

# UC Riverside

## UC Riverside Previously Published Works

### Title

The Others: Equitable Access, International Students, and the Community College

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3z3046kd>

### Journal

Journal of Studies in International Education, 22(1)

### ISSN

1028-3153

### Authors

Viggiano, Tiffany  
Damián, Ariadna I López  
Vázquez, Evelyn Morales  
[et al.](#)

### Publication Date

2018-02-01

### DOI

10.1177/1028315317725883

Peer reviewed

# The Others: Equitable Access, International Students, and the Community College

© 2017 European Association for  
International Education  
Reprints and permissions:  
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav  
DOI: 10.1177/1028315317725883  
journals.sagepub.com/home/jsi



Tiffany Viggiano<sup>1</sup>, Ariadna I. López Damián<sup>1</sup>,  
Evelyn Morales Vázquez<sup>1</sup>, and John S. Levin<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

This qualitative investigation explains the ways in which community college decision makers justify the inclusion of international students at three community colleges in the United States. We identify and explain the ways in which decision makers rationalize institutional policy—particularly recruitment strategies and motivations—related to international students, and discuss whether these policies could be considered ethical in a globalized context. Importantly, we conclude that community college decision makers first crafted a class of privileged international students and then justified price discrimination on the basis of said privilege. This vicious circle, we call the international access paradox, prevented decision makers from recognizing or responding to the needs of low socioeconomic status (SES) international students and international students from disadvantaged countries.

## Keywords

community college, international students, internationalization of higher education, strategic institutional management of internationalization, justice

Traditionally, community colleges in the United States are nonselective, relatively inexpensive postsecondary educational institutions, with a comprehensive undergraduate curriculum, a mission of open access, and a focus on underserved local populations (Meier, 2013). However, in the contemporary globalized world, U.S. community colleges have searched for ways to move beyond their communities via internationalization (Center for International and Global Engagement [CIGE], 2012). The overall number of international students in community colleges grew 19.72% from 1999/2000

---

<sup>1</sup>University of California, Riverside, CA, USA

## Corresponding Author:

Tiffany Viggiano, University of California, Riverside, 1207 Sproul Hall, 900 University Avenue, Riverside, CA 92521, USA.

Email: Tiffany.Viggiano@email.ucr.edu

to 2013/2014 (Institute of International Education [IIE], 2014). As many as 40% of the approximately 1,000 community colleges in the United States have specific internationalization plans, including internationalizing the curriculum and the recruitment of international students (CIGE, 2012).

Practitioners and scholars note three salient reasons for international student recruitment at the community college (CC). First, exposure to international students provides benefits to domestic students (Brennan & Dellow, 2013; Manns, 2014). These benefits range from improved cognitive development (Mamiseishvili, 2012) to increased persistence rates (Brennan & Dellow, 2013). Second, CCs have begun to include or rationalize international students as a part of their open access mission: Their low tuition rate makes them the ideal institution to serve the growing middle class of developing nations (Raby & Valeau, 2007; Treat & Hagedorn, 2013). Third, and most often cited, international student enrollment is a source of revenue (Hagedorn & Zhang, 2013).

Although the rationales for recruitment of international students are not necessarily mutually exclusive, at times they may come into conflict with one another. For example, if CCs pursue only international students who can pay full price, generating revenue for the college, they do not extend access to international students from less affluent backgrounds (Adnett, 2010). Limits on access to specific groups of international students, based primarily on economic criteria, contradict the open access mission of the CC (Levin, 2001) and lessen the geographical and socioeconomic diversity among the international student population at institutions of higher education (Schofer & Meyer, 2005).

In general, decision makers have authority over the student recruitment process, and thus determine how to achieve these recruitment goals. Scholars use the term *decision makers* (Brennan & Dellow, 2013) to refer to executive leadership. We extend the term to include those institutional members who may be paramount in forming a “shared vision” (Kouzes & Posner, 2007) at their respective institutions or who have a prominent role in the governance of their institution, such as senior administrators, deans, faculty chairs, and faculty who have served on curriculum, or similar, committees. These actors within CCs influence and shape organizational change (Opp & Gosetti, 2014). Moreover, given the committee system where faculty and mid-level administrators participate in decision making on matters such as curriculum and student admissions, these decision makers likely have a significant influence on a CC’s internationalization plans and strategies (Levin, 2001).

