection development resources. *Collection Building*, *37*(3), 97–110.

Tsai, B. (1988). Special bibliographic instruction for international students: A survey of academic libraries in medium sized state universities. Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations.

Ury, C. J., & Baudino, F. (Eds.). (2005). *Brick and Click Libraries: Proceedings of an Academic Library Symposium*, Northwest Missouri State University, Maryville, Missouri, October 14, 2005.

Uwhekadom, E. E., & Olawolu, O. E. (2013). Globalization, information technology and higher education in Nigeria: The roles of library professionals. *African Higher Education Review*, *7*(1), 79–87.

Vogus, B. (2019). Open Educational Resources (OER) and textbooks: Opportunities for academic libraries. *Public Services Quarterly*, *15*(3), 242–247.

Wei, W. (1998). Outreach to international students and scholars using the World Wide Web. *Sci-Tech News*, *52*(2), 11–14.

Welch, J. E., & Lam, R. E. (1991). The library and the pluralistic campus in the year 2000: Implications for administrators. *Library Administration & Management*, *5*(4), 212–216.

Whitehurst, A. P. (2010). Information literacy and global readiness: Library involvement can make a world of difference. *Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarian*, *29*(3), 207–232.

Wibbeke, E. S., & McArthur, S. (2014). *Global business leadership* (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.

Yusuke, I., & Bartlett, J. C. (2014). Are librarians equipped to teach international students? A survey of current practices and recommendations for training. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *40*(3/4), 313–321.

Zimerman, M. (2012). Plagiarism and international students in academic libraries. *New Library World*, *113*(5/6), 290–299.

6 Conclusion

It is hoped that this book's descriptions of academic library internationalization are helpful. Upon research and reflection, the contention is that keeping the identities of the colleges and personnel anonymous takes little away from their descriptions: the internal/external dynamic was evident no matter which nation, and many of the same challenges were faced. Granted, the literature showed that the nation where a college operates can have an impact: if it is wealthy, then chances are there will be more opportunities to internationalize, or possibly fewer challenges. However, like so many aspects of academic library internationalization, the same can be stated about academic librarianship in general. Many of the same perceptions about academic library internationalization transcended nations, along with personnel descriptions of stakeholder usage.

The book concludes with final observations within the conceptual framework used to describe the libraries in the study. Last thoughts about why academic libraries should internationalize are included, along with why they should not especially as relates to intention on both the library's and college's parts. An argument is made that no matter the reason behind the internationalization of a library, the process of doing so should be intentional. Where academic library internationalization happens on a campus provides additional consideration about departmental boundaries. It also stresses the importance of effective leadership and collaboration; the notion of trust reemerges. Trust is also part of understanding who the stakeholders are, especially the importance of avoiding stereotypes is restressed. Finally, how to accommodate stakeholders is summarized, along with last thoughts concerning immersion, not only in terms of moderation in relation to stakeholders but also perceptions among stakeholders, especially library personnel themselves. Within each of these sections are suggestions for future research.

Why?

Why should academic libraries internationalize? Before this question can be readdressed, other points need reestablished. This book contends that most academic libraries do internationalize to some extent. Be it intentionally or by default, the very nature of what an academic library is, and the content it

DOI: 10.4324/9781003128878-6

provides lends itself to internationalization. Unless an academic library resides in a college that insists on only regional or national outlooks, it is practically impossible to not have content by scholars outside one's nation; and the idea that a library would only collect national content despite its college's curricular needs is ludicrous. However, the types of internationalization by default that seemed to be the situation at academic libraries observed in this study were inadequate for the needs of their college internationalization.

Meaningful internationalization must be intentional. The strategies and rationales described by those such as Duderstadt (2009), Neal (2001), and Riggs (1997) offer examples of the possibilities available to libraries. This book does not necessarily subscribe to all the notions prescribed by these visionaries; libraries differ in mission, vision, culture, and obviously the colleges they serve. There is no "best practices" guide that all libraries should follow (although it is suspected that many such guides will soon emerge), but they all imply a deliberate plan of action toward internationalization. No matter what strategy a library employs, it should be well conceived and deliberate.

The importance of intentionality reestablished, the why question now becomes more specific: why should an academic library go beyond internationalization by default? Before answering this question, yet another contention needs established: not all libraries should go beyond default internationalization. Libraries studied for this book were affiliated with colleges that espoused "globalization" or "internationalization", but it seemed some of the libraries lacked adequate vision or administration to pursue it. This had less to do with capability on the parts of the administrators, and more with motivation; although very capable managers, some simply did not see justification for intentional internationalization. They believed there were other more pressing needs that required their attention. This could certainly be argued; however, what cannot be argued is that if library personnel, especially library administrators, cannot see value in internationalization, unless it is forced from on high per Downey (2013), then it is probably not a good idea. And if indeed it is forced from on high, then problems with resource allocation that Downey described can follow.

Not only did some colleges in this study not give their libraries incentive to internationalize (e.g., additional funding; acknowledgment in strategic plan objectives), they did not set much of an example themselves. Although a college may imply or even state in its mission its intent to internationalize, this study sometimes failed to observe evidence of it; In other cases, there was evidence but it was misaligned. For example, one college associated internationalization more with academics in surface artifacts, but according to interviews, their main concern seemed to be increasing revenue through international student enrollment. There is nothing wrong with the goal of increasing enrollment; again, Knight (2004) cites it as one of the major rationales for a college to internationalize. However, for meaningful, holistic internationalization to occur, that should not be the only reason and if it is, then it should at least be acknowledged to avoid the types of misperceptions, confusion, and even cynicism observed in this study with regard to intentions.

Confusion at the college level is especially problematic for libraries that struggle with overall identity. "Is this an academic or administrative department?" As explained in Chapter 3, not all libraries could be all things internationalization. Due to limitations, some need to focus on quality rather than quantity (e.g., curricular integration or event programming; attracting prospective students or information literacy facilitation). One library in this study was a one-person operation that specialized in information literacy, but felt pressured to pursue revenue generating ventures, à la Downey. How could one person conceivably internationalize the library in any respect, let alone for both academic and administrative purposes? In short, unless internationalization is well conceived at the overall college level, and library personnel understand their role in the conception and are enabled to fulfill it, then strategic, deliberate library internationalization could disappoint.

