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Abstract

DO WE BELONG? UNDERSTANDING HOW PROGRAM DIRECTORS PERCEIVE THE ROLE OF THE INTENSIVE ENGLISH PROGRAMS ON UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES.

By Irene Silas
March 2019

Chairs: Dr. Luke Cornelius and Dr. Amanda Pascale

This qualitative case study examines the perspectives of leaders of five intensive English programs (IEPs) about their departments’ positions at U.S. public universities as well as their perceptions of the directors’ roles in developing visibility on campuses. The data was collected through interviewing and analyzed using the Constant Comparative Method which produced five distinctive themes: planned happenstance; belonging; funding; work with university; director’s role. The cross-case findings presented similar ideas from all of the participants – intensive English program legitimacy and visibility on campuses have still not been achieved. The findings from the study can aid IEP directors, and especially their supervisors, in understanding the need to create belongingness for those programs and to provide better involvement of members into university communities.
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Introduction

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD, 2015) reported that approximately 4.5 million students received their education in a country other than the one of their citizenship at that time. Globalization and internationalization have contributed to the increasing number of international students in the United States (IIE, 2016). The Institute of International Education (2016) reported over one million international students in the Academic Year 2015/2016. It is likely that the number of international students will continue growing and could increase to around 8 million by 2025 (Guruz, 2011).

The increased number of international students in the United States can be attributed to two main factors. One factor is student migration, fueled by globalization, and it has become popular around the world. The other factor is the students’ desire to learn English in the countries where it is the native language. First, in the recent decades, many countries, including the United States, have shown greater interest in students who cross borders to study. The reasons for this interest in student migration are the important economic, political, and social benefits that international students bring (Altbach, 2004). While increasing the diversity of culture and thought on American campuses, enrolling international students is also lucrative. International students commonly pay out-of-state tuition and often live in student housing (Cheslock, & Gianneschi, 2008; Okunade, 2004; Toutkoushian, & Shafiq, 2010; Weerts, & Ronca, 2012). What makes international students even more attractive is their paying ability. Even before the students are admitted into an American institution, as a part of their visa application, they need to provide proof that they have the resources to pay for classes and living expenses for the duration of study in the United States (Reminder, 2016). This special requirement makes international
students reliable payers. In the 2015-2016 academic year, international students brought in an estimated $32.8 billion and supported over 400,000 jobs on U.S. college and university campuses (Policy Trends and Data, 2017). For these reasons, international students are considered a resource for higher education institutions (Cantwell, 2015; Goralski & Tootoonchi, 2015). More often now, cash-starved universities look towards international students who pay full tuitions and could provide a way for the local community to help other students achieve global citizenship (Okunade, 2004). A recent article by U.S. News and World Report (Ross, 2018) points out that nowadays some American universities accept up to 100 percent of international applicants.

The other factor in the increase of international students in the United States is that the countries where English is the national language tend to be popular choices for students for whom English is not their first language. This phenomenon can be attributed to the fact that the English language is an international lingua franca, a means of communication in English between the people who do not speak English as their first language. In fact, only one out of four speakers of English in the world is a native speaker (Crystal, 2003). There are other countries that provide a native English language experience, including former British colonies and countries with strong international business connections, so they often act as competitors to the United States (Kachru, 1986; Pennington & Hoekje, 2010). Therefore, for international students to choose the United States as their education destination, the existence of intensive English (IEPs) programs in American universities may provide a competitive edge.

Considering the supply of international students interested in studying in the United States along with the demand of U.S. institutions to enroll international students, many colleges and universities are exploring opportunities to increase recruitment of international populations.
There are various ways of attracting international students to university campuses. Some students are admitted as degree-seeking students in programs of study or certificate programs. Other students are international language students who come to intensive English programs on American university campuses and spend a number of semesters learning academic English and participating in university life. University intensive English programs or IEPs, which began humbly as a linguistic model to teach military men foreign languages in 1940s (Kaplan, 1997), provide international students with the first glance at American college life and can function as a critical pipeline for international student recruitment. Just like other international students, the financial impact that English language students bring to university campuses is noticeable. Both publicly and privately-governed universities and colleges develop intensive English programs to provide English language instruction to adults. The number of students in independently-owned and university-owned language programs is substantial and has been growing, according to the Institute of International Education (IIE) (Intensive English Programs, 2017). In 2016, intensive language programs reported over 108,000 students in comparison to just over 45,000 ten years before (Intensive English Programs, 2017).

Intensive English programs, which are aimed at adults who come to the country on a student visa, are plentiful in the United States. IIE reports over 800 intensive English programs exist in the U.S. (De Angelis, 2015). Though some of these programs are stand-alone, others are integrated into the university governing system. Indeed, there is evidence to suggest that a university-governed program may be well-suited for the purposes of international student recruitment. For instance, the students at a university IEP are more likely to transfer to a degree program afterwards as compared the students who come to a standalone program and often solely come for a cultural experience (Szasz, 2009/2010). Despite the critical role that IEPs may
play in the international student recruitment strategies, and evidence suggesting university
governed programs are recruitment catalysts, these programs are often marginalized on campuses
(Eaton, 2013; Pennington & Hoekje, 2010). They have many facets and are organic in nature,
which means that their components, including students, staff, and faculty within, are constantly
interacting, making them unique organizations (Pennington & Hoekje, 2010) which have been
struggling to find recognition on campuses (Eskey, 1997; Jenks, 1997; Staczek & Carkin, 1984).
Even though there is some literature available regarding intensive English programs and English
language teaching, currently little empirical research exists in regards to IEPs and their role on
university and college campuses in the United States. The following study attempts to fill the
gap in the field of English language program administration and provide more clarity to the
upper administration of universities about the role of international language learners and their
part in campus internationalization.

Two research questions guided this study:

1. How do IEP directors perceive the treatment of their programs and students by
   university leaders and university departments in comparison to other programs on
campus?
2. How do IEP directors perceive their role in fostering connections between IEP
   program constituents and the broader campus community?

Significance of the Study

English language learners have a major impact on university campuses. U.S. News &
World Report (Martin & Morse, 2018) presented the indicators that helped discover the top
universities for international students. Out of six final criteria, the third one claimed that having
English language classes for foreign students made a university more attractive for foreign
students. Yearly, English language programs host a significant number of international students. IIE reports that there were over 100,000 English language learners in the intensive English programs in the United States in 2016 (Intensive English Programs, 2017). There were just over a million international students in all higher education institutions in America in the 2015-2016 school year (Enrollment Trends, 2017), which means that 10% of the total international student population was English language students. Due to such noteworthy numbers, the presence of English language learners must have a profound impact on university and college climates.

English language programs are considered “a many-splendored thing,” according to Robert Kaplan (1997). These programs are special because the students are taught not only academic subjects, such as English grammar and vocabulary, but there, they also receive cultural understanding of an American university, receive help with housing, medical insurance, or the location of a nearest doctor, and receive other much-needed information that a foreign national who is new to the U.S. may need. Sometimes language programs are also used as another opportunity for the international students to access higher education. If a student does not completely meet the language admission requirements, he or she can achieve the level of proficiency by studying in an intensive English program (Hoekje & Stevens, 2018). In some universities, such as the University of Mississippi and Utah State University, for example, their English language courses carry credit and can be used towards their future degree. Because English language programs provide both academic and student services, they are viewed as being nonconventional and are often marginalized within a university (Eaton, 2013). Unfortunately, their unique internal structures and the complexity of the services they provide to international students do not put them in high standing and do not earn them a high regard (Eskey, 1997, Kaplan, 1997; Thompson, 2013). Pennington and Hoekje (2010) discuss the ecological nature of
intensive English programs, which suggests that many facets of the programs are interrelated and that programs respond to the outside influences as an organism. The concept of an organization being multi-faceted has been discussed in organizational literature (Bolman & Deal, 2008). The internal structure, the position of a language program within an institution, and the role of its leaders are valuable to understand for the purpose of this study.

Due to intensive English programs’ differences from other university departments, they are often being passed from one division to another and are not recognized as legitimate academic departments (Kaplan, 1997). The reporting structures vary from university to university and the agendas of the heads of the departments to which language programs may belong vary drastically, leaving program administrators in a weak position. The programs and their administrators are treated as “second-class” citizens (Kaplan, 1997, p. 8). Eaton (2013) advocates that often there are concerns about the treatment “related to power and exploitation” (p. 173) of IEP directors who are “overwhelmed and overstretched” (p. 172). If universities do not recognize English language programs as equal departments, it is understandable why university community members might not notice or recognize international language students as equals. If IEPs, their members, including the students, are not recognized and treated as equal members of university communities, it can reflect negatively on the way the language students perceive the institution where they are studying English. As a result, this treatment may deter them from pursuing their degree at that institution or recommending it to others, which may result in lower international student enrollment and diversity on campus.

This study is necessary to improve the understanding of the position of intensive language programs and English language learners in the institutions of higher education in the United States. There is a significant lack of research in the field, and this study attempts to
provide better insight into the perceptions of program leaders about their departments and the role of those administrators, students, and the programs in their host institutions.

**Definition of Terms**

**Academic Pathway, also Bridge:** In this study, only pathways related to English proficiency are discussed. “A postsecondary program of study combining credit-bearing and developmental ESL coursework to prepare a student who is unable to meet the English proficiency standards for admission. Such a program leads into an SEVP-certified degree program” (SEVP Policy Guidance S7.2).

**Conditional Admission:** “An agreement between a school and a student to tentatively admit the student into a program of study for which the student does not meet all standards for admission. This agreement is contingent upon the student successfully meeting a school-specified set of supplemental conditions intended to fully qualify the student for the program” (SEVP Policy Guidance S13.1).

**DSO:** Designated School Official is a university employee who is certified and authorized by the Student and Exchange Visitor Program (SEVP) to check and issue documents for F-1 international students and communicate information about international students to the Department of Homeland Security (What Is a DSO, 2014).

**Globalization:** “the economic, political, and societal forces pushing 21st century higher education toward greater international involvement” (Altbach & Knight, 2007, p. 290)

**E&G:** Education & General “revenues and expenditures are those that are intended for operating the educational, research and public service missions of the institution” and are provided by the state and student tuition payments (Barbett & Korb, 1999).
**English as a Foreign Language (EFL):** It is “the practice and theory of learning and teaching English for use in countries where it is not an official medium” (Collins, n.d.).

**English as a Second Language (ESL):** English is not the first language of the students who are taught ESL though they reside in an environment where English is the primary language of communication (Collins, n.d.).

**English Language Learner (ELL):** These students cannot express themselves fluently in English and commonly were born in countries where English is not the main language of communication (English-Language Learner, 2013).

**English Language Teaching (ELT):** It is “the practice and theory of learning and teaching English for the benefit of people whose first language is not English” (Collins, n.d.)

**F-1:** This is a visa that “allows you to enter the United States as a full-time student at an accredited college, university, seminary, conservatory, academic high school, elementary school, or other academic institutions or in a language training program” (Students and Employment, 2018).

**Foreign student:** These are “persons admitted by a country other than their own, usually under special permits or visas, for the specific purpose of following a particular course of study in an accredited institution of the receiving country” (Foreign Students, 2003)

**Intensive English Program (IEP):** These programs provide full-time English language instruction for at least 18 hours a week to the students who are likely to matriculate into a degree program at an institution of higher education in the United States (Szasz, 2009/2010).