Yet little is known about whether or not CC members ensure that the pursuit of revenue generation is not detrimental to the other two rationales—exposure and access—for international student recruitment. There is insufficient research on the ways in which these two rationales influence or shape community members’ views of the purpose of international students. For example, Treat and Hagedorn (2013) argue that the CC could extend access to less affluent international students, yet the degree to which CC decision makers embrace or act on this belief is not evident in the scholarly literature.

## Research Purpose

The purpose of this investigation is to explain the ways in which decision makers justify the recruitment, enrollment, and treatment of international students at three community colleges in the United States. We identify and explain the ways in which decision makers rationalize institutional policy—particularly recruitment strategies and motivations—related to international students, and whether these policies could be considered just in a globalized context.

## Literature Review

Although the traditional internationalization of higher education focused upon international student recruitment in the hopes of forming global alliances and furthering scholarship (Gacel-Avila, 2005), in many Western countries, the ever-accelerating pressure to compete has made international student recruitment a profit driven activity (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Marginson, 2007). Despite the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization's (UNESCO; 1998) World Declaration that higher education should be "equally accessible to all on the basis of merit" and that institutions should not discriminate on the basis of economic disparity, Western institutions of higher education commonly recruit international students in an effort to recuperate funds lost from state disinvestment (Adnett, 2010; Schofer & Meyer, 2005). Thus, primarily international students who are willing to pay full price are accepted (Altbach & Knight, 2007). Moreover, affluent countries that import these students—such as the United States, Canada, and Australia—accumulate tuition revenue and human capital at the expense of the less developed countries that export these students (Tremblay, 2005). In practice, the Global North profits from the exchange of international students to the detriment of the Global South (Jooste & Heleta, 2017). Consequently, the enrollment of these underrepresented international student groups may increase global inequality, in part, because of the high cost of international student tuition (Adnett, 2010; Schofer & Meyer, 2005).

At the campus level, scholarship often touts the benefits of the diverse perspectives that international students bring to a campus (Hagedorn & Zhang, 2013; Mamiseishvili, 2012; Opp & Gosetti, 2014; Soria & Troisi, 2014). International students' perspectives can introduce and inspire domestic students to learn about worldviews they would not have considered otherwise (Deardorff, 2006). The interaction between domestic and international students can improve cognitive ability for domestic students (Mamiseishvili, 2012) and, in a globally competitive economy, exposure to this diversity can prepare domestic students for the workforce by helping students to understand global perspectives that are different from their own (Manns, 2014; Treat & Hagedorn, 2013).

Yet, based on measures of country of origin or socioeconomic status (SES), there is not sizable diversity among international students in the West, particularly in the United States where 50% of international students come from China, India, or South Korea (IIE, 2014). International students from countries with a lower gross income

(e.g., Sub-Saharan and Caribbean countries) are significantly underrepresented in the United States (IIE, 2014). Scholars and administrators criticize institutions of higher education for educating only the young elite from foreign nations (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Schofer & Meyer, 2005). Consequently, this lack of geographical and socioeconomic diversity among international students limits the opportunity that domestic students have to gain understandings of diverse international populations.

In contrast to U.S. universities, U.S. community colleges have the potential to grant access to international students of lower SESs (Treat & Hagedorn, 2013), but, despite the CC's historical commitment to open access (Meier, 2013), state disinvestment has spurred these institutions to find new ways to subsidize their revenue streams (Levin, 2005). As CCs pursue these new revenue streams, they drift from their traditional open access mission toward a mission of economic development (Levin, 2000; 2005). Administrative perceptions on international students are influenced by students' expected economic return, and price discrimination is a clear motivator for international student recruitment in CCs (Levin, 2002). In the late 1980s and early 1990s, international student recruitment began to increase at CCs, and new assumptions spurred decision makers to shift focus away from the social mission and toward economic outcomes (Levin, 2001).

Presently, many scholars do not include international students as part of the social mission of the CC. Rather than exploring the CCs' ability to serve low SES international students, researchers (Brennan & Dellow, 2013; Hagedorn & Zhang, 2013; Opp & Gosetti, 2014; Raby & Valeau, 2007) advocate for the presence of international students at the CC as a way to improve outcomes for low SES domestic students. Thus, the bulk of scholarship related to international education at U.S. community colleges assumes that international students are tools for domestic benefit rather than for global equity. The literature does not address the ways in which the economic focus on international students influences access of, and institutional policy related to, international students. Furthermore, it neglects to note the degree to which these policies may advantage or disadvantage specific student populations. Finally, while scholarly literature documents the presence of a pronounced focus on the economic benefit of international students, it overlooks, in part, the ways in which institutional members rationalize this economic focus.