Now that reasons why not to internationalize have been established, the answer to why to do so can be better entertained. Throughout the book, benefits of internationalization to an academic library have hopefully been illustrated. Literature on matters of internationalization mostly favor it with few exceptions (e.g., Downey, 2013). One reason why is validation. This book subscribes to the notion that sectors worldwide, and the organizations that comprise them, will become more global in vision and operation, including higher education. This will not only create an opportunity for academic libraries, but an actual need for them to be internationalized (Eghe-Ohenmwen, 2015; Okiy, 2010; Uwhekadom & Olawolu, 2013). For years since the World Wide Web revolutionized higher education, academic libraries have been forced to reinvent and justify themselves: internationalization, due to its relationship with information literacy, offers great opportunities in such matters.

What other campus department is capable of facilitating and enriching internationalization as well as the library? Research for this book found few to none. The international offices were more concerned about enrollment, which is extremely important, not just in terms of the singular revenue factor, but to any holistic internationalization as advocated by this book: having international students on campus is as important to internationalization as any learning resource the library develops (Ferriss, 2016). Second language programs can be useful to campus internationalization, including advising the library's internal collection development, but lack the organizational influence potential that the library possesses due to its academic support identity – the library is well positioned to facilitate campus internationalization.

The international office personnel and second language instructors interviewed for this book had little perspective on the types of collaboration needed for holistic internationalization as described in this book, other than what it could directly do for their departments. Holistic internationalization is not a direct transaction; it relies on the type of information fluency that library resources and services can facilitate. It is hoped that this book has impressed upon readers the codependence internationalization and information literacy now share. Just as the library is in a unique position to facilitate

internationalization, no other department has the library's information literacy resources and expertise.

It is expected that this book's interpretation and application of information literacy in relation to internationalization will draw criticism (it already has by some reviewers). In fact, the very conceptualization of information literacy as described in Chapter 2 draws criticism in and of itself; some colleagues clamor for association frameworks, especially one in particular which reads more like a legal contract than an applicable framework. Additionally, not all colleges would agree that internationalization depends on information literacy, at least not in the way it is often associated with academic libraries. Ironically, such objection might relate to this book's concern about how information literacy is presented: a possible reason that colleges might not couple internationalization and information literacy is because the numerous information literacy frameworks available again seem to want to outdo one another or prescribe to everybody rather than serve the fundamental purpose that the phrase literally states – information literacy.

This author is utterly astounded that information literacy is not one of the most discussed and pursued concepts in the world today, in all sectors, given the Information Age in which everyone now operates (Lombard, 2010). One possible reason might be those often complex information literacy frameworks devised by librarians, and exclusively associated with libraries. It is this book's contention that if information literacy were described in broader, simpler terms like those of Chapter 2, then more people might invest in it, including an acknowledgment of its importance to internationalization. If it could be presented to college executives in more practical ways like Identify, Locate, Evaluate, and Use, then they too might give information literacy more consideration, and with it, a role for the library in its campus-wide facilitation.

As it is, evidence from this study found little interest in or understanding about information literacy on the parts of administrators, who certainly did not equate it or the library with internationalization. It is up to library leaders to educate and convince them if academic library internationalization is to play a pivotal role at individual colleges, and in higher education for which it is not only entitled, but much more importantly, for which it is needed.

Another why reason is social equity. This relates to information literacy: in a world where information is a commodity, not understanding how to effectively Identify, Locate, Evaluate, and Use it is no longer unfortunate, but can sometimes be the difference between life and death. Does this statement seem like dramatic hyperbole on the part of the author? Consider the Covid-19 pandemic: research showed that less fortunate groups were more susceptible to the virus due to misinformation (Krings, 2020). It is events like this pandemic that make academic library internationalization relevant beyond higher education. As the time of writing (April 22, 2021), well over two million people worldwide have died due to this virus. To write that the lack of internationalized cooperation built on information literacy to fight this virus has disappointed at national and global levels would be an insulting understatement to their memories.

It is not enough for academic libraries to support their colleges in terms of providing content in reaction to campus initiatives – they must be more proactive in their approaches to informing their colleges on matters about and related to internationalization. In collaboration with some health-care professionals, one library in this study created a LibGuide that informed about the pandemic and discredited some of the misinformation that had been circulated about it; instead of using it, college executives relied on their marketing department to keep them, and the rest of the campus community informed. Library personnel figuratively shrugged, the collective thinking being, "Oh, well…". It allowed the college's diminished and evidently ignorant perception of the library's value prevent it from using the best resources. The college evidently had concerns other than ensuring its campus, or the community it claimed to serve, were information literate about the pandemic.

It is not enough for colleges to state in their missions that they are committed to international students and global citizenry – they must demonstrate it through strong advocacy for social justice and global egalitarianism. The academic library has the potential of enabling such notions by facilitating information literacy. The college must recognize that, and the library must help them to do so. This requires visionary leadership rather than status quo management.

This pandemic presented the higher education sector an opportunity to challenge such unethical notions as the free market over humanity mindset. Such a challenge aligns with many college mission statements yet this book contends that to date higher education has not met the challenge. And no matter whether a college is one of the so-called "elites" or one of the struggling majority, it still has social responsibilities that accompany higher education. If higher education is to meet responsibilities as a sector that informs governments, but also condemns them when they fail to best serve citizens, and at a micro level the library informs its college, then there must be more holistic vision and embrace of internationalization, and proactive policy. And information literacy too – the academic library can play a key role but must be more deliberate.

The world cannot afford the importance of internationalization to be diminished in higher education, or at any college. Information literacy is a huge part of it, and the lack of both is a contributing reason why this pandemic got out of control. Similar problems are likely to arise in the future unless things change (Harari, 2018). The academic library could help people achieve internationalization and information literacy; thus far, many of the academic libraries studied for this book have not met their potential. The stakes not only lower enrollments, departmental prestige, or something actually important like academic standards – the stakes can indeed be human lives. The academic library must determine for itself whether to be a bystander or a leader in such international challenges.