**Internationalization:** It “is defined as the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education” (Knight, 2003).
**International student:** He or she “is defined as anyone studying at an institution of higher education in the United States on a temporary visa that allows for academic coursework. These include primarily holders of F (student) visas and J (exchange visitor) visas” (FAQ, 2018)

**J-1:** “The Exchange Visitor (J) non-immigrant visa category is for individuals approved to participate in work-and study-based exchange visitor programs. Participants are integral to the success of the program. Here you can learn more about obtaining the J-1 Visa and other relevant visas” (J-1 Visa Basics, n. d.).

**Lingua franca:** This is a language which is “widely used as a means of communication among speakers of other languages” (Collins, n.d.).

**MA TESOL:** Master of Arts in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages.

**Native language:** This is a language that a person learns as a child at home.

**Out of status:** It means a loss of “immigration status due to some sort of violation of the visa terms” (Immigration Law, 2018).

**TOEFL:** Test of English as a Foreign Language.

**UCIEP:** University and College Intensive English Programs is a professional organization of intensive English programs that requires the members to meet and uphold its standards to keep its membership (About, n.d.).

---

**Summary of Chapters**

This qualitative study is guided by two research questions which were used to explore the position of intensive English programs on public university campuses in the United States of America. It is focused on the director perceptions of their program’s role on campus and their own role in facilitating the program’s inclusion into the campus community. The goal of the
study is to bridge the gap in literature about the role of intensive English programs in the U. S institutions of higher education.

Chapter II provides a review of current available literature related to the field of globalization, internationalization, international students, and intensive English language programs. Chapter III outlines the methodology used in the study as well as the methods and strategies used to answer the research question. The design of the study and strategies that ensure trustworthiness are outlined. Chapter IV details the data analyses and presents a narrative summary of the results. In the concluding Chapter V, the interpretation and discussion of the results are mapped out and related to the already existing knowledge.
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The relationship between an Intensive English program and its host institution is unique. The lack of understanding of Intensive English programs and their specifics leaves the administration of a university or college and the language program at a disadvantage during a time when internationalization of campuses is a commonplace term. There is a reasonable amount of research about international students on university campuses. There are studies about international student achievement, their hurdles when adjusting, their language barriers, discrimination, and homesickness (Andrade, 2006; Hegarty, 2014; Lin & Yi, 1997; Poyrazli & Lopez, 2007; Yeh & Inose, 2003; Zimmermann, 1995). Some university faculty and administrators participated in research about international students within their departments (Galloway & Jenkins, 2009; Peterson, Briggs, Dreasher, Horner, & Nelson, 1999). However, almost no literature exists about IEPs’ and language students’ roles on campus and the program administrators’ efforts in bridging the gap between the programs and their host institutions. Intensive language program activists, such as Christison, Hoekje, Pennington, Stoller, and others, have written books about the programs, their organization, and issues they face in higher education. There is a reasonable amount of peer-reviewed literature that discusses the curriculum of IEPs, language instruction, and language student achievements (Carrell & Carson, 1997; Peng, 2007; Reid, 1987; Stoller, 1994). Still, there is almost no empirical research that can offer insight about the role of English language programs on university campuses. Having the knowledge about the interaction between the programs and their host institutions could benefit researchers in the field, other directors as practitioners, and even some university administrators. The study following review of literature will rely on the existing sources to provide an understanding of what intensive language programs do and who their stakeholders are to offer
some insight into the relationship between the programs and their host institutions and present a foundation for the following study.

**Theoretical Framework**

This review of literature relies on assumptions from a sociocultural perspective (Vygotsky, 1963) in which globalization, language program identity, and program participants’ feeling of connectedness are investigated through a mediated concept, mind, or tool. Vygotsky was a Russian psychologist and psycholinguist who researched the interaction of “mind in society” and speech with its social attributes (Lantolf, 1994). His idea of a mediated mind as a relationship between ourselves and the world around us is impactful during social interactions and higher forms of mental activity. Vygotsky’s theoretical contributions were eagerly applied to the field of education and especially language learning. He was fascinated with the way humans learn as well as why and in which way they choose to learn something (Jaramillo, 1996). Vygotsky’s concepts of education and sociocultural theory will inform the research questions outlined above through the review of literature. Mediated relationships between English language programs within the network of the university departments and the tools used to explain identity and belonging will provide a framework for understanding the current knowledge base.

Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory allows researchers to explore the way globalization influences higher education institutions. Interconnections between cultures are even more noticeable with the increase of globalization (Lim & Renshaw, 2001). Based on sociocultural theory, humans learn from cultural and social experiences, and globalization forces these processes to happen at a faster pace because new and unknown cultures may appear as a part of a global village phenomenon, as a single community. Vygotsky focused on time more than space
because influences from foreign lands were not a part of his daily life during the soviet era. However, Marginson and Anh Dang (2017) discuss how Vygotsky’s ideas, if they combine the continuum between time and space, can be applied to globalization. His ideas are “ontologically open to an adaptation that incorporates global forms of mediation in a central role” (p.123). For instance, educational policies and strategies, even though still regulated by individual nations, are presently crossing borders. Society can remake their cultural-historical conditions and adapt to multicultural environments by understanding that an individual mind is connected to national minds and global minds. Additionally, mass media, English as lingua franca, and increased travel contribute to the understanding of humans as social beings in the current world and how global changes impact individual thoughts and organizational possibilities. Even though Vygotsky’s sociocultural framework may feel outdated for the global phenomena, still his research about social learning provides valuable foundation for the global learning environment.

To discover the ways IEPs and their members are regarded in higher education institutions and whether program members experience a sense of belonging, the identity of the program should be inspected. A sociocultural lens can provide insight into the way language programs and their members self-identify and experience the sense of belonging to an organization. Institutions of learning develop their unique identities to attract students to their programs. Bucholtz and Hall (2005) define identity as “the social positioning of self and other” (p. 586). They discuss sociocultural linguistic identity as being stored mostly in a person’s mind and as being emergent. As for a language program’s identity, this notion can be explained with success with the use of sociocultural theory. The actions of members of the organization – leaders, staff, faculty, and even students – contribute to the identity of a language program. Hatch and Schultz (1997) ascertain that organizational identity is the shared perception of its
values and characteristics. They insist that organizational external content influences its image and internal organizational culture affects its identity. A program’s identity is grounded in its symbols that can include policies, experiences, and stories. Moreover, Vygotsky’s idea of the outside world influencing individuals through artifacts can be transposed to the identity of a department being influenced by the external signs – university policies, access, organizational culture, etc. Organizational culture remains a central aspect of a program’s identity in a sociocultural framework because the individuals in an organization create the human dynamic of interactions with one another and with the tools internally and outside of a language program.

The program members’ sense of belonging to an institution can be explained through the sociocultural lens. Vygotsky (1963) claimed that humans, through the interactions with tools and activities, change the world around them. IEP program members, using mediated mind, create meaningful connections because of the higher mental capacities that Vygotsky researched (Lantolf, 1994). People’s experiences help them improve their previous knowledge and evaluate either their success or failure. The program members’, administrators, faculty, staff, and students, feeling of connectedness is created by building school and community-related experiences. As international students come to the United States, for instance, they experience a sense of loss (Hayes & Lin, 1994). They lose their social networks that help them with their daily lives in the home countries. When they come to an American institution, there is no identity that they share with their friends and family at home, so if an institution encourages the students’ participation in events, activities, and etcetera, they may be more successful students in the U.S. If language students are involved in the university life, they will create meaningful connections. Some researchers discuss the importance of the students’ emotional and behavioral involvement in school (Furrer & Skinner, 2003; Stipek, 2002). Language students are an
especially vulnerable population because those students come to different countries, cultures, routines, and especially language environments. They have to understand the world around them, make sense of the social interactions, build on them, and learn the English language in the meantime. Vygotsky’s ideas on the nature and development of human behavior and Luria’s ideas about the mind being a functional system are tied into the Activity Theory (Lantolf, 1994).

The activity can be psychological or social and can act as a functional system. However, Leontiev (1978) takes the theory further and states that the brain activity does not only happen because of a biological or cultural need, but instead those parts turn into motives, which direct every human goal. IEP members can have a better opportunity to develop a sense of belonging through social interactions and involvement if they are provided with the chances to be a part of the university.

Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory will help the researcher to explore the literature and evaluate the available knowledge, although slim, on the topic of intensive English language programs, administrators, and students in a university setting. Vygotskyan framework will allow the researcher to answer the research questions after receiving and analyzing the information and transforming it into new knowledge. Sociocultural theory is an invaluable framework to explore the literature and help in answering the research questions because it has a holistic interpretation of learning. Instead of understanding the elements of a language program, administrators, students, and etcetera. separately, the information will be examined as a complex organism emphasizing the interconnectedness of all parts.

**Globalization, Internationalization, and Higher Education**

To understand the environment in which intensive English programs operate, the influence of globalization and internationalization on the world and higher education should be
examined. The socio-cultural lens highlights globalization and its influence on higher education. In recent decades, there has been an increased discussion about globalization and internationalization in higher education (Giddens, 2000; Hawawini, 2011). At times, these two terms are used interchangeably (Altbach & Knight, 2007), and there is no overall agreement about the meaning of the terms (Welch, 2002). However, globalization and internationalization, even though close in concept, have different foci.

Globalization cannot focus on just one area of life – it affects economic, cultural, political, and even technological aspects, so it can be seen through different lenses: world systems, global culture, global society, and global capitalism (Giddens, 2000; Sklair, 1999). Each of the approaches to globalization has its value. The world systems approach would allow groups to follow their economic interests within one world-market while trying to change this market by influencing both more and less powerful states, and such system would not allow for sole control of the world market by one state (Sklair, 1999; Wallerstein, 1974; Welch, 2002). This model, though, tends to focus on economic factors forgetting the importance of political and cultural aspects. Conversely, the area of focus of Sklair’s global culture model (1999) is on culture rather than economy and politics. According to this model, information technology and mass media is turning the world into a “global village” (152), though it may interfere with the identities of individual cultures (Sklair, 1999; Welch, 2002). The global society concept identifies globalization as decreasing the transactional distance between people and, therefore, creating the necessary conditions for a global society (Sklair, 1999). However, the possibility of global society is still highly doubted by sociologists because, for instance, in different countries the social norms vary and cannot be easily standardized (Giddens, 2000; Sklair, 1999). The global capitalism model is focused on integrating economies into a globalized world market.
The problem lies with its sole focus on capitalism and with the idea of countries discussing globalization but committing only to voting on local issues, and decisions about international trade agreements are rarely open for voting to citizens, who often feel disconnected from those choices.

Each one of Sklair’s (1999) ideas has its value, and Giddens (2000) pointed out that globalization cannot focus on only one or two areas of life; it includes economic, cultural, political, and even technological aspects. However, according to Welch (2002) from the standpoint of higher education, global capitalism has merit and could be considered as a model of globalization because, as “education is increasingly treated as an engine of economic activity and international competitiveness” (p. 437), internationalization of higher education and the understanding of modern reforms can rely on global capitalism.

In institutions, globalization is seen as “the economic, political, and societal forces pushing 21st century higher education toward greater international involvement” (Altbach & Knight, 2007, p. 290). Many universities in developed and developing countries have tried to stay on track with understanding and globalizing campuses because some researchers believe that “globalization drives and is driven by higher education” (Delgado-Márquez, Hurtado-Torres, & Bondar, 2011, p. 267). Globalization is the notion that focusses on the world becoming interconnected while internationalization is localized to institutions that want to stay abreast with the changing environment worldwide.