## **Theoretical Orientation**

This investigation is guided by both a criticalist perspective (Martinez-Aleman, Pusser, & Bensimon, 2015) and Rawls (1999) justice theory. Criticalist perspectives assume that power relations play an implicit role in the formation of social reality (Martinez-Aleman et al., 2015). Scholarly understandings of the ways in which educational systems perpetuate inequality can lead to explanations of societal inequalities and attendant values (Atwater, 1996). Moreover, an explanation of the ways in which powerful members of the institution construct knowledge can also point the ways in which social inequalities are reproduced in that particular setting (Atwater, 1996). Thus, this investigation analyzes the perceptions of decision makers to explain the ways in which economic inequalities for international students are justified and reproduced at the institutional level.

In the present stage of globalization, the world can be conceived as a “single place” in which national borders are blurred (Robertson, 1992). Thus, we apply Rawls’s (1999) theory of justice globally. Two principles underpin this theory. First, the liberty principle states that individuals have the right to freedoms and protection from undue harm (Rawls, 1999). Rawls’s second principle can be split into two subprinciples: the fair and equal opportunity principle (FEOP) and the difference principle. FEOP states that given equal talent, opportunity, motivation, and ability, anyone—regardless of their background, culture, or class in society—can obtain any career. The means of ensuring FEOP is equal access to education (Nussbaum, 2006). The difference principle postulates that there can be unequal groups in society—typically used in reference to economic disparity—as long as these inequalities do not disadvantage the least advantaged. Rawls’ overarching argument is that should a rational person not know which social and economic position they will be born into, they would accept these principles because they would not want to be placed in a group that is not afforded their rights of advantage.

## Research Questions

This investigation answers the following three questions:

**Research Question 1:** How do community college decision makers understand the purpose of international students?

**Research Question 2:** What are community college decision makers’ motivations for the recruitment of international students?

**Research Question 3:** How do community college decision makers apply the open access mission in relation to international students?

## Method

We utilized a qualitative approach (Mason, 2002) and an interpretative perspective (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). This twofold approach allowed us to understand the perspectives of professional members in-depth and explore a socially constructed reality in which the perceptions of others influence the physical world (Atwater, 1996). To explain these perceptions, we used semistructured interviews (Reybold, 2003). Based on scholarly tradition and our ontological perspective, we suggest that interviews with professional members provide insight into the workings of an institution of higher education (Levin, 2005; Mason, 2002). The qualitative analysis of semistructured interviews allowed us to explain the ways in which decision makers understood their institution’s practices related to international students.

## Data Sources

This project was part of a larger investigation that sought to explain the structural changes related to neoliberal policies that occurred in seven CCs in the United States and Canada (during the first two decades of the 2000s). All of the colleges in this

sample were selected because of their interest in internationalization at the turn of the century (Levin, 2001). For the present investigation, we used purposeful and criterion sampling strategies (Patton, 2005) to narrow data to those that “fit” our questions for this investigation (Howe & Eisenhart, 1990). We selected three U.S. colleges within different states and referred to them by their pseudonyms, Suburban Valley Community College (SVCC), Pacific Suburban Community College (PSCC), and City South Community College (CSCC)—located in California, Hawai’i, and Washington, respectively. Each expressly articulated goals related to globalization and/or diversity in their mission statements: PSCC included the preparation of international students “for productive futures” in its mission statement, SVCC noted “global justice” as a core competency, and CSCC focused only on diversity with no specific reference to the global community.

We selected the interviews of institutional members who we considered decision makers, that is, individuals who have some official influence on institutional policy. This included chancellors, presidents, finance and student affairs administrators, deans, faculty chairs, faculty leaders (both present and former), and major committee members (e.g., curriculum). The data set for this investigation included interviews of 26 individuals at the three colleges. The questions included inquiries regarding the interviewees’ backgrounds, their roles in the institution, and the major changes in the institution since the 2000s. The robust number and length of the interviews (60-90 min) enabled deep and comprehensive analysis (Becker, 1996).