It is this book's contention that all libraries, but especially academic libraries, have a responsibility to ensure information literacy among all people, no matter whether they pay tuition, or live in the same nation. It begins with enabling campus stakeholders, especially students, who as educated

individuals themselves should take the responsibility that comes along with that privilege. However, it should not end on campus: if a community is bereft of a public library, then it should fill that void and facilitate information fluency in ways that increase individual information literacy (Eghe-Ohenmwen, 2015; Okiy, 2010; Uwhekadom & Olawolu, 2013).

There are probably more reasons for academic libraries to internationalize. Future research in response to the question why would benefit from additional perspectives and methodologies. One interesting slant could be academic librarians from nations considered as "underdeveloped" analyzing the academic libraries in nations considered "developed": what do they think the so-called "developed" nations' academic libraries could do to improve their own internationalization? It is often librarians from the "developed" nations that write about what others should do to internationalize (this author included); perhaps reading more from those less represented in the literature instead of writing to them could expand perspectives.

This book contends that mission should drive library policy. However, internationalization was rarely acknowledged in library missions or even other governing artifacts in this study. Is there another driver? Many of this study's respondents indicated personal satisfaction related to their undefined internationalization roles, especially in interactions with international students; do personnel feelings or incentives matter more to a library's internationalization efforts than mission?

Some colleges claimed internationalization in mission and/or vision, but what is their actual level of commitment? Underlying that, what is their motivation? Such questions do not need to be motivated by the cynical assumption that the "real" reasons are not aligned with often idealized missions; however, research for this book indicated that there are often misunderstandings or misconceptions about what constitutes internationalization at a college, including appropriate motivations behind it in relation to that college's culture or mission. An analysis of commitment levels could answer questions like: is a college's internationalization more for domestic students (i.e., global exposure), or international students from less privileged nations (i.e., global service)? Answers to this question would be beneficial to library plans. At the colleges studied for this book, the majority of personnel interviewed associated internationalization more with international students than other stakeholders, and this was also the case in the literature; they also appreciated the global exposure for personal reasons. Consistent understanding of motivation and intention at the college level might help library personnel better internationalize at a departmental and individual level rather than rely on personal feelings.

This study did not judge who was more responsible for the lack of intentional academic library internationalization. Although one could argue that the college sets the example and decides what opportunities are available, it could also have been a matter of libraries not taking full advantage of opportunities provided. Regardless, why was it the case that there were few deliberate attempts to internationalize the academic library? Why did the colleges

limit library internationalization, or why does the library limit itself? Even poorly funded libraries can be deliberate in internationalization that is feasible within their budgets. Is there a relationship between library internationalization engagement, and the division in which it resides (e.g., student living; finance; facilities)? Descriptions from this qualitative study provided possible answers, but perhaps some factor analyses applied within individual colleges might also give insight.

Based on Chapter 2's information literacy conceptualization, one could argue that information literacy and/or internationalization are not necessarily directed by moral or ethical motivations. This book disagrees from the standpoint that higher education in general is a privilege, and the responsibility that accompanies it, including that pertaining to internationalization and information literacy, should serve the common good, especially vulnerable populations. However, an argument can certainly be made that information literacy could be pursued for negative purposes. Example: a person who wants to steal something valuable had better be information literate about the item (e.g., security, value, detectability), or the crime might be foiled. Identifying and understanding immoral pursuits of internationalization and information literacy might help prevent them.

Research into these issues might have implications beyond internationalization and information literacy and inform college leaders on how to better utilize academic libraries in general.

Where?

Just as internationalization is the antithesis of regionalism and nationalism, the process to achieve it on the part of an academic library runs along parallel lines. It cannot be just one department "internationalizing" in isolation. One of the main themes from the literature and primary research was collaboration. If library personnel do not collaborate among themselves, as well as with external stakeholders (e.g., academic support; faculty; students), then there is little chance of holistic internationalization. Although the idea of collaboration is often claimed, including in academic library job descriptions, the actual idea became controversial, even adversarial at some colleges in this study. It seemed some personnel and departments were adamant about establishing or enforcing institutional boundaries, much like national boundaries that stymie international cooperation.

It is easy to condemn territorial mindsets in higher education as petty symptoms of people clinging to power. However, at some of the schools studied, there seemed to be the feeling that people must justify the work they do or fear losing their jobs; thus, in such climates line-drawing behavior becomes understandable albeit counterproductive. Rather than condemn those who wish to stake claims, it is more useful to understand why they feel compelled to monopolize information literacy or internationalization and, as has already been established, there are those who do indeed see them as exclusive phenomena.

In addition to personal fears and ambitions, there are legitimate reasons some feel compelled to maintain their domains. Those who place internationalization within the domain of one or a select few people on campus might do so out of concern for international stakeholders. The fear of stereotypes or inadvertent conflict that can arise was a major concern of at least one library director and scholars (e.g., Lund, 2004; Swain, 2004) in this study. This particular director recounted incidents where domestic and international stakeholders misinterpreted words and actions, and tempers flared. If all college personnel are given a stake in the internationalization process, then those whose primary responsibility is for a single aspect of internationalization like international student acclimation might fear that colleagues not as culturally aware or sensitive could offend international stakeholders. This is not a fear without merit: research for this book revealed, not much, but some latent negativity toward "international students", especially those associated with certain cultures.

People in favor of departmentalized internationalization likely believe they can help avoid potential conflicts. Despite justification, departmentalized internationalization is still as oxymoronic as nationalized globalism. For a college to be truly internationalized, then all departments need to collaborate. It is unlikely that all departments or personnel will be as competent as those whose primary occupation involves internationalization; however, invested stakeholders will possibly interact with many departments on campus, and research indicates that the library will be one of them (Albarillo, 2018; Bordonaro, 2004).