Delgado-Márquez et al. (2011) discussed that internationalization came as a response to globalization, and internationalization of higher education is seen as a solution to increasing globalization. Internationalization in the United States began after World War II when universities “began to establish an international footprint” by doing research abroad and
recruiting international students and professors (Eckel & Kezar, 2011). The definition of internationalization depends on which perspective is in scope. Delgado-Márquez et al. (2011) identified four perspectives of internationalization in the context of higher education institutions: activity, competency, ethos, and process perspective. From the activity standpoint, internationalization is seen as a method of incorporating international education into curriculum. Competency is a transformation of national institutions into international institutions, while ethos is the way of developing international culture on campuses. As for the process perspective, international and intercultural dimension should be included in teaching, research, and service with the help of policies and procedures.

Knight (2003) defined internationalization simply as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary institution” (p. 2). However, Hawawini (2011) argued that such definition is merely a description of the beginning steps of internationalization; therefore, he proposed that institutions should be integrated “into the emerging and global knowledge and learning network” (p. 5). His definition is broader: “The internationalization of higher education institutions is the process of integrating the institution and its key stakeholders – its students, faculty, and staff – into a globalizing world” (p. 5).

The reasons for internationalization can be broken down into economic, academic, religious, and political (Hawawini, 2011). The latter two motives are often excluded from discussion because they almost never start at the higher education level, and either politicians or government agencies finance them (Hawawini, 2011). For universities, which have become more entrepreneurial, globalization and the knowledge society have been evolving (Delgado-Márquez et al., 2011). Many colleges and universities have become more competitive in the
global sense by trying to attract international students and cooperative in the international sense by supporting study abroad programs (Delgado-Márquez et al., 2011). Hawawini (2011) discussed that because economic systems globally are becoming more similar, the countries with developing policies may want to adopt the ones from the developed countries, and who can deliver the knowledge better than universities educating students? Some higher education institutions claim that they have already started implementing policies that will increase internationalization of campuses. However, those policies, better called initiatives, either have small effect or fail to bring what they promise (Hawawini, 2011). Unfortunately, during any decision-making in the internationalization of universities, administration rarely includes members from IEPs into the conversation (Staczek & Carkin, 1984) though English language programs enroll large numbers of international students who are actively internationalizing campuses. Because education is more entrepreneurial now, IEPs can have a major impact on the university fiscal resources (Pennington & Hoekje, 2010).

Internationalization projects are often associated with the solutions to financial problems. Altbach and Knight (2007) reported that some for-profit providers such as Laureate and the Apollo Group (associated with the University of Phoenix) have founded higher education institutions overseas as well as bought already existing institutions overseas. This lucrative desire of for-profit universities to cross borders is understandable because it will allow them to enroll larger numbers of students and increase their profits. Altbach and Knight (2007) indicated that non-profit institutions are devoted to research enhancement and support of developing and middle-income countries. On the other hand, because of declining state funding to many higher education institutions for various reasons (Cheslock, & Gianneschi, 2008; Toutkoushian, & Shafiq, 2010; Weerts, & Ronca, 2012), internationalization as well as international students in
America can be seen as funding potential for public higher education institutions. Foreign students bring billions of dollars to the economy of the United States every year (Altbach, 2004; Altbach & Knight, 2007). National Association of Foreign Student Advisers (NAFSA, n.d.) reported that in 2016-2017 academic year, international students who studied in American colleges and universities brought almost $37 billion to the economy and supported countless jobs. Intensive English programs enroll international students who pay tuition fees, often stay in the university housing, and generally study in an intensive program for a number of semesters before transferring to a program of study or returning to their countries. The financial benefit from all international students, especially including English language students, is obvious.

Another reason for the interest in campus internationalization is the exposure to different cultures. Many American students often lack global understanding and international knowledge of their disciplines and have limited foreign language abilities (Siaya & Hayward, 2001). When international students come to America’s campuses, they make new acquaintances with local students. This can happen during classroom exchanges or social interactions outside of classroom. Perry (2003) stated that the relationships that are built during college years can even facilitate contacts between countries if those students become leaders in the future. He also insisted that Americans should embrace international students because “we must continue to nurture our greatest foreign policy asset: the friendship of those who know our country because we have welcomed them as students” (p. 4). Certainly, international students bring diverse cultures and opinions to university campuses. Not all American students have an opportunity to travel overseas to experience other cultures; international students provide local students with cultural opportunities, enriching their classes with new experiences. Not all of university students have international classmates from a variety of countries. Students in intensive English
programs generally are from a great variety of countries and, if involved in the university life, can contribute to the diversification of thought and culture and even support internationalization efforts.

**Immigration Development and International Students in the U.S.**

To understand if there is any difference between the traditional international students and the IEP students, one needs to understand what an international student is. UNESCO defines international students as “students who have crossed a national or territorial border for the purpose of education and are now enrolled outside their country of origin” (2016). An international or foreign student is a national of another country who enters the United States with a purpose of receiving education. Institute of International Education (IIE) reported that there were over a million international students in 2016/2017 Academic Year (Institute of International Education, 2017). Students enrolled in an intensive English program (IEP) are considered international students and will eventually be enrolled into a university, even though they differ drastically from the traditional international students (Eskey, 1997).

The U.S. Department of State (Student Visa, n.d.) explains that the course of study and the type of educational institution which a student wants to attend, will determine on what type of student visa they enter the country. International students come on three different visa categories – F, J, and M. F visas are reserved for academic education, which includes English language programs; M visas are for vocational learning; and students on J visas come for cultural exchange programs (U.S. Visas, 2017). English language learners are short-term visitors on F-1 visas and go through the same immigration process as any other international university student being educated to the United States.
The first wave of international students in America took place after the signing of the Immigration Act in 1924, which is considered the most stringent immigration act in history of the U.S. as the quotas were set at a mere 2%. The quotas did not restrict students and professors from studying in America. English language programs on university campuses in the U.S. began to surface in 1950s (Goodwin & Nacht, 1983), so until then, international students did not start coming to the U.S. for the sole purpose of learning the English language. Before 1978, all international students received their visa for only a year, and then they had to renew it. In 1978 and 1981, the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) issued regulations allowing the visas to last for longer than a year. Further regulations of 1983 and 1987 cancelled “term” visas, which required the students to renew their visas after a certain number of days, because of the excessive amount of paperwork. Therefore, non-immigrant student visas received a “duration of status” label (Haddal, 2006), which means that the students’ visas last as long as they are enrolled and attending classes. The duration of status requirement also brought the need for better tracking of the students who were enrolled in various programs throughout the country.

The Department of State, the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), the Department of Justice, and higher education institutions initially had struggled to track the location and status of international students (Wong, 2006). Often, higher education institutions had no communication with immigration and other governmental services, and neither organization was sure whether the students had arrived, or whether they had left the country. As a response to the concerns, in 1983, INS launched a tracking system of foreign students that was called Student and School System (STSS). STSS required higher education institutions to record and keep track of international students in the United States. The students were supposed to fill out forms, and INS instructed universities and colleges to verify the data, such as admission data,
arrival and departure dates, and other information, from those forms. However, in 5 years, by 1988, INS realized that the system was not accurate and reliable because some schools were not certified to issue Certificates of Eligibility for Nonimmigrant (F-1) Student Status-For Academic and Language Students (form I-20), which resulted in the collection of inconsistent information about students and their statuses. Moreover, there was no accurate data about how many students were enrolled in which programs, and whether they were still actively pursuing their education (Wong, 2006). There was no control over how long the students were staying and whether their visas were in or out of status. Finally, after the bombing of the World Trade Center in 1993, immigration reform was called for, especially because it was found that the terrorist attacks were committed by either persons who came on student visas or who were non-immigrants (Wong, 2006). One of the terrorists was in the United States on an expired student visa, which reinforced the need for more scrutiny and reporting between the state departments and educational institutions.

As a response to the events, in 1996, the Congress enacted the Immigrant Responsibility Act and a program to collect up-to-date information about international students. Since the Act became law, it has been revised several times. The Attorney General and the Secretaries of State and Education developed the reporting program. Since the enactment, the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) has been collecting data, first manually and later electronically, about students’ identities and addresses, visa information and changes done to them, types of academic enrollment, and information on disciplinary actions taken against a student by educational institutions. The scrutiny of international students increased even more with the Enhanced Border Security and Visa Reform Act of 2002 (Siskin, 2005). This Act came as the way for the government to increase control of incoming students and potentially intercept further
possible terrorist attacks. The new changes included proof of students’ acceptance to an institution, registration and enrollment of students into a school upon their arrival, information about transfers between schools, and increased communication between the Department of State, INS, and educational institutions. Additionally, in October, immediately after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism (USA PATRIOT) Act initiated an amendment made to Section 641 of The Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA). It required Student & Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS) to be implemented in full before January 30, 2003 (Exchange Visitor Program: SEVIS Regulations, 2002). The USA PATRIOT Act furthermore ensured that additional data could be collected about the date and point of entry of international students to the U.S.

Nowadays, SEVIS is “a part of the National Security Investigations Division and acts as a bridge for government organizations that have an interest in information on nonimmigrants whose primary reason for coming to the United States is to be students” (Student and Exchange Visitor Program, 2017). The Student and Exchange Visitor Program (SEVP) is under the umbrella of the Department of Homeland Security. The program oversees educational institutions and their relationships with the students on F and M visas and their dependents. For the purpose of this study, only F visas will be discussed because intensive English programs traditionally educate only students who come on F visas, and therefore, only SEVP has relevance to this study.

Soon after the Department of Homeland Security and SEVIS started the electronic recording of international students, educational institutions which wanted to accept international students had to become certified by SEVIS and enter all students into the system by August,
Every school that is certified by SEVIS must have one principal designated school official (PDSO) who is the primary contact for all students with non-immigrant visas, F and J. Schools often have additional designated school officials (DSO) who work with students and update student files in SEVIS. DSOs have control over international students’ I-20s, which means that they can issue, change, and terminate I-20s (Study in the States, n.d.).

English as a second language students in intensive English programs come from various countries and experience the same immigration scrutiny as the traditional international students do. One of the differences that IEP students have from degree seeking students is to keep their international student status, they have to be enrolled in a full course of study which translates into at least 18 hours weekly in a classroom (U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, 2013). This means that often DSOs in intensive English programs monitor the students’ attendance in order to comply with the Department of State regulations.

Even though the students who come to the intensive English programs enter the United States and are subject to the same visa rules as the degree-seeking international university students, they are far from being traditional. English language students vary greatly “in prior educational experience, proficiency in English, expectations, motivation, and most of all, academic and career goals” (Eskey, 1997, pp. 21-22). English language students do not have a specific degree they are pursuing when they arrive, and often the only commonality they have is the language learning experience and sometimes their general plans for the future. Most English language learners plan on being admitted to an academic program of study in pursuit of a degree, but until then, they become members of an IEP community.
Intensive Language Programs in a University Setting

Even though there has not been much research done to understand the position of IEPs in a university setting, the literature that is available provides a grim reality on the position of IEPs and their constituents in a university. Many have heard the acronym ESL, and some even know its meaning. English as a Second Language (ESL) is taught to students in a country where English is a native language. ESL is at the core of any English language program. Sometimes other acronyms, such as EFL, ELT, IEP, and others, are used interchangeable with ESL. They all have different meanings and are often used incorrectly. The most confused acronyms are ESL and EFL. ESL should be used to describe English when it is learned as an additional language in a country where it is utilized as the main means of communication. EFL, on the other hand, is the English language that is taught or learned in a country where English is not an officially used language. Intensive English programs exist in the U.S. postsecondary institutions; they provide English as a second language instruction and may have different purposes. Some of them target the students who are matriculated and are fulfilling their language requirement before starting their degree, and the other ones serve the students who are nonmatriculated (Dehghanpisheh, 1987). Still, this type of program is often called an intensive English program (IEP) and most often teaches students non-credit English language courses. English language programs on the American university campuses contribute to the overall internationalization of institutions and the diversification of the student bodies.