### *Analytical Methods*

Guided by the research questions and the intention of identifying the shared cultural understandings in individual communications (Cameron, 2001), a group of three researchers—two Mexican international students and one domestic student—performed content analysis of data (Lichtman, 2013). We followed a coding and categorizing strategy divided in the three steps described by Richards (2009): descriptive coding, topical coding, and analytical coding.

First, we carried out descriptive coding to identify the attributes of the speaker (i.e., gender, age, institutional position, discipline, and college) in each interview. Subsequently, we used topical coding to classify data according to its subject (Richards, 2009). During topical coding, we extracted three substantive categories (Maxwell, 2005), driven by the findings of previous scholarship (i.e., revenue generation, open access, and academic benefits for domestic students), one category open to “unexpected data” (Bogdan & Bicklen, 2011) and one category in which we included sociodemographic descriptors used by interviewees to refer to international and/or domestic students (students’ characteristics). Topical coding enabled us to reduce data in accordance with the research questions and to organize data for subsequent analysis. In this phase of coding, the validity check category (Maxwell, 2005) “other” was disregarded: our data did not fit this category.

In our final phase of coding, we performed analytical coding (Richards, 2009) for interpretation of and reflection on data to capture and extract latent meaning

(Graneheim & Lundman, 2004). As tool for this analysis, we applied Van Leeuwen and Wodak's (1999) "macro-strategies" as categories for coding. These strategies included the following actions: construction, perpetuation and justification, transformation, and reconstruction. We used the constructive category to identify whether international students were seen by decision makers as members of the institution or not. The perpetuation and justification category enabled us to explore the ways in which decision makers justified the position international students had in their college. The transformation category referenced the ways in which decision makers used analogy to describe other international students. Last, the destructive category refers to the ways in which individuals discussed international students in contrast to the dominant discourse on international students (Van Leeuwen & Wodak, 1999). We compared this analysis with the two primary principles of Rawls (1999) theory of justice—Liberty Principle and FEOP—to determine whether and/or to what degree decision makers were in violation of these principals. These four strategies enabled us to explore whether CC decision makers were willing to reproduce or modify their college's current perceptions of international students.

## Findings

Data analysis resulted in three main findings that answered our research questions and included shared characteristics among the three CCs. First, open access was defined in distinct ways at each institution. These differences were rooted in decision makers' perceptions of their college's target population. Second, international students were considered primarily as economic drivers and therefore not often considered to be a part of the CCs' target population. Finally, while decision makers considered international students to contribute to the achievement of the open access mission for domestic students, the mission was not applied the international students themselves.

### *The Open Access Mission and Community Colleges' Target Populations*

A central theme among decision makers at the CCs within our sample was the intent to increase access to domestic students as a part of the open access mission. International students were not included in the CCs' commitment to open access. Rather, these CCs developed strategies to guarantee open access to students considered underrepresented by increasing the enrollment of targeted populations.

Each CC had a specific target population, which was determined by the sociodemographic characteristics of the population in the state and in the cities surrounding that particular college. These targeted populations corresponded as well to the priorities set by state policy in Hawai'i, Washington, and California (Levin, 2017). Race, ethnicity, and SES were the categories that decision makers used to describe the population they attempted to attract. At PSCC, in Hawai'i, the target population was Native Hawaiian and efforts were directed to increase the number of these students. "We had students doing it; we had outreach people doing it; we had the campus heads out there saying this is it. We had all our information saying, 'Hey! We want to be a model indigenous-serving



institution” (Vice President, PSCC). Thus, serving indigenous students was a part of the core goal of PSCC.

For SVCC, located in Northern California, underrepresented minority students were the focus of access-increasing strategies. “[T]he strategic plan identified by name, which was reasonably rare . . . the Latino, African American, and Filipino communities. It said, ‘[T]hese are the communities we’re going to go out and recruit’” (President, SVCC). Finally, at CSCC in Washington, recruitment efforts were directed not only at underrepresented minorities but also at nontraditional students. “[T]he amount of students coming out of high school is not our niche market” (Senior administrator, CSCC). “[There is] a Dream Act allowing Hispanic students to get state tuition . . . Those students are in our service area” (Administrator, CSCC).