There are also reasons why the library might want to centralize information literacy. Again, some personnel seemed to feel this is the last major identity or role the library has; obviously, the problem here is a premise built more on desperation than justification. However, there are objective reasons for sole proprietorship: of all college departments, the library is arguably best suited to facilitate information literacy given its personnel training and mission within the organization. Regardless, this book contends there is far greater potential for stakeholders to attain information literacy when the entire campus is involved than just one department. The library is indispensable to information literacy but should not gatekeep it. For example, faculty can gain from the library's information literacy skills prowess, but the library can draw from their diverse expertise knowledge; additionally, other academic support departments (e.g., information technology; instructional design) can contribute resources and skills through technology and pedagogical design. If stakeholders work together, then students, faculty, personnel, even administrators, if indeed invested in "data-driven" decision-making, can become more information literate. Again, this suggests a different perception of what is information literacy, one that is facilitated at an organizational level rather than solely as a student learning outcome. How information fluent a college is will improve its stakeholders' chances of attaining information literacy, and by extension internationalization (Lombard, 2016a).

Chapter 3 discussed the different divisions where libraries are assigned, along with the fact that not all personnel realize the academic/administrative dichotomy. An example of how this works in terms of internationalization: at one college observed for this book, two library personnel had considerably different interpretations about their roles in relation to international students; one saw them as customers, the other as students. The one with the customer perspective saw their role as giving international students what they wanted at any given moment (satisfying a particular transaction); whereas the one with the student perspective focused more on teaching them how to do things for themselves (instilling in them a transformational process).

Again, this book does not advocate for one approach over the other: the library can serve an important role in either model but must align with overall college perception and be consistent. One reviewer questions this contention, implying that the library can indeed be both an administrative and academic unit. This book would not argue against that; in fact, it would acknowledge that serving both purposes was currently the state of operations at libraries in this study. However, the question becomes: is that the best approach? How is that working for most libraries these days? How well positioned and valued are they in their colleges? In terms of internationalization, the libraries observed in this study were not doing too well.

This book does not suggest the library must simply accept whatever scenario in which it is placed. Quite the contrary: library administration is obligated to advocate on behalf of the library in a way that allows it to best meet the college's needs. It may be that a well-informed, visionary library leader does not agree with the current division or role the library is assigned; internationalization could be an impetus for change. Throughout the book, focus has been more on the library changing in response to specific internationalization demands; perhaps internationalization itself can provide the library the inspiration it needs to change its overall mission or model. After all, internationalization, like information literacy, if sincerely and effectively facilitated, is a transformational rather than transactional process.

Reassessment of the library's place in the college could provide leadership opportunities for library personnel other than administrators. Perhaps some personnel think the mission or model needs adjusted; those working in the trenches at service points recognize this in ways administrators cannot see from the back office. Rather than disengage, such personnel could advocate for change by demonstrating the importance of internationalization along with why and/or how its mission prevents it. Seminal leadership experts like Warren Bennis (2009), James MacGregor Burns (1978), and Liz Wiseman and Greg McKeown (2015) inform that true leaders are not determined by organizational appointment or title alone: they can be found anywhere in the organization; therefore, regular library personnel with vision and social capital can and should also advocate for change and internationalization. If such an outlet for leadership to emerge does not exist in a given library, then that library is unlikely to be effective with any mission it states, especially one that promotes internationalization.

Future research in this area should further consider leadership and where it occurs in the internationalization process. Does the library director drive it through such things as mission and policy, or does internationalization evolve more from those involved in its actual delivery (e.g., librarians; student workers)? Another possibility relates more to administrative hierarchy: which better facilitates internationalization, hierarchical or lateral models?

Although colleges greatly differ in terms of leadership, organizational structure, and culture, thus rendering quantitative approaches to research on this subject challenging, there still might be value in doing survey research across different sectors. Examples: academic libraries and government libraries; academic libraries and public libraries (some insightful articles have been written about internationalization and public libraries). This book used a case study approach to analyze and describe individual academic libraries, but some general inferences within and between sectors might provide interesting, if not theoretically reliable correlations.

Who?

This book acknowledges the value of multicultural training for library personnel, not only for better understanding the cultures and histories of the nations from where stakeholders arrive, but also for supporting better resources, particularly collection development. However, it does not condone generalizing about nationalities; individuals differ, especially in widely diverse nations (e.g., Brazil, India). Ultimately, each individual will have their own library preferences for and perceptions about the library, and understanding this is key to effective academic librarianship, no matter what context. However, in terms of internationalization, the stakes increase because as a host nation library, personnel can have a major impact on what an international stakeholder thinks about the entire nation, not just the library.

Based upon student work and questions analyzed for this study, the transactional/transformational dichotomy described in Chapter 4 is more useful than assumptions based on nationality. Although it might be tempting to associate certain cultural dynamics with transactional or transformational behaviors, this book finds that the transactional/transformational mindset transcends nations; transactional stakeholders can be found in any country, as can transformational ones.

Perhaps a compromise can be found. For example, instead of learning about a certain culture with the intention of putting that learning to work when interacting with stakeholders (e.g., Nigerian librarian learning about Confucianism in an attempt to better anticipate Chinese student behavior), library personnel can ask the stakeholders themselves about their cultures. In the process, personnel would likely learn interesting things about the stakeholders that might be similar to others from that culture that would be helpful for internationalization. So rather than proving how enlightened and educated they are about a particular stakeholder's culture (like the author of this book has done on occasion), ask the stakeholder about their culture.

Having previous training and education about it will create the context needed to process the responses. Granted, it is less likely that transactional stakeholders would have as much interest in such a relationship, but both they and transformational ones might welcome the opportunity to be seen as an educator instead of always being seen as someone who needs educating.

There is much that has been written that relates to internationalization stakeholders. However, the transactional/transformational dynamic offers new possibilities. For example, what aspects of library internationalization appeal more to transactional stakeholders, administrative or academic models? Same question for transformational stakeholders. Another question that could be useful to investigate is: who are often more transactional, domestic or international stakeholders (and again the same question can be posed concerning transformational ones)? Additionally, these questions could be specified to the different groups that make up the primary stakeholders described in Chapter 4: students, faculty, administrators, and community members. Would answers to questions regarding transaction and transformation differ among groups?

Stakeholder perception of the library was a significant subtheme of internationalization related literature, specifically those of international students. One reviewer for this book suggested that a study on worldwide perceptions of librarianship as a profession might be useful in terms of understanding stakeholders – the author agrees. Possible research questions could include: How do librarians stack up against other professions, worldwide or in a given nation? How are librarians perceived within the higher education sector among the different internationalization groups? Answers to these questions could shed light on library usage patterns, collaboration activity, and executive patronage.