An intensive English program is always a self-sustained unit within a university, no matter where it reports. They are never described as traditional academic programs and are distant in its organization, structure, curriculum, student body, faculty, and other parts from the rest of the educational operations in universities (Carkin, 1997; Eskey, 1997; Kaplan, 1997; Staczek & Carkin, 1984). The relationship between intensive English programs, other units, the
institution’s administration, and faculty is practically non-existent because of the lack of policy and access to the decision-making by the IEP faculty and administrators (Staczek & Carkin, 1984). In her case study, Strecker (2016), even though she did not investigate how IEPs were viewed by the university members, found that stakeholders saw that the IEP became only marginally known on campus after employing a number of activities, such as a conversation partner program, supporting graduate teaching assistants, reporting to an academic unit, and others. However, the lack of the relationship between an IEP and university stakeholders as well as the inability to advocate for the program may create major obstacles for the language program leadership in legitimizing their department on campus (Jenks, 1997).

The Initiation of English Language Programs in American Universities

The position of intensive English programs might not be advantageous because of the way they were founded in higher education institutions. English language programs started appearing because of three important factors (Kaplan, 1997). One of the reasons was an increasing number of international students who were not able to study in the conventional university classrooms because of their low English language proficiency. At first, there was an attempt to correct this issue with remedial language classes often offered to the native English speakers. Often teaching assistants or volunteers with little or no supervision taught those language students. Another factor important to the advancement of English language programs described by Kaplan (1997) was the change in the language teaching methodology. Earlier, foreign languages were taught as dead languages, such as Latin and Greek, which had no speaking component. During the 1940s, a new linguistic model was used to teach foreign languages to military men. This model started audiolingual methodology and gave a start to
applied linguistics, which became the third primary factor in the establishing of English language programs.

The term *applied linguistics* emerged after a couple of English language teachers believed they should be viewed as scientists instead of humanists and joined scientific linguists in the 1940s. In 1941, the very first intensive English program for international students was established at the University of Michigan. It took over a decade for the term *applied linguistics* to become recognizable. It was not until the 1950s when the journal called *Language Learning: A Journal of Applied Linguistics* began its distribution from the English Language Institute at the University of Michigan (Kaplan, 1997). To ensure that the mission of second language learning was upheld, the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) was established (Hult, 2008). Soon after, other universities started opening language programs, and in 1964, the International Association of Applied Linguistics/Association Internationale de Linguistique Appliquée (AILA) was established. The term *applied linguistics* is strongly related to language pedagogy as well as a medium between theory and practice of teaching a language (Hult, 2008). English language programs have been in the center of applied linguistics for the simple reasons that applied linguists trained language teachers and that material creation and assessment for ESL took their foundation from applied linguistics.

Since the foundation of the first English language program, many other programs have appeared. However, English language programs differ from each other in type and quality, and that is what sets them apart from each other. Two major consortia, the University and College Intensive English Programs (UCIEP) and EnglishUSA (formerly AAIEP), have developed standards and best practices in the field over the last 30 years (About, n.d.; History, n.d.). An accrediting body, the Commission on English Language Program Accreditation (CEA) was
created exclusively for intensive language programs. These organizations can help international students understand that only some language programs follow the standards and will provide the desirable quality instruction. However, even if a program is a member of a consortia or has secured an accreditation, its legitimacy and level of prestige on campus ultimately relies on where in the university it is housed.

It is possible that the position of IEPs on campuses is considered disadvantageous (Osborne, 2015) because English language programs in higher education institutions came into existence over a short period. Most of the programs were unplanned and only served the immediate needs of the host institutions. Therefore, there is not one specific location for IEPs in universities. These programs are often located in the most unlikely places, such as Continuing Education or Student Services because they are traditionally viewed as having a lesser status (Osborne, 2015; Pennington & Hoekje, 2010) than academic programs. They do not fit into the student personnel services side either, and they are not actually supporting the mission of divisions of continuing education (Kaplan, 1997), except for providing financial support. Osborne’s survey (2015) confirms that IEPs are independent units with a director in charge though where they are housed, how their faculty is seen, and how their students are treated on campus vary greatly. An IEP has many facets that separates them from other units on campus – its setting, organization, policies, students, faculty, and even leadership have unique functions.

An IEP’s Location

One of the differences of a language program from other departments on campus is that it has both an academic and an entrepreneurial side (Pennington & Hoekje, 2010). In an IEP, students are taught English as a discipline, and the instructional side of a program requires as much attention as any academic university department in terms of curriculum development, faculty hiring, firing, or mentoring, and, of course, student success. On the other hand, the
department is most always self-supported and has to provide for all of its financial needs. No matter where the program is positioned in a university, a leader will have to be creative in formulating various points to advocate for the department as well as to understand the politics within the host division as well as within the university as a whole. Heyen’s study (2016) contributes that IEP programs used to have more autonomy but nowadays are run by structures outside of the programs, which often stunts their ability for development. Osborne’s study (2015) supported the knowledge that English language programs reported to various departments on campuses, including colleges and academic departments, continuing education, or international division. The location of the IEPs varied greatly in Osborne’s survey, but many programs were reported to be administrative units lead by a Director.

An intensive English program can be situated in a traditional academic department, such as a College of Education or Arts and Sciences (Pennington & Hoekje, 2010). It can also be housed in a Continuing Education or even in a Student Services unit. Being a part of an independent center such as Study Abroad or International Programs is a possibility as well. Where a language program is situated can slightly influence its functions; its position can have some influence on recruiting, or it can have a different financial structure, for instance. Most programs are autonomous with their own recruiting, admissions, student services, and curriculum. Osborne (2015) reported that about a third of the programs she surveyed claimed that they had some kind of relation to an academic department – either a self-sustained unit or a part of a department within an academic unit. Being a part of an academic unit can have its benefits such as faculty designation and, sometimes, academic credits for the students.

The location on an IEP on campus is important because it can mean more recognition for the program and its constituents. If a program is housed in an academic department, the
program’s curriculum is regarded with higher status, and the program can even offer the students credits for upper level English classes (Pennington & Hoekje, 2010). The opportunity to receive credit for ESL classes could attract more students and might allow the program to gain recognition. The intensive English program can offer benefits to academic departments as well; it can function as a research or a graduate teaching practicum site allowing for mutual benefit to the host department and the program. If a language program is a part of student affairs or international centers of some sort, it can receive the advantage of having more access to the student services. Some programs may benefit by easier access to “disability services, counseling services, and academic tutoring” (p. 73). They may also receive greater exposure on campus through student life services. However, they are pulled further away from “the academic mainstream,” and there are few opportunities for those programs to be recognized among their academic counterparts (Eskey, 1997, p. 24). There are advantages and disadvantages for the development, and sometimes success, of a program to being housed in one unit over another. However, no matter where a program is located, it is essential to understand that an IEP is a unique department and needs to be seen as an essential unit in a university as well as a multi-faceted organization.

An IEP as a Living Organism
To understand why an IEP is a unique department on a university campus, it is important to remember that intensive language programs are fluid organisms that adjust and develop based on their surroundings unlike other departments on campus. Pennington and Hoekje (2010) discussed the ecology of intensive English programs and their organic nature. Both tangible and intangible notions encompass organizational ecologies. People and physical items are tangible parts of organizational ecologies while “atmosphere or climate, values, and reputation” (p. 21)
are considered intangible. It is important to remember that IEPs have beliefs, traditions, culture, etc. and those contribute to its overall complexity. The intangibles become more important in an IEP because these organizations are considered social ecologies first, and only then, physical ones. Though it is important to remember that a program is a single unified organism, and that it has all of the items in constant interaction with each other.

An IEP, in a simplified way, includes people, things, and processes in addition to its curriculum and instruction (Pennington, 1998). The tangible assets include fiscal resources, physical resources, and human resources. Fiscal resources of an intensive English program tell a lot about the overall state of the program. These resources are the result of the marketing and recruiting of students and any financial contributions, such as donations. The importance of this tangible notion is evident because the higher the fiscal resources an intensive English program can produce, the more physical and human resources can be improved (Pennington & Hoekje, 2010).

Intensive English programs are commonly self-sufficient units on a university campus and often have to defend their fiscal resources. Many programs are regarded as “cash cows” and are required to provide the cash flow to other units (Eskey, 1997). In many cases, the funds generated by intensive English programs are used on expenses that are not even remotely related to any operations of the program. Those programs are often limited in access to their own fiscal resources and are forced to minimize costs of operations and salaries. IEPs are dependent on a variety of constraints which can influence their ability to generate funds (Kaplan, 1997). For instance, the political climate, market changes, institutions’ policies, and other issues may hinder the financial success of an IEP. Therefore, keeping a fiscally healthy program is one of the many challenging tasks a program director faces daily (Eaton, 2013). If the program does not generate
revenue, the director is forced to let go of staff and faculty and cut the resources to stay afloat. Sometimes, the programs are closed if they are not as lucrative as the host institution expects it to be (Eaton, 2013). When Heyen (2016) interviewed some IEP faculty about the importance of finances in their department, it was clear that the faculty were frustrated that they were not compensated fairly, and that a bulk of their program’s money went to support other programs and departments while they were left to work harder to survive. For instance, the Florida Board of Governors (2018) reported that if compared to English instructors holding a master’s degree in Florida while teaching credit-bearing courses full-time year-round, IEP instructors with the same level of education and teaching the same load receive in compensation about 20% less.

While being self-supported units, there is commonly an expectation of the IEPs to supply funding to the host institutions, which leaves IEPs in a precarious financial situation – either recruit enough students to survive or perish (Carkin, 1997; Eskey, 1997; Heyen, 2016). However, it is understandable that the treatment of the fiscal resources of IEPs differs based on which host institution they are located in and their place within the hierarchy. Other factors that may influence the fiscal resource are the political and economic strains in the world (Pennington & Hoekje, 2010). If the global conditions are not favorable, the effect on the fiscal resources of an intensive English program may be negative. In addition to the political and economic factors, various considerations need to be taken regarding the financial success of a program.

As for physical resources, such as classrooms, technology, etc., they are easily identifiable and often exist autonomously from a program (Pennington & Hoekje, 2010). The quality of physical resources does make a program either more successful or inadequate, as they are linked to all the parts of the ecology. Pennington (1989) claimed that physical resources are in a direct cause and effect relationship with the number of people in the program. If the
physical resources are plentiful, then the number of employees and students is higher. It is clear that if there are enough funds and classrooms, the students, faculty, and staff will be comfortable and will probably have newer technology and maybe even a different curriculum. However, there might not be as many students, faculty, and staff if there are no physical resources available for use. The program cannot absorb an increasing number of students if there are no classrooms available, for instance. It is important that the physical resources are adequately addressed to ensure program’s quality and growth, and for that reason, a program leader should be allowed to participate in the discussions about the opportunities that a university could provide to a program (Pennington & Hoekje, 2010).

The last main aspect of tangible assets is, as described by Pennington and Hoekje (2010), human resources which in this discussion describe students, faculty, and administration within an IEP. All of them are equally important and help build a program’s community, which is extremely valuable when developing a sense of belonging with the students (Pennington & Hoekje, 2010). However, human resources of an intensive English program differ from the ones in other units on campus. The number of students can influence the number of staff as well as the job distribution of faculty and administration from one semester to the next. It is imperative to understand the position of each member of the IEP’s human resources collective, and how they differ from the counterparts in other university departments.