The target populations at the three colleges, regardless of whether they were identified by their race, ethnicity, or SES, were perceived as underserved, disadvantaged, and marginalized populations (Levin, Viggiano, López Damián, Morales Vázquez, Wolf, 2017). CCs’ strategies endeavored to serve students with limited “cultural capacity or cultural competence” (President, SVCC) and limited academic skills, as well as those who had not been served “all that well” (Vice President, PSCC).

The description given at the SVCC illustrates the characterization of these populations at the three colleges. “[Recruitment strategies are developed to] engage the communities currently marginalized, not just from the school, but from higher ed . . . We’re looking for people whose families have struggled” (College President, SVCC). Decision makers at all three colleges perceived the mission of their CC to be related to serving the disadvantaged in society. Those who were defined as disadvantaged differed by college, but none of these definitions included international students.

Institutional members at all three colleges assumed that international students did not arrive at their college with academic or economic disadvantages. The assumption was that all international students were either middle class or higher, and likely received a scholarship from their home country. “[Their] government is heavily subsidizing [their] education” (President, PSCC). This assumption is arguably a result of the decision maker’s perceptions of international students as economic engines of the institution. Decision makers also considered international students to be well fitted for their college’s academic requirements. “[W]e had a lot of very bright, very skillful students who had good writing skills, good English skills—they’d learned all that in Iran I guess—and then they came over here to get their college or university degree” (Former Committee Member, CSCC).

Furthermore, international students’ academic abilities were associated with advantages to the colleges’ students. For example, in California, international students brought a “reputation of academic excellence” (President, SVCC) to the college, and in Hawaii, they served as “language tutors” (Vice Chancellor, PSCC) for domestic students. Institutional members’ characterizations of international students positioned them apart from underrepresented populations and, thus, not as a target population for whom the college should extend open access. Strategies of open access at these CCs were directed toward disadvantaged populations; nevertheless, the definitions of disadvantaged were limited by geographical privilege. That is, these colleges focused on

serving disadvantaged populations in the surrounding community and not across borders. Yet international students were targeted for another reason: economic revenue.

### *International Students: The Community College's Economic Engine*

Our data suggest that at the three colleges, decision makers were interested in international students not because of the open access mission, but because international students brought much-needed financial resources: International students were seen as revenue generators.

Obviously we like the international students because A, they bring a bunch of diversity, you know, to us. B, we think our students can learn from them and also develop partnerships and relationships with institutions where those students are coming from. But you know, honestly, from my perspective, it's also because they pay rack rate. (Vice Chancellor, Administrative Services, PSCC)

Although decision makers were attracted to the benefits of multicultural diversity on campus, they made the economic benefits that international students provided to their respective colleges a priority. The recruitment of international students became an institutional strategy to resolve the economic problems that CCs faced due to state and federal budget cuts to and disinvestment in higher education. "There's been no new money at the state for years now . . . you've got international students" (Senior Administrator, CSCC).

Although international students were used as a resource to hold off the effects of the fiscal crises at all three institutions, at CSCC, international students' enrollment was also considered a strategy to prevent state disinvestment associated with low enrollment.

[Every college in the district is] down, so now we have to go to plan B. Plan B is to buy international FTEs and make them state FTEs. Yes, [we pay for the international students] . . . [I]n ensuring that we don't lose money from the state in the future. (Administrator, CSCC)

Because CSCC struggled to maintain enrollment, decision makers feared that the state would reduce the number of full-time student equivalencies (FTEs), and thus funding, that the institution received. If the state decreased these FTEs, then the institution would qualify for less state funding. International students were therefore used as fiscal placeholders so that the state did not revoke CSCC's right to future FTEs. The international students paid the institution, and the institution used this money to pay the state for the FTEs.

Whether the institution practiced price discrimination or used international students as fiscal placeholders, decision makers' views of international students as economic engines represent a clear divide between the meaning of an international student and the meaning of a domestic student at these three colleges. Decision makers were then

able to justify this economic “othering” by arguing that revenue from international students was what allowed the institution to function. “[International students] bring in 40, 42, 45 percent of the tuition dollars. And, so, without that this campus won’t be able to do some of things we want to do” (Chancellor, PSCC). Thus, decision makers asserted that international students were charged more to subsidize the needs of the entire college. A few decision makers justified price discrimination further with less logic. A former member of the academic senate argued that higher tuition created more motivated students.