The author finds the Geert Hofstede cultural dimensions (2001, 2010 with Hofstede and Minkov) interesting in relation to academic library internationalization. Although the book was reluctant to apply them in terms of understanding stakeholders, they provided added insight into better understanding transactional and transformational behaviors. Perhaps a factor analysis that would study relationships between these dimensions and the transactional/transformational spectrum could be undertaken. This author would still not recommend drawing conclusions about individual stakeholders, but maybe some general inferences could provide additional insight.

How?

One of the underlying subthemes of how to accommodate stakeholders was immersion. How much should they be accommodated for purposes of internationalization? The literature was mostly concerned about international students: some think it is important to understand their cultures to best accommodate them; another perspective, ironically from some of the same people who think they should be accommodated, argue that if they are

distinguished by culture or nationality, then risk of their being stereotyped can follow. Both concerns are valid, and whatever strategy is ultimately determined should balance these opposing concerns and be informed by campus collaborative consensus. The library should not unilaterally decide its stakeholder accommodation but be informed by all stakeholders regarding preferences and perceptions (back to understanding who).

Research for this book indicated that there was often a collaboration deficit for the library. This included library personnel among themselves as well as with external colleagues. It seemed a great part of this deficit could have been attributed to lack of trust. There must be trust among stakeholders, especially among library personnel themselves, or breakdowns like the reference desk example cited in Chapter 5 can occur (Marcus, 2003). Such trust includes intentions and capability. Trust in capability was not always a reality at some colleges in this study based on the lack of interdepartmental collaboration (e.g., international office personnel rarely associated internationalization with the library). Trust is also a factor in community outreach; community members must trust that academic library personnel have ability, resources, and good intentions.

In reviewing the literature, and interviewing college personnel, the fear concerning international stakeholder disadvantages more likely stemmed from the motivation to help them succeed. Educators simply wanted to eliminate obstacles to their information literacy – the concern was academic success. Whereas those who argued that international stakeholders are as competent as or superior to domestic peers, although making sound arguments in many cases, were motivated by the fear that they might be stereotyped by librarians as inadequate – they wanted to avoid a social problem. It is okay to disagree over the priorities or policy development in response, but the intentions of most colleagues on these matters should not be disparaged.

The idea of trust not only applies to academic library internationalization, but scholarship about it. There seemed to be a lack of trust among scholars regarding intention: rather than give those who try to identify stakeholders with particular cultures the benefit of the doubt (e.g., personnel distinguishes stakeholder culture to show interest), they sometimes assumed the worst. In fact, mistrust that seems to underlie internationalization intentions at times may have been a factor in the mediocre levels of participation for this study. Again, disagreement is not undesirable; if everyone strives for consensus just for the sake of avoiding conflict, then innovation-killing group think can emerge. However, before assuming bad intentions, all stakeholders, including library personnel, should have faith in one another's intentions, and try to understand different perspectives rather than diminish or cancel them. Understanding different perspectives is arguably a cornerstone of internationalization, information literacy, or any higher education endeavor.

Trust is crucial to internationalization, and like many of the other themes in this book, trust and internationalization depend on one another. Internationalization can create trust among different cultures (e.g., increased information literacy about different cultures leads to better understanding

and trust); trust will increase internationalization (the more trust, the better chance for collaboration, and ultimately better understanding). The academic library can play a pivotal role in building trust and consensus in and about its internationalization; however, library personnel themselves must prove capable of trust.

There seems to be a growing trend for libraries to omit personnel contact information on their websites. In the process of doing research for this book, before my invitations to participate could be dismissed, it was surprisingly difficult to even contact some library colleagues. This lack of accessibility is likely intended to prevent spammers and solicitors; regardless, potential stakeholders are denied access. In terms of internationalization, this presents problems; while it is a nuisance for simple transactions, for individuals invested in relationships it could be a warning sign (i.e., personnel in that department do not want to invest in them). Therefore, in the interests of accessibility and internationalization, libraries should make available contact information; otherwise, stakeholders might not use any of the resources or services the library offers. Some individuals need to have a personal connection with library personnel before they can trust in them (Lombard, 2016b).

Future research on how to accommodate stakeholders in terms of internationalization might investigate this matter of trust. An analysis of the main factors that prevent or inspire it in an academic library internationalization context could lead to useful realizations that can improve accommodation for both domestic and international stakeholders, as well as library personnel among themselves.

Many of the same challenges that confront academic librarianship in general may also confront internationalization (e.g., lack of funding; diminished perception). However, the good news is that many of the same governing principles that facilitate sound librarianship apply to internationalization, including mission and organizational alignment, and understanding and accommodating stakeholders. Internationalization also offers new perspectives in which to consider traditional challenges that face academic libraries, along with opportunities to revitalize and revalidate them.

Most of what is in the literature regarding internationalization is positive but limited in scope. That which is holistic is often visionary, yet not practiced. Academic library internationalization should be deliberate and holistic rather than rely on default approaches to singular, finite, or traditional issues. A logical place to begin is with the library's governing artifacts: being explicit about internationalization in the mission statement and developing specific objectives within the strategic plan can serve to remind and inspire library personnel about the importance of internationalization and assure external stakeholders of the library's commitment to it.

In addition to being more deliberate, the library must clearly communicate its intentions and purposes. One might not think that academic librarianship would be a sensitive topic; however, internationalization in any context, depending on how it is viewed, can incite strong feelings. Some nations around the world are divided over aspects of internationalization: for

example, there are nationalists who want to close borders and impose tariffs; not all of these people are xenophobes, they simply see such actions as protecting their cultures and economies. Others want free trade and open borders: it is not that they are unpatriotic but believe that to globally compete requires nations not to be secluded. These differing mindsets can also manifest themselves within higher education: see immersion in Chapter 5. In making its intentions clear, the library can also inform or remind potential stakeholders aware of what it offers, per Chapter 5's marketing concerns.