**Students.**

International English language students are interconnected with the curriculum, faculty, and student services as a part of the ecology in an IEP (Pennington & Hoekje, 2010). If the student body changes in size or composition, it will influence the whole ecology and force its parts to adjust. With a specific group of students, faculty may adjust their teaching styles and
approaches to achieving the students’ language learning success. Their cultures might be prescribing the way they should respond to their instructors and office staff. A multilingual and multinational intensive English program’s classroom offers enjoyment as well as challenges for all of the members of educational process. Some students might be particularly motivated to use only English in every aspect of their lives in the U.S. while others only speak English in class and revert to their native language as soon as they leave the classroom and prefer not to participate in activities. The students’ interconnectedness to the other parts of a language program is evident as they are in the center of the ecology of a language program. Moreover, understanding the reality and the changing dynamics of the students as well as their part in a program’s ecology is essential for the program’s leadership because it should highlight the students’ needs in becoming university members.

It could be a goal of a university to retain English language program students who will enroll into a program of study after completing their intensive language courses. IEP students are the reason for the program’s existence and the most important of its resources. When they come into American universities, they bring their cultures, beliefs, attitudes, alongside with the music they listen to and the food they eat. Pennington and Hoekje (2010) elaborate:

This is the reality of the multilingual, multicultural world of the language program that makes it such a rich and complex ecology. It is the responsibility of the program leadership to nurture this multilingual, multicultural environment as well as its linkage with the students’ world beyond the program and with the larger institution within which it exists (p.106).
To ensure that international language students are adjusting well to the program and the university life, an additional necessary component for an administrator to secure is a well-developed student services component.

**Student Services.**

One of the biggest differences between an IEP and any other department on campus is that English language programs provide students with academic classes as well as student services under the same umbrella. IEPs used to offer no support beyond academic instruction when the departments first started appearing in the United Kingdom (Altbach, Kelly, & Lulat, 1985). In the United States, on the contrary, language programs started providing students with more than just language instruction. While a higher education institution often has a number of departments which are responsible for assisting students with housing, medical insurance, admissions, counseling, orientation, student life, and mentoring, many IEPs do it all (Quigley & Pereira, 2011). In most cases, an English language program is responsible for providing their students with all of those necessities in addition to recruiting those students initially (Middlebrook, 1991). Often, there are not enough staff members among which those responsibilities are distributed. As a result, sometimes, the same staff member or even a faculty member is responsible for providing the necessary services to the language students. International English language students require special attention because their language skills are not sufficient to be independent in the United States. Moreover, the students are often not prepared to face the multicultural reality in an American institution and the student services staff members can provide them with their initial cultural adjustment.

To attract students to an institution in the United States, student services put forth their best recruiting efforts though they “are often ill-equipped to address international student
recruitment” (Hoekje & Stevens, 2018). The reasons for that are unprepared staff and not enough available fiscal resources to spend on recruiting. Recruiters from American universities travel overseas to recruiting fairs and meet with agents to maximize their efforts. Hoekje and Stevens (2018) reported that 37% of U.S. universities use agents to bring more students to their English language programs and pay them hefty commissions. At times, agents may deceive the students and schools by charging both – agent commissions to schools and counselling fees to students. IEPs, regardless of the agents doubling up on commissions, still rely on them to bring more students to the institutions, and unfortunately, many programs do not have the designated, qualified student services staff to market and recruit for the program.

Before the students are even in the United States, IEP’s team members make sure that they receive all the necessary information for their embassy interview and the trip to the United States. A language program’s admission team needs to provide careful instructions, sometimes in the students’ native languages. Upon the students’ arrival to the institution, they need to be given an orientation that would include many items that American university students do not have to be explained. However, an orientation is not only for new students; returning students must be reintroduced to the rules every semester (Middlebrook, 1991). English language students need to know about the cultural differences in the university and the community; they have to understand the rules of the everyday life, both spoken and unspoken. Because of their cultural inhibitions, they may be reluctant to ask about the rules in the community.

In addition to the advising about the life in the United States, IEP students have to be counseled about their responsibilities as an F-1 visa student. The rules of an international student are considerably strict especially about employment and class attendance (Middlebrook, 1991). International students may only work on campus and less than 20 hours a week while still
maintaining a full load of at least 18 hours of instruction weekly. Often, programs have to warn students about their attendance and even dismiss them from a program for excessive absences. Staff members keep track of student attendance daily and counsel them as necessary.

Many programs have after class activities to improve the international students’ sense of belonging to the programs and universities, by default. When the students first arrive, they are faced with a new intimidating world and they need to be able to build meaningful connections (Hoekje & Stevens, 2018). Student services provide the students with the opportunities to build social networks by offering field trips, volunteer activities, participation in clubs, and others. Language students’ engagement is the meaningful interaction that helps them to become a part of an IEP and potentially a university community. Student services encompass many aspects of program functions; in fact, it is everything beyond classes and instruction (Pennington & Hoekje, 2010). Most English language programs are completely autonomous from the rest of the university in the recruiting and admissions process. For the best success of the program and less concerns, program leaders need to ensure that the students are well taken care of, and the support is provided as needed. If the program is successful at ensuring the students’ needs are satisfied, their adjustment to the American and university life will be easier.

English language student adjustment to an American university and the development of the sense of belonging to the institution starts from the first days and months the student spends on campus. If the students develop a sense of belonging to an institution, they will be more likely to continue their education and be successful in that university (Freeman, Anderman, & Jensen, 2007; Lacina, 2000). International students identify social concern as being one of the biggest challenges for them in adjusting when in the U.S. (Hayes & Lin, 1994). Providing the students with a support system and helping them overcome fear, depression, and frustration
always falls on the shoulders of the IEP staff and faculty. They also encourage the students to develop the sense of belonging to a community. As the students complete a couple of semesters at an intensive program, they start noticing the rest of the campus, and it is vital to ensure that the students experience being a part of the university community. The program’s staff and faculty have to make sure that there are constant opportunities for the students to achieve the sense of belonging, and program leaders need to advocate on the students’ behalf to ensure that they are a part of the university community.

**IEP Faculty.**

Faculty, instructors, or teachers—IEP educators have been given all those names by their students, colleagues, and administration. IEP faculty is extremely important for the success of any program. They spend the most time with the students and, therefore, influence them the most. Hiring the right candidates and providing them with resources, mentoring, and professional development will help any program become successful at offering language instruction. The role of faculty of an intensive language program is not as straightforward as the one of any other faulty on a university campus (Pennington & Hoekje, 2010; Szasz, 2009/2010). IEP instructors often, in addition to their teaching assignments, are required to assist with student services, curriculum development, and even extra-curricular activities. The leaders of language programs have to consider multiple ways to maximize the potential of their faculty.

An employee who teaches in a university-housed intensive language program has to be as qualified as any other instructor in a higher education institution. The standards for faculty are strict and their “education and training commensurate with their teaching assignments” along with a number of other requirements according to the Commission on English Language Program Accreditation (Faculty, n.d.). However, those instructors are rarely designated as
faculty and are not always members of a teachers’ union, often teach the loads of over 20 contact hours per week, and sometimes have no benefits (Shasz, 2010). Most are expected to teach year-round. They prepare and instruct for full teaching loads, help develop the program’s curriculum, and mentor new instructors. They sometimes serve on committees and are often required to present at conferences to stay current in the field. In addition to instruction, many faculty members in an IEP have administrative and student services responsibilities (Eaton, 2013; Shasz, 2010; Soppelsa, 1997). Those instructors may plan and facilitate students’ after-class activities, might pick up students from the airport, or could grill at a summer barbeque. Carkin (1997) discussed that whoever did not work in an IEP would not understand the amount of workload that the instructors carried. They are also underpaid and often teach in various programs within an IEP, resulting in burnout and turnover (Soppelsa, 1997). The expectations for an English language program’s faculty are high, and they will continue to be an essential part of the organization.

The status and designation of IEP instructors often depends on where the unit is located. Some of the instructors are not classified as faculty, but instead are hired as staff in their departments (Shasz, 2010). Therefore, they might not have the same recognition on campus as other faculty members. Winkle (2014) points out that the faculty will have better recognition if they are allowed to have a promotion process and locate IEPs in academic departments. Most programs cannot afford all their classes to be taught by the full-time employees, so part-time instructors become essential to the program’s teaching needs. Part-time faculty often teaches 50% or more of the program’s courses. Though part-time faculty have no benefits, full-time instructors often have the benefits that are comparable to the ones other faculty members receive on campus (Shasz, 2010). However, English language program instructors do not always receive
the compensation that is as competitive as the one their colleagues get in other departments while the IEP faculty are still teaching more contact hours weekly (Heyen, 2016). It is essential that faculty, both full-time and part-time, an important part of the human resources in a language program’s ecology, gets recognition, and the program’s leadership needs to adopt the atmosphere of support and “encourage active professionalism” by developing internal professional development activities as well as support conference attendance presentations (Stoller & Christison, 1994, p. 18).

Providing instructors with support, opportunities for professional development, and allowing them to be a part of the decision-making in a program helps them to be more committed and engaged in the success of the language program. There are various ways of encouraging faculty, empowerment, and prevention of burnout by providing them with opportunities for professional development (Soppelsa, 1997). Faculty could become more in tune with each other, and instead of competing, they may work towards the betterment of the program and begin to feel ownership for the successes and failures of the program. The instructors who feel empowered will feel devoted to the improvement of the program and will care about the students (Stoller & Christison, 1994). Faculty support is another responsibility for an IEP leader and should be a priority because they spend the most time with the students daily and will advocate for them helping to improve their opportunities on campus.

IEP Leadership.

So far, in this literature review, there have been many statements about what an IEP leader should do to maintain a successful organization. However, the discussion of what leadership is in itself is appropriate as well. As Northouse (2010) points out, “there are almost as many different definitions of leadership as there are people who tried to define it” (p. 2). He maintains that leaders influence others to accomplish an objective. There are rather different factors that
people believe distinguish leaders from followers. Some believe that there are specific traits that a leader must possess, such as intelligence, self-confidence, determination, integrity, sociability, and others. There are other researchers who think that the possession of certain skills point to a leader. Northouse (2010) also discusses style and situational approaches as well as a number of leadership theories and others. In addition, there are formal and informal leaders and having been appointed a leader does not always make someone an authority figure in the eyes of the staff (Heifetz, Grashow, & Linsky, 2009). The goal of a successful leader is to provide a vision and protection, keep stability, and inspire others. There is a definite distinction between leaders and managers as well as a definite need for leaders instead of managers (Northouse, 2010; Turaga, 2017). What separates them from managers is that leaders listen to their employees, empathize, appreciate, delegate, excite, and build rapport.

When discussing a leader, there can be focus on his or her traits, styles, and skills. Most of those perspectives are generalized for all leader types. As for an IEP leader, that person must be as unique as the organization he or she is running. Pennington and Hoekje (2010) discuss prior research that outlines leader traits, and they point out that those qualities are vague and “describe potentials rather than actual characteristics of performance” (p. 171). They maintain that some of those traits can become negative characteristics if taken to the extreme. One of the most important traits for English language program administrators as well as a part of a job description is the ability “to serve as catalysts for change and innovation” (Stoller, 1997, p.33). Change and innovation are not at all the same in the IEP world. English language program leaders have to accept change as a part of their jobs and advocate for change for their students, faculty and staff, and programs. Change in the programs can come from anywhere – increased or decreased enrollments, international political climate, policy change, staff or faculty mobility,
and others. Innovation, however, happens when there is need for improvement. Innovation pushes IEP directors to look for new ideas, find improvements often where none seem available, and hope that innovation continues to be positive for a program. Often program leaders initiate innovation because they are dissatisfied with the current state of affairs inside their programs or on the outside. Always being ready for changes and looking for new opportunities requires a special kind of leader. Moreover, it is essential for IEP leaders to be flexible and adjust their leadership style to fit the needs of each situation, so no one style can satisfy every possibility.