International students are more motivated, at least in part, because they are paying more to take the courses. They’re a long way away from their family so in some cases it’s a big commitment by their families and somewhat of a hardship and that’s got to be some motivation. (Former Committee Member, SVCC)

Rather than recognize financially struggling international students as a population in need of assistance, decision makers perceived international students as a source of revenue and this encouraged them to view the hardships of international students to be a motivator for academic achievement. This logic enabled decision makers to justify the recruitment of international students as a cross-subsidization strategy and legitimated price discrimination.

### *The Illusion of Open Access*

Finally, our data suggest that the idea of CCs as open access institutions was an illusion for the majority of international students. At all the three colleges, the recruitment of international students was primarily a response to economic arguments. Economically motivated recruitment strategies influenced the type of student to whom the CCs extended access.

Because international students were used for financial purposes, decision makers targeted those populations that are able to pay full tuition, which encompassed middle to high-income students from relatively developed countries. “I know [the President] is pushing very hard to get into China now that things are changing in China and there’s a middle class there” (Senior Administrator, PSCC). The targeting of these populations limited not only socioeconomic but also geographical diversity.

So, instead of individual students coming . . . from Japan, [for] the Koreans . . . colleges will send the students overseas, because the Korean government is heavily subsidizing international education. And so a number of colleges and universities are moving to add an international aspect to their operations, at least applying for and getting money from the government. (President, PSCC)

Thus, access for international students at these colleges depended primarily on the economic status and geographical location of the students. As a result, some ethnic and national groups were more prevalent than others in U.S. community colleges. At the three CCs in our investigation, the majority of international students came from Asian countries.

Of course we also have a lot of foreign students who are not immigrants . . . They're international students. We used to get a lot from Japan, but now we get a lot from China. (Former Committee Member, CSCC)

So most of it, you can see is still Japan and Korea. I think I've calculated: I think it's eighty percent . . . East Asian. (Committee Member, PSCC)

Primarily, only international students who were from wealthy families or from countries that offer funding were able to attend. Decision makers recognized that this reliance on international students encouraged volatility in international recruitment.

I think at one point it was almost 300 [Iranian students]. And the reason was that the Shah of Iran would give scholarships to students to go study in America, especially those that he thought might be troublesome . . . Well of course, as soon as the Shah was overthrown, that ended that. We had very, very few Iranians after that. (Former Committee Member, CSCC)

Thus, the reliance on foreign funding for international students jeopardized access for these international students.

## Conclusion

Decision makers constructed student groupings based on geographical location, and this action created hierarchical systems which privileged specific students, the target populations, and disadvantages others, particularly international students. In the three colleges investigated, decision makers aimed to recruit primarily affluent international students. The presence of predominantly affluent international students encouraged decision makers to perceive international students as less financially needy, and, thus, not a group to whom the open access mission should be extended. In sum, CC decision makers first crafted a class of privileged international students and then justified price discrimination on the basis of said privilege. This vicious circle, we call the international access paradox, prevented decision makers from recognizing or responding to the needs of low SES international students and international students from disadvantaged countries. Thus, it may be one reason that there is not a significant degree of international student diversity at CCs.

At these three colleges, international students were given the illusion of open access: while theoretically any qualified person could attend the institution, decision makers construct policy that targets only those who can pay full price. Although decision makers promoted access to U.S. citizens based on socioeconomic disadvantage, the same logic was not extended to international student recruitment. Thus, policy and practice created significant barriers for socioeconomically disadvantaged international students. In this way, access was restricted on the basis of geographical location, and, therefore, birthright. Rather than promoting access to those international students with the least socioeconomic privilege, these CCs promoted access predominantly to those who were born to geographical and socioeconomic privilege. Based on the concept of

the world as a single place (Robertson, 1992), this was in violation of FEOP as defined by Rawls (1999). The international access paradox may prevent decision makers from recognizing the injustices of modern international recruitment strategies. As such, this work serves as a mirror for community college decision makers to begin to recognize their role in global injustice and inequity.