Regardless how one feels about it, as one library director noted, internationalization is now a factor in all facets of life. No matter how badly certain groups or leaders may want to localize, the ever-arising global opportunities and challenges will require new perspectives and solutions that can only be generated from internationalized processes; internationalization is necessary for people and society to not only evolve, but survive (Harari, 2018). The academic library can either choose its role in this internationalized reality or wait for one to be chosen for it. One of the possibilities of allowing the choice to be made for it could be no role at all, which was already the case for some libraries in this study.

This book described academic library internationalization at what would be considered typical situations for most colleges. It now concludes with a forecast of two possible futures for them: one without intentional internationalization, the other with intentional efforts toward it. Although the second option holds no guarantees of success for the academic library, the first might ensure its doom. As has hopefully been impressed throughout this book, such a demise would not only be unfortunate for the academic library itself, but tragic for stakeholders who in this Information Age more than ever need the resources and services academic libraries provide.

References

Albarillo, F. (2018). Super-diversity and foreign-born students in academic libraries: A survey study. *Portal: Libraries & the Academy*, *18*(1), 59–91.

Bennis, W. (2009). *On becoming a leader*. New York: Basic Books.

Bordonaro, K. (2004). The use of an American college library by ESL students: an exploratory study in the utilization of resources and language learning (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from WorldCat Dissertations. (OCLC: 57439794)

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Downey, K. (2013). Why did we buy that? New customers and changing directions in collection development. *Collection Management*, *38*(2), 90–103.

Duderstadt, J. J. (2009). Possible futures for the research library in the 21st century. *Journal of Library Administration*, *49*(3), 217–225.

Eghe-Ohenmwen, A. (2015). Best practices for repositioning, towards global competitiveness in academic libraries of privately-owned universities (ALPUS) in Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *6*(13), 50–52.

Ferriss, J. (2016). Integrating international students through the library experience. *Christian Librarian*, *59*(1), 7–9.

Harari, Y. N. (2018). *21 lessons for the 21st century*. New York: Spiegel & Grau.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind. Revised and expanded* (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *8*, 5–31.

Krings, M. (2020). Study shows vulnerable populations with less education more likely to believe, share misinformation. https://news.ku.edu/2020/04/28/study-shows-vulnerable-populations-less-education-more-likely-believe-share (accessed on April 4, 2021).

Lombard, E. (2010). *Pursuing information literacy: Roles and relationships*. Oxford: Chandos.

Lombard, E. (2016a). Information fluency: Not information literacy 2.0. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *42*(3), 281–283.

Lombard, E. (2016b). Translating information literacy: Online library support for ESL students. *Journal of Library & Information Services in Distance Learning*, *10*(3/4), 312–319.

Lund, J. R. (2004). Plagiarism: A cultural perspective. *Journal of Religious & Theological Information*, *6*(3/4), 93–101.

Marcus, S. (2003). Multilingualism at the reference desk. *College & Research Libraries News*, *64*(5), 322.

Neal, J. G. (2001). The entrepreneurial imperative advancing from incremental to radical change in the academic library. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, *1*(1), 1–13.

Okiy, R. B. (2010). Globalization and ICT in academic libraries in Nigeria: The way forward. *Library Philosophy & Practice*, *12*, 1–10.

Riggs, D. E. (1997). What's in store for academic libraries? Leadership and management issues. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *23*(1), 3–8.

Swain, H. (2004). I could not have put it better – So I won't. *Times Higher Education Supplement*, *1646*, 62.

Uwhekadom, E. E., & Olawolu, O. E. (2013). Globalization, information technology and higher education in Nigeria: The roles of library professionals. *African Higher Education Review*, *7*(1), 79–87.

Wiseman, L., & McKeown, G. (2015). *Multipliers: How the best leaders make everyone smarter*. New York: Harper-Collins.

Appendices

Appendix A: systematic literature review description

Three databases were searched: LISA (Library and Information Science Abstracts), ERIC (Education Resources Information Center), and WorldCat. LISA offers comprehensive, scholarly sources in librarianship; ERIC is a premiere education database; WorldCat is the world's largest bibliographic database. No date range was set (some articles cited from the 1960s). Although much has changed in terms of academic libraries over the years, especially as pertains to internationalization, there were still sources that, despite their dates, provided useful insight within the general themes they helped form; additionally, they illuminated the evolution of internationalization within academic libraries.

In addition to supplementary keyword searches, controlled vocabulary was utilized. A database's controlled vocabulary is superior to keyword searching in terms of the relevance and comprehensiveness of results. However, each database had to be searched separately since they did not always share the same controlled vocabulary terms.

To find information about academic library internationalization as a concept, the following search strings were used: in LISA, DE "LIBRARIES & globalization"; ERIC, DE "Global Approach" AND DE "Academic Libraries"; WorldCat, su:Academic libraries AND su:Globalization. These searches resulted in 80 unique sources, 27 relevant to this study.

There were other relevant sources about more singular aspects of academic library internationalization. Although they did not consider internationalization as an overall process or phenomenon within the academic library, they were still important to understand in order to describe it. One concept in particular was international students; very rarely is this stakeholder group not a part of any discussion on academic library internationalization, and is often sole focus. The following search strings were used to find items on academic libraries and international students: in LISA and ERIC, DE "FOREIGN STUDENTS" AND DE "ACADEMIC LIBRARIES"; WorldCat, su:Students, Foreign AND su:Academic libraries. The searches resulted in 656 unique sources, 106 relevant to this study.

Just as international students are important to this study, so are international faculty. The following search strings were used to find items on academic libraries and international faculty: in LISA and ERIC, DE "FOREIGN COLLEGE TEACHERS" AND DE "ACADEMIC LIBRARIES"; WorldCat, su:Teachers, Foreign AND su:Academic Libraries. The searches resulted in 141 unique sources, seven relevant to this study.

Another important topic related to this study was study abroad. The following search strings were used to find items on academic libraries and study abroad: in LISA, DE "Foreign study"; ERIC, DE "Study Abroad" AND DE "Academic Libraries"; WorldCat, su:Foreign study AND su:Academic Libraries. The searches resulted in 529 unique sources, ten relevant to this study.