There are also skills that one needs to possess to be a successful leader. Pennington and Hoekje (2010) discuss prior research and point out the need for technical skill, human skill, conceptual skill, or a combination of skills for an IEP leader. Technical skills are professional, such as curriculum design or teaching methodology, and administrative, for instance, “budgeting, scheduling, and program promotion” (Fox, 2009, p. 323). However, when faculty was asked what they were looking for in an administrator in a study cited by Fox (2009), the response included only one technical skill. Most of the respondents needed a leader to have a vision, which is a conceptual skill. Forbes (2012), on the other hand, attempts to identify the personal qualities needed to direct an IEP and to create a skill set that program directors need to have to be successful. By conducting a battery of surveys, Forbes identified 54 skills, and the highest rated skill was integrity, which researcher discovered was “a personal quality in the literature” (p. 80) rather than a skill. She also discovered that leadership, management, and decision-making skills are essential for the position of an IEP director. According to Forbes’ study, there are also 47 types of knowledge that an IEP leader should possess, such as budgetary knowledge, institutional knowledge, immigration regulation knowledge, and many others. One of the most interesting discoveries in Forbes’ skill set research was the identification of 93 personal qualities,
which a program administrator should have in addition to skills. Among many others, having to be honest and ethical, having the ability to make difficult decisions, respond quickly, and work well with others while leading requires a language program administrator to be outstandingly unique.

Leaders of intensive language programs have complex jobs, which require flexibility and understanding of the global world in which programs exist nowadays. Because of the unique job description, program administrators are expected to be experts in many areas. Those may include budgetary decision-making, student and staff recruitment, admissions, immigration, curriculum and instruction, mentoring, advising, professional development, and many others. As soon as an IEP director is appointed, that person takes full responsibility for everything that will either make a program successful or destroy the department (Fox, 2009). Eaton (2013) discussed that IEP directors often are put in the “precarious and arguably unethical position” by the university expecting program administrators to incorporate “business practices into education” (Eaton, 2013, p. 168). They are expected to run successful, revenue-generating departments as well as maintain internal operations (Eaton, 2013). In addition to maintaining the success from within the department, IEP directors have to be able “to advocate for increased status within the institutions where they are housed, through grant activity, by establishing highly lucrative and advantageous external partnerships, or by linkage with an academic department – as a site of research and/or teaching practice” (Pennington & Hoekje, 2010, p. 65).

It is only one of the many unique parts of the job description of a language program administrator – helping their unit to be considered a legitimate and equal participant in a university setting. Jenks (1997) discusses the way language programs fit into the host institutions and explains the paths of legitimacy. It is an especially complicated task when many
other departments and upper administration do not understand intensive language programs and what their contributions to the university are (Dvorak, 1986; Staczek & Carkin, 1984). Strecker (2016) reported that IEP’s legitimacy improved when it was more involved with host institutions’ processes. Program directors may develop an outreach plan to ensure that their program is noticed on campus. A program’s leader is essential in promoting and advocating for the program through creating partnerships with other departments on campus and local corporations to build its brand and leave its footprint.

**Summary**

Even though there is plenty of literature available about the field of English as a second language as explained in the review of literature above, there are not many sources that provide information about the role of IEPs in a university setting and the position of IEP leadership in facilitating the inclusion of the program and the students into the university life. Members in some IEPs report the feeling of separate identity from other departments on campus, and the importance of providing care to the students in their departments due to this feeling of seclusion (Heyen 2016). Other recent research implies that the implementation of certain elements, such as starting a conversation partner program and establishing GTA preparation partnerships, securing accreditation, facilitating a change in faculty status, etc., might contribute to the achievement of legitimacy on a university campus, as it did in one IEP (Strecker, 2016). There is also a study that outlines the skills that a successful IEP leader should possess (Forbes, 2012). However, the purpose of this study is filling the void in research about the position of IEPs in their host institutions, giving voice to language program administrators, and providing practical resources for the practitioners.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Patton (2002) discusses that dissertation writers are often seeking the understanding of a phenomenon in which they are interested. In this study, the researcher was seeking an understanding of the feelings and opinions of IEP directors about the way their departments and students were viewed by others on their campuses. To understand a social world, such as a higher education institution and its components, one needs to engage in interactions and their interpretations (Marshall & Rossman, 2011) and provide vivid analyses of the collected data. The researcher’s aim was to give voice to the participants, to capture their understanding of their reality, and to deliver the collected information to the readers through rich descriptions. To achieve that, the researcher used case study research to discover IEP director experiences when advocating for their programs and students within institutions of higher education.

Why Qualitative Methodology

Qualitative research allows for the understanding of social environments holistically, giving more attention to smaller details, and having the ability to interpret the context in which the data is collected. Stake (1995), for instance, identifies three main differences between qualitative and quantitative analyses. One of them is “the distinction between explanation and understanding” (Stake, 1995, p 37). A qualitative researcher is looking to discover the uniqueness of a phenomenon, “a happening” (p. 37). Rather than search for “explanation and control,” which quantitative studies try to obtain, qualitative researchers are looking for “understanding the complex interrelationships among all that exists” (p. 37). Stake asserts that the purpose of research “is not to discover [#1], for that is impossible, but to construct a clearer reality [#2] and a more sophisticated reality [#3], particularly ones that can withstand disciplined
skepticism” (p. 101). Qualitative methodology allowed the researcher of this study to relay a detailed message to help the readers construct meaning about the program directors’ perceptions.

Qualitative methodology is a set of assumptions, while qualitative methods provide the tools for research. There are five main qualitative methods, which Travers (2001), Patton (2002), and others agree on: “observation, interviewing, ethnographic fieldwork, discourse analysis and textual analysis” (Travers, 2001, p. 2). Those data collection methods allow researchers to look at cases or phenomena in search for some expected and unexpected relationships. In this investigation, the best method for data collection was in-depth, open-ended interviews because this method allowed the researcher “to enter into the other person’s perspective” (Patton, 2002, p. 341).

**Why Case Study**

For data collection, a researcher needs to use research strategies, such as a case study. Case studies are commonly used in social sciences to research programs or individuals (Stake, 1979; Yin, 1981). The meaning of a case study research strategy can be constructed from the words of its proponents. Stake (1995) identifies that a case is “an integrated system” which is bounded and has “working parts” (p. 2). Yin (2003) claims that a case study strategy provides the best results if a researcher is searching to answer the questions “why,” when he or she cannot manipulate how the participants behave, when the researcher considers the context to be essential, and if context and phenomenon have blurred borders. Merriam (1998) sees a case study as “a thing, a single entity, a unit around which there are boundaries” (p. 27). For the purpose of this study, the case consisted of IEP program directors within an integrated, complex system and their interaction within set boundaries that the researcher outlines further. Case studies permit a researcher to learn from individual cases through multiple lenses to understand
many angles of a phenomenon (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Stake, 1995), so there is no specific methodology or method that should be used with a case study, discussed Yin (1981). Based on this knowledge, the researcher was able to choose the methods that fit this study best.

Case study methodology is “down-to-earth and attention-holding” (Stake, 1978, p.19). Stake (1978) discusses that to be able to provide an understanding of the problems at hand, researchers must communicate and accept the information from the ones who have lived through the experiences. Case studies give voice to the individuals; though individuals are not the ones being studied, but instead, “a system of action” is the piece of analysis (Tellis, 1997, p. 3). The voices in the studies and the perspectives of individuals, groups, and their interactions maximize the amount of information that can be learned about the interrelationship between the context and what is being studied. If the goal is to discover the perceptions of language program administrators about how their departments and program members in a university setting, then case study methodology will be the most complementary “to generate description and understanding” of the current state of the field and “to generate pragmatic implications for practitioners” (Marshall & Rossman, 2011, p. 45), such as other directors and upper level administrators. To explain the perceptions of language program directors, the vivid information of their natural experiences had to be collected by interviewing them individually about their environments, which is considered one of the advantages of the case study approach. Yin (2003) recognizes that a descriptive case study allows a researcher to present in-depth information within its context. The goal of the researcher was to ensure that this study has both descriptive features, allowing for “a rich, thick description,” as well as heuristic, helping the readers understand the studied phenomenon (Merriam, 2009). The close collaboration between the researcher and the program directors allowed the voices of the participants to be heard and
created the knowledge about whether there was development and reinforcement of the language
students’ and language programs’ connections to the university campuses.

Single cases offer a researcher an opportunity to analyze a single bounded system; the
term cross-case study is used by Merriam (2009) to describe generalizations that can be drawn
from separate units of analysis. Merriam asserted that a case study is distinguished by an
element that is analyzed, not a topic. To understand the phenomenon, a researcher needs to
focus on individual pieces of analysis and draw on the similarities and differences across them.

Stake (2006) states, “The cases in the collection are somehow categorically bound together. They
may be members of a group or examples of a phenomenon” (p. 5-6). For this study, cross-case
analysis was the most appropriate strategy because even though the individual respondents were
IEP directors, the phenomenon that the researcher studied was leadership practices, processes of
IEP directors, and their views about the value of the department as a part of a higher education
institution.

**Boundaries.**

It is sometimes difficult “to draw a line marking where the case ends and where its
environment begins, but boundedness, contexts, and experience are useful concepts for
specifying the case” (Stake, 2006, p.3). To ensure that the case study is a bounded system, a
researcher needs to ponder whether or not the data collection will be “finite” or to see if there is a
change that could come about as a result of a case study (Merriam, 2009, p. 41). As for the
following study, the boundary can be seen in Figure 1. This case bounding points out the units
of analysis – program directors – who are represented as dots in the center. The triangle around it
is what binds these instances. Each point of the triangle represents a boundary. One boundary
that frames the case is that research was done in Research Public universities in the United
States. The other one is that only IEP directors were a part of the study. The third boundary was the directors’ experience in the field of IEPs. Case boundaries, the “what,” are what defines case-study research (Merriam, 2009; Stake, 2006; Smith, 1978)

**Figure 1 Cross-Case Boundaries**

**Figure 3.1. Cross-Case Boundaries**

![Cross-Case Boundaries Diagram]

**Figure 3.** The explanation of the case boundaries of this case study. The outside triangle represents the three boundaries which encompass five IEP directors as represented by colorful circles.

**Design of the Study**

**Research Questions**

The researcher wanted to learn about the IEP directors’ experiences and perspectives while recognizing similar themes between individual cases, which could provide additional insight and inform the field of IEPs in universities. The first research question was: *How do language program directors perceive the treatment of their programs and students by university*
leaders and university departments in comparison to other programs on campus? The goal of the researcher was to learn what experiences the IEP directors had, and whether there were any differences in perceptions between the different directors. For the second questions, the researcher asked: How do the IEP directors perceive their role in fostering connections between IEP program constituents and the broader campus community? Learning about what strategies and processes the leaders utilized and understand their approaches was essential. The researcher also wanted to inform others about the work the IEP directors do in advocating for their students and programs. This investigation sought to examine how IEP directors felt about their roles on campus, and how they thought their experiences changed the outlook of a university community on IEPs.

Selection of Participants

When selecting participants for this study, the researcher used the following criteria:

- The IEP directors needed to be employed by public institutions of higher education. The researcher wanted to ensure that all of the directors interviewed were from similar environments. Public universities have similar missions and have a similar amount of control in their governance (Hegde, 2005; Morphew & Hartley, 2006) and, therefore, provided a standardized environment for research of the participants.