When international students could afford to attend the CCs, they were used as placeholders and subsidizers for the CCs' target populations. Decision makers at these colleges viewed international students as a means to improve domestic student education, without regard to the education of the international students themselves. Thus, rather than the unsubstantiated argument that international students take seats away from domestic students (Raby & Valeau, 2007), at CSCC international students were used to save seats for future domestic students. In addition, international students in the three colleges served as business liaisons, language tutors, and sources of cultural diversity for local students. That is, their inclusion helped these colleges achieve their missions. In this way, the presence of international students actually extended access and provided academic benefits to domestic students.

However, future research on the perceptions of international students at the community college is needed to ascertain whether these benefits are undermined by the othering of international students. Glass and Westmont (2014) link sense of belonging to cross-cultural interaction. Although our data cannot speak to the perceptions of international students themselves, it is likely that this othering environment would influence the students' sense of belonging and therefore their likelihood of engaging in these ambassadorial roles. Furthermore, Glass and Westmont (2014) also link sense of belonging to the average grade earned by international students. Research on the relationship between othering and international students' sense of belonging could provide ground to discuss the ways in which this relationship impedes international student equity once they are enrolled in the college.

There are further avenues in which practitioners can develop approaches for CCs to define international students as more than economic entities. For example, practitioners at CCs could seek other sources of revenue when state sources diminish. In this way, then, international students do not have to serve as revenue generators. In addition, CCs that participate in recruitment efforts could ensure that they are also recruiting and visiting low-income countries. However, it is clear that further empirical research should construct counternarratives to serve as examples of alternate systems in which international students are not othered or seen as economic entities.

Internationalization challenges the existing understandings of community at the community college. CCs must decide the ways in which their missions fit into an increasingly globalized world. Although they have a history of serving only their local communities, the increasing number of international students on community college campuses demonstrates an expanding conception of community. As such, this investigation has argued that for community colleges to adhere to their own principles of service to the underserved, and more recent claims of championing diversity (Levin, 2017), they must embrace international students as part of the communities they serve, and accord international students the same status as local students. To accomplish this

goal community colleges should consider seeking out students who fall under the category of underserved, which would include students from developing countries and low-income students from across the globe.

### Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### References

- Adnett, N. (2010). The growth of international students and economic development: Friends or foes? *Journal of Education Policy*, *25*, 625-637.
- Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *11*(3), 290-305.
- Atwater, M. M. (1996). Social constructivism: Infusion into the multicultural science education research agenda. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, *33*, 821-837.
- Becker, H. S. (1996). The epistemology of qualitative research. In R. Jessor, A. Colby, & R. A. Shweder (Eds.), *Ethnography and human development: Context and meaning in social Inquiry* (pp. 53-71). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2011). *Research for education. An introduction to theories and methods* (5th ed.). New Delhi, India: PHI Learning.
- Brennan, M., & Dellow, D. A. (2013). International students as a resource for achieving comprehensive internationalization. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *2013*(161), 27-37.
- Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with spoken discourse*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Center for International and Global Engagement. (2012). *Mapping internationalization on U.S. campuses*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education. Retrieved from <https://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/Mapping-Internationalizationon-USCampuses-2012-full.pdf>
- Deardorff, D. K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *10*, 241-266.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 1-32). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gacel-Avila, J. (2005). The internationalisation of higher education: A paradigm for global citizenry. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *9*, 121-136.
- Glass, C. R., & Westmont, C. M. (2014). Comparative effects of belongingness on the academic success and cross-cultural interactions of domestic and international students. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *38*, 106-119.
- Graneheim, U. H., & Lundman, B. (2004). Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: Concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. *Nurse Education Today*, *24*, 105-112.