Additionally, various keyword searches were conducted in attempt to gather more information about domestic students and faculty, administrators, and community members. Nothing new or relevant emerged. In addition, the idea of academic libraries operating overseas had to be searched as keyword search strings; again, nothing relevant emerged not already covered within the controlled vocabulary searches.

Appendix B: primary research methodology

This appendix describes the methodological approach employed for this study, including: research design; participants; materials/instruments; site selections; data collection; data analysis; validity and truthfulness; ethical assurance.

Research design

Qualitative methodology was employed to gather deeper meaning and understanding of academic library internationalization through direct interaction and observation (Glesne, 2011; Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2002). A qualitative approach helped illuminate the setting within which internationalization occurs. Case study design was deliberately adopted because the focus of the study is on real life (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Yin, 2014). A case study approach is commonly applied in library research as it offers a "rich thick description", (Merriam, 2009, p. 8; Patton, 2002), and focuses on one academic library within a stipulated timeframe (Yin, 2014). The design of the study facilitated analysis, and identified trends within library operations (Glesne, 2011). The case study helped examine, compare, and contrast each library's data to better understand its internationalization efforts.

Participants

The participants for this study included those who work in the case study academic libraries, and their institutions' offices that cater to internationalization. Twenty-three library personnel participated, including directors,

librarians, and support staff; 11 international office personnel participated, including second language directors and instructors, international student admissions officers, and study abroad personnel; and 11 faculty from different disciplines also participated.

Each participant was provided detailed explanation of the study with informed consent prior to data collection. Participants were given the opportunity to clarify questions or concerns regarding the study, and assured of confidentiality.

Materialslinstruments

According to Creswell (2012), the researcher plays an important role in the process of collecting data in qualitative research. Additionally, Marshall and Rossman (2011) stated that researchers must acknowledge their identity, "voice, perspectives, assumptions, and sensitivities" (p. 96). For this study, the author served as primary data collection and analysis instrument, and recognized benefits and limitations of the role (Lofland, Snow, Lofland, & Anderson, 2006; Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2002). According to Hatch (2002), a qualitative researcher's data collection is a key issue: the author has worked in higher education as a librarian for over 25 years; thus, recognizes and understands the tacit knowledge of library processes and systems. That knowledge enabled the author to gain access to important research areas that might have been missed by researchers who do not work in libraries.

Seidman (2013) suggested that the main goal of interviewing is to understand the lived experiences of those being interviewed, thus, the focus should be on the participants rather than interviewers themselves; therefore, the author frequently self-reminded to listen and read carefully, and remain objective throughout the process of collecting and analyzing data, and presenting findings.

According to Crotty (1998), researchers partner with research participants to construct meaning of their experiences and perspectives; therefore, the author gathered and analyzed data and, when possible, partnered with some of the participants to create meaning of the practices for academic library internationalization. The author's role as primary data gathering instrument enabled "understanding the setting as an insider and describing it to and for others" (Patton, 2002, p. 268). The author's experiential knowledge, including technical knowledge, research background, and personal experiences (Maxwell, 2005), supported data collection.

Site selections

The academic libraries for this study were selected for ease of accessibility and entrée, and the fact that their parent universities had explicit internationalization goals. Additionally, the missions of the sites aligned with the "…teaching/learning, research, and service functions" Knight (2004) used

to describe internationalization. The continents of Asia, Australia, Europe, North America, South America, and sub-Saharan Africa, and the regions of the Near and Middle East, were all represented. Additionally, no schools that ranked above 200 in any of four popular magazines' annual "best" rankings of colleges and universities were included; no college with an endowment greater than 100 million USD was selected; and only colleges that offered at least bachelor level degrees in more than one discipline were selected.

Data collection

According to Schein (2010) culture is "a set of basic tacit assumptions about how the world is and ought to be, that a group of people share and that determines their perceptions, thoughts, feelings and to some degree their overt behavior" (p. 11). Organizational culture researchers examine observable and concrete elements of an organization such as "physical and social environment, technological output, written and spoken language, artistic production, overt behaviors, and rites" (p. 24) to understand its culture; thus, relevant personnel were selected for interviews. Since this was a case study, documents connected with the functions of the library were also examined. These included, when available, items such as mission statements, strategic plans, policy manuals, websites, and course descriptions, and also deidentified student assignment, faculty syllabi, library instruction, and research consultation data.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted (Appendix C) because they offer rich, thick data from a small sample size relevant to the topic, and unobtainable from other sources (Patton, 2002, p. 230; Merriam, 2009). The interviews were sometimes recorded and completed in person to provide data that supports the study (Riessman, 2008); other times, they had to be conducted in writing with translation by colleagues who spoke both the participant's and the author's languages. Responses to interview questions can provide unique lenses through which to view internationalization. Several researchers agree that interviews are the most "widely" adopted method for collecting qualitative data (Burns, 2003; Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009; Roulston, deMarrais, & Lewis, 2003; Silverman, 2000). Semi-structured interviews provide the opportunity to probe for in-depth responses to questions unavailable in other sources (May, 1993). Interviews are also helpful for garnering data about events that have already taken place and are not possible to redo (Merriam, 2009).

Content analysis (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005) was applied to all documents. Structured analysis enabled a probing of the data for breadth and depth, and for better support of the study's purpose (Bowen, 2009; Patton, 2002). Observation data was also collected at some of the libraries to connect meaning with interpretation. Triangulating the interview responses, content analyses, and observations enhanced the data's trustworthiness, ensuring reliability of the study's findings (Creswell, 2012).

Data analysis

Marshall and Rossman (2011) contend that "qualitative data analysis is a process of bringing order, structure, and interpretation to a mass of collected data" (p. 207). For this study, the data was hand coded. Forty-four people were interviewed, which resulted in 161 minutes of interview data recorded, along with 48 pages of text transcription. Additionally, over 500 documents and artifacts were studied.

Interviews were manually transcribed and coded in keeping with Saldaña (2012, p. 22). By hand coding, the author "spread out to see the smaller pieces of the larger puzzle (p. 23)." According to Patton (2002) the use of manual coding "highlights the thinking and mechanics involved in data processing" (p. 463). Once codes were established, they were copied into an electronic file.