- The leader needed to have been employed in the position of a director for at least two years before the beginning of the study. This length of time was chosen to ensure that the program directors were not novice at the institution and were experienced enough to understand the climate of the university and their program’s position within it.
• The IEP directors had to work in the programs that were members of UCIEP (University and Colleges Intensive English Programs). The researcher’s choice in looking at only the participants in that organization was purposeful because to become members of UCIEP, intensive language programs have to be scrutinized based on a set of quality standards and have to submit proof of meeting those standards every five years. UCIEP was the first consortium of IEPs; it was established in 1967 and currently has 80 member programs (About UCIEP, n.d.). The researcher was not limiting the choice of participant selection to the programs having the CEA accreditation because not every IEP in a public institution of higher education can afford to be accredited by this organization or receives resistance from the upper administration about the accreditation. Still, all of the IEPs governed by public universities are accredited by university accrediting agencies under their umbrellas.

To find participants for this study, the researcher relied on the professional network of colleagues, other IEP directors. Purposeful sampling guided participant selection. Patton (2002) claims that content-rich cases can be the pinnacle “to the purpose of the inquiry, thus the term purposeful sampling” (p. 230). It was essential to the success of this study to select the participants who provided plentiful details about IEPs and their place in a university. A large number of participants in a qualitative case study can confuse a researcher because of the individual uniqueness of each case and might skew the analysis of the collected data (Merriam, 2009; Stake, 2006). Therefore, the researcher planned to interview approximately 5 participants.

After receiving an approval from the Institutional Review Board on July 12th, 2018, the researcher reviewed the lists of program-members of UCIEP looking for the potential
participants. The researcher accessed the information about IEP directors in public universities on the UCIEP website according to the outlined criteria. The researcher consulted some experts in the field to help with the participant selection. An individual email (see Appendix A) was sent to seven directors who met the criteria asking if they were interested in participating in the study trying to ensure that at least five participants were available for the interview. After receiving email replies, the researcher emailed a short demographic questionnaire (See Appendix B) as well as an informed consent (see Appendix C). As soon as the responses were received, the researcher proceeded with scheduling interviews. The participants needed to provide both a signed copy of the informed consent and the demographic questionnaire prior to an interview.

The information presented in Table 1 outlines the responses to the demographic questionnaire.

*Table 1 Participants’ Demographic Questionnaire*

**Participants’ Demographic Questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years worked in current position</th>
<th>Years in the field of intensive English</th>
<th>Appointment type</th>
<th>IEP’s location in the University</th>
<th>Reporting to</th>
<th>Program size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boris</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Academic &amp; Professional (AP) Faculty</td>
<td>International Affairs</td>
<td>Institute’s Director</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Department of Languages</td>
<td>Department Head</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilar</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>College of Arts</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Medium to large</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Collection

The best ways to collect the data for a case study are through interviews, observations, and document review (Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995; Yin, 2002). Interviews were chosen as a method of data collection because it let the researcher discover the feelings and insights of the participants that could not be observed (Patton, 2002). In qualitative research, one of the advantages is that “the researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis” because of the use of “nonverbal as well as verbal communication,” ability to “process information (data) immediately, clarify and summarize material,” and make sure the participants agree with the interpretation and the researcher can learn more about the “unusual and unanticipated responses” (Merriam, 2009, p. 15). The interviews helped the researcher ask the necessary questions as well as follow up when necessary.

Interviews

Interviews provide insight into other people’s meaningful experiences and help others understand their stories (Patton, 2002). The researcher collected the data using an interview guide, also called a semi structured interview approach (Esterberg, 2002; Merriam, 1998; Patton, 2002). The researcher prepared open-ended questions (Appendix D) that allowed for the same general lines of investigation while still giving the freedom to explore further by asking spontaneous questions and making careful decisions about what additional questions to ask during the allotted time. It was also helpful that the researcher knew and had met all of the participants in person because of her program’s membership in UCIEP. This was a critical factor.
because the researcher knew that she had “access to rich and willing informants” (Wengraph, 2001).

The selected directors of the IEPs are located in various states of the United States, and the researcher could not travel to each site to interview them. Therefore, interviews were conducted with the participants using Skype video calling. The choice to conduct the interviews via Skype allowed the researcher to observe the participants while asking them questions and seeing their emotions and reactions as well as hearing their perceptions and opinions. An MP4 recording program Camtasia was used to record the interviews as well as an additional audio recorder, DropVox, was used as backup. Each participant completed a 30-45-minute interview. Before the interview, all the participants had been asked to sign a written consent form (see Appendix C) and were notified that they were being recorded. Even though the interviews were recorded, the researcher took notes that cataloged the participants’ reactions and used active listening skills to document the themes and key words, which were in the interviewees’ language and descriptions (Wengraph, 2001). This kind of journaling provided the researcher with another medium for logging the unique data.

Data Analysis

According to Clark and Creswell (2010), “qualitative data analysis is a systematic, rigorous and thoughtful process that researchers use to uncover large patterns about the central phenomenon from the data collected” (p. 72). The careful process of organizing data, including the participants’ responses to the emails, Demographic Questionnaire, informed consent and carefully transcribing the interviews ensured that there was no confusion with the large amount of data in this study. The researcher labeled the interviews with the participants’ pseudonyms, university codes, and the dates of the interviews. The pseudonyms were selected personally by
four out of five participants, and the fifth pseudonym was selected by the researcher. The institutions where the IEPs are located were coded based on their size, geographical location, and their research designation to ensure confidentiality. All of the Intensive English Program’s official titles and locations within the universities were replaced with IEP and generic department and college names respectfully.

For data analysis, the researcher relied on the work of Sharan Merriam (2009) who drew from Glaser and Strauss’ Constant Comparative Method (1967). To understand data, a researcher should move back and forth from specific to abstract (Merriam, 1998). After the analysis of each individual data unit, the researcher needs “to build abstractions” (Merriam, 2009, p. 204). The analysis process of this study started with reviewing the first interview transcript. The researcher took notes and highlighted interesting bits of information. Identifying the parts of data that may be useful is called open coding (Merriam, 2009, p. 178). After the first transcript is coded, the comments need to be reviewed and collapsed if they look similar, and this processed is known as axial or analytical coding (Merriam, 2009, p. 180). Through this process categories or themes emerge and the explanations of themes across units of analysis are essential. It was important for the researcher to understand the different approaches the IEP directors took to help their students and programs become a part of the university. Therefore, the first data source was reviewed, and the researcher identified 25 different subcategories by noticing key phrases which stood out.

Once the work with the first data set was complete, the researcher moved to the next transcript and, keeping in mind the subcategories or subthemes that emerged from the first interview, looked for the same categories in the second set. Merriam (2009) insists that a unique list needs to be kept for each data set, they should be compared, and a unified list of categories
needs to be compiled. “This master list constitutes a primitive outline or classification system reflecting the recurring regularities” in the study (p. 180). Therefore, the researcher of this study created a table, marking the participants’ names at the top and writing down the comments from the first data set and searching for similar ideas in the other data sets. Merriam suggests that the text from the interviews should be assigned to those themes which should meet several criteria: help answer the research questions, be able to include all the important data, only include individual data pieces in one category, and should be of “the same level of abstraction” (p. 185-186). In this study, after the review of the 25 initial categories, they were collapsed into 22 subthemes. Five themes became evident, and all 22 subthemes supported them. Following the discovery of the themes, it is important to see if those categories may come together in a meaningful way and are related to each other. In this study, instead of developing a theory, it may be possible to find a connection that would provide recommendations for application of the findings by offering suggestions and explaining the potential benefit to higher education institutions.

**Trustworthiness**

Several writers discuss criteria for thorough qualitative research practice (Cresswell, 2009; Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Patton, 2002; Stake, 2006; Wengraph, 2001). Once Lincoln and Guba (1985) presented the criteria that was geared towards qualitative research, those constructs replaced the ones borrowed from quantitative research. Credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability help establish trustworthiness of a study. There are procedures that ensure that those criteria are met. Triangulation, member checks, rich, thick description, researcher’s positionality, and other strategies help a researcher cultivate trustworthiness (Merriam, 1998). A variety of those strategies were used to ensure trustworthiness.
Credibility and Validity

In efforts to provide the readers with the most accurate data, every important finding should be guaranteed from being misinterpreted by readers (Stake, 2006). To confirm the accuracy of perceptions, member checking is often used (Merriam, 2009; Stake, 2006). Member checking helps a researcher to warrant that the interpretation of the data is successful by asking the participant to review the transcription or analysis of the data. Triangulation was achieved by drawing upon the data sources such as conducting in-depth interviews with multiple participants, writing notes while interviewing, and performing member checks. Stake (2006) discusses that “the process of triangulation occurs throughout the fieldwork and analysis” (p.77). Being careful while reviewing individual cases and evaluating the similarities and differences in a thorough analysis allowed the researcher to offer evidence of the carefully scrutinized findings and provide credibility to the study. After completing the transcription and the data analysis, the researcher of this study sent out individual emails asking the participants to read over their individual interview transcripts and interpretations to verify that the data was recorded correctly.

Transferability

Qualitative researchers seek a deeper understanding of the phenomenon rather than researching whether the study can be generalized, as quantitative methodologists seek (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Patton, 2002). The findings of a study should help others who researching on a similar topic (Marshall & Rossman, 2011) and allow that knowledge to be used in other situations, but in this case, it is the readers’ and future researcher’s responsibility to know what knowledge may be transferred depending on their needs (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Therefore, providing the readers with a rich, thick description of the study and ensuring that the descriptions of the participants, the setting, and the results are clear and plentiful can serve as evidence of dependability and transferability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985;
Merriam, 2009). In this study, the readers are presented with the quotes from transcripts assuring there was enough evidence for transferability.

**Dependability**

Dependability in qualitative research is as important as reliability in quantitative. The difference is that a qualitative researcher prefers that the readers agree that “the results are consistent with the data collected” (Merriam, 2009). To protect the accuracy of descriptions, the interview data in this study was recorded with two different media sources ensuring the safety of the data. All the materials collected were stored securely and confidentially. A researcher is the main instrument in qualitative research, and its main benefit is that the investigator is able to work with data immediately, check and summarize the information, and explore inconsistencies and differences in answers (Merriam, 2009). Because the data was collected and analyzed by the researcher of the study, it was made sure that the raw data was analyzed quickly, and all the materials were traceable. On average, the interviews were transcribed within five days of the Skype meetings and labeled with identifiers removed.

**Researcher’s Positionality and Bracketing**

**Positionality**

My relationship with the world of foreign language education and as a second language learner of English started when I was seven. My love for language learning was evident as I had an opportunity to start learning an additional foreign language in seventh grade and, even at such young age, develop interest for teaching when I tutored younger children in English. After having received a graduate degree in foreign language instruction in Belarus, I practiced my skills in developing curriculum and attempting to instill the love for English in my students who were earning technical degrees.
When I started teaching at a university in the United States of America, I developed a different understanding of language learning – with a purpose of every-day survival and personal achievement. In 2006, I began my career in an IEP in the United States as a part-time instructor. After years of teaching, I traded my full-time teaching job for the position of an IEP Director. My involvement in English language learning, teaching, and administration has provided me with a unique perspective and empathy for the ESL profession, leadership, and language students.