- Hagedorn, L. S., & Zhang, Y. (2013). International students in U.S. community colleges: Status, opportunities, and failure. In J. S. Levin & S. T. Kater (Eds.), *Understanding community colleges* (pp. 53-67). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Howe, K., & Eisenhart, M. (1990). Standards for qualitative (and quantitative) research: A prolegomenon. *Educational Researcher*, 19(4), 2-9.
- Institute of International Education. (2014). *Community colleges: International students*. New York, NY: Author.
- Jooste, N., & Heleta, S. (2017). Global citizenship versus globally competent graduates a critical view from the south. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 21, 39-51.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2007). Leadership is in the eye of the follower. In J. Gordon (Ed.), *The Pfeiffer book of successful leadership development tools* (Vol. 154, pp. 3-10). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Levin, J. S. (2000). The revised institution: The community college mission at the end of the 20th Century. *Community College Review*, 28(2), 1-25.
- Levin, J. S. (2001). *Globalizing the community college: Strategies for change in the twenty-first century*. New York, NY: Palgrave/St. Martin's Press.
- Levin, J. S. (2002). In education and in work: *The globalized community college*. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, XXXII(2), 47-78.
- Levin, J. S. (2005). The business culture of the community college: Students as consumers; students as commodities. In B. Pusser (Ed.), *Arenas of Entrepreneurship: Where nonprofit and for-profit institutions compete* (pp. 11-26). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Levin, J. S. (2017). *Community colleges and new universities under neoliberal pressures: Organizational change and stability*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Levin, J. S., Viggiano, T., López Damián, A. I., Morales Vázquez, E., & Wolf, J. P. (2017). Polymorphic students: New descriptions and conceptions of community college students from the perspectives of administrators and faculty. *Community College Review*, 45(2), 119-143.
- Lichtman, M. (2013). *Qualitative research in education: A user's guide* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Mamiseishvili, K. (2012). International student persistence in U.S. postsecondary institutions. *Higher Education*, 64(1), 1-17.
- Manns, D. (2014). Redefining the role, scope, and mission of community colleges in an international context. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 38, 705-709.
- Marginson, S. (2007). Global position and position taking: The case of Australia. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11, 5-32.
- Martinez-Aleman, A. M., Pusser, B., & Bensimon, E. M. (Eds.). (2015). *Critical approaches to the study of higher education: A practical introduction*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative researching*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Maxwell, J. A. (2005). Designing a qualitative study. In L. Bickman & D. J. Rog (Eds.), *Handbook of applied social research methods* (pp. 69-100). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Meier, K. (2013). Community college mission in historical perspective. In J. S. Levin & S. T. Kater (Eds.), *Understanding community colleges* (pp. 3-18). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Nussbaum, M. (2006). *Frontiers of justice: Disability, nationality, species membership*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Opp, R. D., & Gosetti, P. P. (2014). The role of key administrators in internationalizing the community college student experience. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2014(165), 67-75.

- Patton, M. Q. (2005). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Raby, R. L., & Valeau, E. J. (2007). Community college international education: Looking back to forecast the future. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2007(138), 5-14.
- Rawls, J. (1999). *A theory of justice*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Reybold, L. E. (2003). Pathways to the professorate: The development of faculty identity in education. *Innovative Higher Education*, 27, 235-252.
- Richards, L. (2009). *Handling qualitative data: A practical guide* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization: Social theory and global culture*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schofer, E., & Meyer, J. W. (2005). The worldwide expansion of higher education in the twentieth century. *American Sociological Review*, 70, 898-920.
- Soria, K. M., & Troisi, J. (2014). Internationalization at home alternatives to study abroad: Implications for students' development of global, international, and intercultural competencies. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 18, 261-280.
- Treat, T., & Hagedorn, L. S. (2013). Resituating the community college in a global context. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2013(161), 5-9.
- Tremblay, K. (2005). Academic mobility and immigration. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 9, 196-228.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. (1998, October 5-9). *Higher education in the twenty-first century: Vision and action*. Paper presented at the World Conference on Higher education, Paris, France.
- Van Leeuwen, T., & Wodak, R. (1999). Legitimizing immigration control: A discourse-historical analysis. *Discourse Studies*, 1, 83-118.

## Author Biographies

**Tiffany Viggiano** is a PhD candidate at the University of California, Riverside, USA. Her research utilizes a critical lens to investigate the internationalization of higher education in the U.S. and abroad. As a 2017/18 Fulbright recipient, Tiffany's upcoming work will look at the shifting purpose of international education in Finland.

**Ariadna I. López Damián** is a PhD candidate in the Higher Education Administration and Policy program at the University of California, Riverside. Originally from Mexico, she studies at UCR with a UC MEXUS-CONACyT fellowship. Her research interest is the personal engagement of part-time faculty in the U.S. and Mexico.

**Evelyn Morales Vázquez** is a PhD candidate in the Higher Education Administration and Policy program at the University of California, Riverside. Originally from Mexico, she studies at UCR with a UC MEXUS-CONACyT fellowship. Her research interest is the study of the professional identity and emotions in academic life cycle.

**John S. Levin** is professor of Higher Education at the University of California, Riverside, USA. His forthcoming work is on the management of the academic profession.