Bereska (2003) posits that researchers should reflect on data for understanding and meaning. Therefore, after transcribing and reading the interview transcripts the author reflected on the data as it related to the research questions. First cycle coding was used (Rogers, 2018; Saldaña, 2012) to identify the number of internationalization narrative segments described by each library participant, and the same was done for international office participants and faculty. In keeping with Rogers, each interview transcript was coded individually then recoded after coding the next, thus comparing the most recent interviews with their predecessors. Library personnel participants mentioned 74 word segments, repeated 303 times, related to this study's topic, or described an experience congruent with the literature; international office participants mentioned 37 segments, repeated 134 times; faculty mentioned 12 segments, repeated 36 times. These segments were synthesized into codes: Glaser and Holton (2004) believed that qualitative data should speak for itself, and that codes will emerge to ensure researchers develop new concepts. During first cycle coding, anything considered a unit of social organization was coded per Saldaña (2012, p. 14).

Descriptive coding techniques were used for second cycle coding as an analytical filter to help further ensure data quality and integrity. The codes were recycled several times to focus on "salient features of the qualitative data" (Saldaña, 2012, p. 8); thus it is hoped that "essential elements of the research" (Saldaña, 2012, p. 8) were captured. Categories of descriptive meaning relevant to the research questions emerged from the interview responses. To further ensure analytical reliability, narrative research protocol was utilized (Creswell, 2012; Miles et al., 2014; Rogers, 2018; Saldaña, 2012) to maintain code accuracy within each participant's experience. The codes were then converted into categories.

Words or phrases were written in the transcript margins that identified anything related to internationalization. This process is known as "open" (Johnson & Christensen, 2008, p. 403) or "initial" coding (Saldaña, 2012, pp. 100–101). Open coding is appropriate given the richness of data and inductive nature of the study (Saldaña, 2012). According to Saldaña (2012), open coding provides researchers an "analytical lead" (p. 101) to deeply explore the

data further. In line with Saldaña, words or phrases noted in margins served as preliminary codes. Extracted quotes relevant to the codes helped develop a master coding list, and were sorted and categorized.

A conceptually clustered matrix was used to help identify themes. According to Miles et al. (2014), such a matrix displays relevant responses of key participants, allows initial comparison between responses and participants, and lets the researcher see how the data can be analyzed. It lends itself to case study, and provides preliminary standardization of content-analytic themes (pp. 174–175). This process combined with narratives helped avoid lumping together responses that convey different meanings (Miles et al., 2014).

Through repeated iterations of the codes and categories, narrative memo technique, cluster analysis, and constant connection with and reflection on the conceptual framework, three major themes emerged: content, intention, and roles.

Validity and reliability

Johnson and Christensen (2008) contended that validity or trustworthiness is used to describe the quality of research. Therefore, careful thinking is required to determine how to make a qualitative study "plausible, credible, trustworthy, and … defensible" (Johnson & Christensen, 2008 p. 264). In keeping with these standards, triangulated interviews and content analyses were cross checked for supporting or contradictory information (Creswell, 2012; Glesne, 2011; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Varjas, Nastasi, Moore, & Jayasena, 2005). Second, the conceptual framework was applied to help "interpret and explain the data" (Johnson & Christensen, 2008, p. 266). Third, when possible, member checking was used to determine credibility (Marshall & Rossman, 2011).

Ethical assurance

Gannon University IRB approval was attained to ensure the research posed no risk to participants (Roberts, 2010). The study was explained to participants to alleviate concerns, inform them of their right to discontinue, and ask them to sign an informed consent form. Permission to record the interviews was granted by those who participated, and transcripts emailed for cross checking. Finally, to protect privacy and reputations, any identifying data was deleted (Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Merriam, 2009).

References

Bereska, T. (2003). How will I know a code when I see it? *Qualitative Research Journal*, *3*(2), 60–74.

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, *9*(2), 27–40.

Brantlinger, E., Jimenez, R., Klingner, J., Pugacn, N., & Richardson, V. (2005). Qualitative studies in special education. *Council for Exceptional Children*, *71*(2), 195–207.

Burns, M. (2003). Interviewing: Embodied communication. *Feminism and Psychology*, *13*(2), 229–236.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Qualitative inquiry and research design choosing among five traditions* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Glaser, B. G., & Holton, J. (2004). Remodeling grounded theory. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *5*(2).

Glesne, C. (2011). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (4th ed.). New York: Longman.

Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Hsieh, H., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative Health Research*, *15*(9), 1277–1288.

Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2008). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *8*, 5–31.

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lofland, J., Snow, D., Lofland, L. H., & Anderson, L. (2006). *Analyzing social settings: A guide to qualitative observation and analysis*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2011) *Designing qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Riessman, C. K. (2008). *Narrative methods for the human sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Roberts, C. M. (2010). *The dissertation journey: A practical and comprehensive guide to planning, writing, and defending your dissertation*. Corwin Press.

Roulston, K., deMarrais, K., & Lewis, J. (2003). Learning to interview in the social sciences. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *9*(4), 643–668.

Rogers, R. (2018). Coding and writing analytic memos on qualitative data: A review of Johnny Saldaña's the coding manual for qualitative researchers. *The Qualitative Report*, *23*(4), 889–892.

Saldaña, J. (2012). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Seidman (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Silverman, D. (2000). *Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Varjas, K., Nastasi, B. K., Moore, R. B., & Jayasena, A. (2005). Using ethnographic methods for development of culture-specific interventions. *Journal of School Psychology*, *43*(3), 241–258.

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.

Appendix C: prompts to guide interview

Library personnel

How would you define "internationalization"?
How does your definition align with what you do in the library?
What are your thoughts regarding internationalization of the library (policy, resources, services)?
Describe your experience with internationalization in the library.
What is your role in the library's internationalization?
What are some positives of your involvement in internationalization? Negatives?
Describe support given (for and by you) for the library's internationalization.
What should be improved?
Final comments.

Faculty

How important is internationalization to your teaching, scholarship, and service?
What role does the library play in your internationalization initiatives?

Internationalization personnel

What are your thoughts regarding internationalization of the library – (resources, services…)?
Describe your experience with library internationalization.
How does the library help your internationalization efforts?
What should be improved?
Final comments.

Index