This passion for international students, IEPs, and advocacy for the field have brought me to this cornerstone of my educational career. My personal work as an administrator in an IEP allowed me to assess the state of the ESL field and my role as a leader and advocate. The person who inspired me to become a leader and become the type of leader I am today was my in-law, late Judith Barrett Silas, who worked as a school principal. Through our conversations, I learned what it was like to be a principal of a failing inter-city school and to advocate for your faculty and students in order to see the school succeed. She told me of the difficult decisions and the ways the retired principal managed to inspire her employees and her students while mobilizing them for the betterment of the school. When we had these conversations, I was not yet an administrator, I did not know or understand “the dark side,” I was simply listening to a wise woman, explaining her road to building a successful organization. It was only later that I realized how valuable those conversations were. On the other hand, while in the workforce, I observed other kinds of leaders who had different approaches and who were focused on self-serving goals, and I wondered what it takes for a leader to want to advocate, fight, and search for success in an organization.
The mixture of my personal and professional experiences has influenced my beliefs about language instruction and leadership in the university-governed IEPs. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to learn from the stories of my colleagues, IEP directors, about their experiences, the roads they had taken, and about their successes and failures.

**Bracketing**

As a part of an ESL community, as a leader of an IEP in a public institution, and as an advocate for the rights of international students, I recognized that biases were not avoidable. Stake (2006) mentioned “that biases can be good, bad, or some of each” (p. 86). I recognized my subjectivities and monitored them while collecting and interpreting the data. The benefit of those reflections kept me mindful of the subjectivity that could have affected the interpretation of the data. To ensure the credibility of this study, I provided the statement of my positionality and bias and explained my involvement in the IEP field. I ensured that I showed that I have personal philosophies about leaders of language programs and ESL students. During every stage of my study, I reflected deeply on my positioning to suspend my judgement and focus on the voices of the participants.

**Participants’ Bias**

Because this study is based on interviewing IEP directors, professionals in their official roles, there may be an understanding that the limitations of their positions may influence their responses. I understand that there is a possibility for underlying apprehension of making bold statements or potentially a need to present their program in a more favorable light to dispel any potential negative perceptions that could be related to them. Even though the identities of the participants are protected, there is a possibility of internal concern about the repercussions which their words could have on the perception of the program or them personally. Due to the
abovementioned possibilities, the participant responses in this study were analyzed and outlined without making assumptions based on the directors’ body language or verbal cues.
CHAPTER IV: CROSS-CASE FINDINGS

Writing up the findings is considered a difficult process in qualitative research often because “there’s no standard format for reporting” this kind of data (Merriam, 2009, p. 245). A case report should be a combination between a traditional report and storytelling (Stake, 1995). Merriam (2009) pointed out that it is critical to have an audience in mind and to understand the purpose of the study to be able to write a quality report. Keeping in mind other practitioners, leaders, and administrators, the aim of this research is to explore what role the directors of the intensive English programs believe they have in facilitating connections between the program members and the rest of the university community as well as understand their perceptions about the treatment of their programs and their members by the host institution. This chapter will consist of the discussion of the five themes and their subthemes that emerged during the analysis and supported the research questions which guided this study.

Common Themes

There is not a definitive number of categories or themes that case-study researchers recommend should emerge after the cross-case analysis (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 2009). During the cross-case analysis in this study, five major themes emerged out of 25 categories. The first theme sets the stage for the rest of the analysis. Planned Happenstance allows the understanding of the participants’ professional backgrounds and motives for becoming IEP directors. The second theme delves into how leaders felt about their program constituents’ belonging. The third theme highlights the way the directors view their programs’ access to fiscal resources. The fourth theme illustrates how the directors perceive their program’s involvement with the university. Theme number five gives insight into how the directors view both their internal and external roles. Themes two, three, and four supported Research Question #1: How
do IEP directors perceive the treatment of their programs and students by university leaders and university departments in comparison to other programs on campus? Themes one and five are essential to answering the second research question: How do the IEP directors perceive their role in fostering connections between IEP program constituents and the broader campus community?

The subthemes that guided the themes are listed in Table 2.

Table 2 Themes and Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes and Categories</th>
<th>Theme 1. Planned Happenstance</th>
<th>Theme 2. Belonging</th>
<th>Theme 3. Funding Priority</th>
<th>Theme 4. Work with University</th>
<th>Theme 5. Director’s role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wanting to help</td>
<td>Legitimacy</td>
<td>Make money</td>
<td>Feeder</td>
<td>Initial role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>Existence/non-existence</td>
<td>Fund balance</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Actual role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting the job</td>
<td>Forgotten</td>
<td>Space availability</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Visibility and perceived role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Place at the table</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reaching out</td>
<td>Future work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Siloed</td>
<td></td>
<td>University support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Types of classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preparedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived preparedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student connectedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theme 1: Planned Happenstance.

I begin this chapter with an overview of the participants’ decision to assume a role of an intensive English program director. All IEP directors during the interviews were asked how they decided to pursue their careers as program directors. Three subthemes became evident after the data analysis. Because these are the directors’ personal stories, they are presented in a form of
narration and are not broken into subthemes. Even though all five participants in this study moved into the IEP Director position after they had spent some time teaching, their paths differed.

Director Boris was teaching abroad, and “it wasn’t fulfilling from a professional point of view.” In his opinion, there was a lot that he could do better to fill the “gaps,” such as “faculty collaboration, training sessions, all of this stuff.” Here is how he described his path to the director’s position:

That's what motivated me to come to the Large Southeastern Research University B for the PhD, and then while I was here just watching the director and a founder of [IEP], I was watching him in action and just seeing all cool things working. But then looking at, again, the possibilities of what I could do with this school really motivated me to become an IEP director, you know. Just-just wanting to do better with the best practices and training and so on. I started out as a as an instructor, PhD, I was a PhD student, and I was, you know, teaching two classes, and then quickly after the first year, I became the testing coordinator because, you know, I needed extra money basically, and then because I had another kid on the way. And then, at the end of that year, I believe it was 99, 1999, I became the assistant director because… and that was a full-time benefited position in 1999. And I was actually in charge of running all the day-to-day operations as the assistant director because [former director], he had a full position as a professor in the MA TESOL [Masters in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages] program, and … then I got my PhD, he was retiring right together, and so that's how I slid in as director.
Director Sarah shared that she “fell into ESL quite by mistake.” She was not convinced she decided to pursue the career of a director, “I'm not so sure I decided. No, I did.” She proceeded to explain:

[I] was hired to teach before I was trained at a time when IEPs were relatively new, and there were lots of students coming from Venezuela, and I… It was a time when I was trying to decide what to do with the next part of my life. I’d just moved to [the state], had a small child, and so when somebody asked, I said, “Well, okay. I'll try this.” I had been teaching elementary school, and I fell in love with it, and so then I went back to get my degree, and in the meantime, before that, the director of the small program where I was which was in a small liberal arts school was going to Japan for a year, so she asked if… the Dean asked me, the untrained person, but I had some teaching experience, and I had been a teacher for a while and another person to co-direct their program for the year till she got back. And then that was all fun too, you know. There were only four of us, I think. And then I came down to [State] to do my graduate work, and the first day of the Methods class that I… or a Structure of English class I was taking, person who said, “Oh, you said you've taught,” and I was hired full time for the semester because they needed somebody critically. Right time, right place. That was in 1981, and in 1983 the director left, and I was asked if I would do it, part-time or, you know, and I was still in the graduate school, but would I do it sort of temporarily, and I said, “Sure, with somebody else.” And then I applied for the job and, so, that's all she wrote, and I've been here ever since, and, you know, if I could continue to do this until, you know, the last days of my life, I’d be happy. It's been a wonderful, you know… It's got its stresses obviously, but
you know, I love what I do, and I love the people I work with, and, and the administration as well - it's been a nothing but supportive.

When asked how Director Pilar decided to become a program director, she answered, “Because I was stupid! No, just kidding.” After, she described how her skills guided her towards this career path:

I don't know that I ever really intended to. I think a lot of us just sort of fall into it. I was an instructor, but I always had coordinator duties because I'm very organized. You'd never know it in my current life, but I've always been very organized. I've always been able to convince people to do things. I've always been able to pull… I've always been able to pull people together and unite people sort of towards a common goal. Again, you never know that in my current position, but I have a long history of that, and so in my previous position at [a university], I was hired as a grad student because they had 24 students, and they couldn't afford to pay faculty … and I'd worked with the director at Harvard, and she said, “Come on over! I'd love to have you. I'll pay for your PhD.” So you know, hey, free tuition, salary – great, you know. And then it just, it was the same thing – well, let's do this, let's do this - assistant director! And then I was recruited to [a university], and when I told the director that, she said, “No, you can't go! I'm grooming you for my position!” It’s like, oh okay! So no, I won't go to [a university]. I will stay in [the city, state], which was a great decision, I have to say. So I mean, I guess I sort of thought it would be kind of interesting to do and fun to do, you know, but that's, that's the glorious side of the job. Nobody ever gets to see the tears at home and the no right answer, it's all no-win situations, but that's okay. It's fun, it's challenging, and I get to
work with the most incredible people on the planet, including the best students, so it makes it worth it.

On the other hand, Director Kirk’s response to how he decided to pursue the career of a director, with a burst of laughter, was, “I didn't pursue it. I was asked to do it for a number of years, and I said no.” He expanded:

Okay, so yeah, and I'm probably not [going to] stay that much longer. I mean in our program, it rotates with faculty and some’ve stayed for a long time, too long, but really for me, I was… I wasn't really interested in it, but you know, I guess, when it came down to it, and I thought it was important for me to sort of take over at the time that there's a bit of turmoil within the University and stuff. Not that I'm better or smarter, you know, than anybody else but it just happens. I thought, I felt like I could help … the program.

Director Kirk’s situation seemed a bit different because it looked like the director position rotated among faculty, and he was not planning to stay in the position for a long time.

Director Emma’s path to an IEP director position was unique as she started by working in the field of English as a Foreign Language for many years in her native country. She further described:

I came to the United States to pursue a master's degree in TESOL, and then I continued with my doctorate. … So during the time I was an international, you know, student, I was a graduate assistant, and I was teaching. I was actually teaching ESL courses for future teachers and… but also, you know, I was also working at the community college teaching ESL, so I've been in the field for many years. My passion has always been teaching, and I, to be honest, I never imagined that I would end up, you know, sitting at a desk, directing a program. That was not in my plans, at least not when I was, you know,
doing my doctorate because I always thought: “Well, I would love to teach, you know, university level or, you know, something like that. However, this, you know, job came along. When I graduated from my doctorate, I started teaching in an intensive English program in [a state], and I think it was almost a year that was there, and I really liked the environment. I met, you know, amazing people with, with amazing, you know, careers.

After director Emma graduated with her doctorate, she taught intensive English but started looking for a position that would sponsor her work visa. Her search was successful when she was offered a position at Large Southeastern Research University A (LSRUA) because of her prior experience directing a program overseas. After seven years in her role, she still said, “I just love what I do, … and I'm so happy I actually took the opportunity.”

Theme 1, Planned Happenstance, provided a deeper understanding of the reasons and circumstances which led the study participants to accept positions as IEP directors. Three out of five directors spoke about becoming IEP directors by chance. One participant found the position while searching for a job which would provide a work visa, and another participant wasn’t interested in being a director but felt he could help. From the interviews, it was evident that the directors felt pride and gratitude for their work and the people with whom they worked. This theme helped answer Research Question 2 because it was clear that these directors, primarily, saw their key role as helping their programs be more successful, though there were “stresses” and “it’s challenging.” IEP directors face various stresses and challenges in their work environment (Eaton, 2013; Pennington & Hoekje, 2010). Forbes’ (2012) research was focused on the skills which IEP directors should possess to be successful. Organizational skill was one of the relevant abilities based on Forbes’ survey. Similarly, one of the IEP directors believed that being organized and being able “to pull people together and unite people sort of towards a
common goal” was one of her strengths when becoming a director. Another skill outlined by Forbes was “ESL Teaching Skills” which the respondents in her research believed to be important for an IEP director. All of the participants of the current study explained that they were ESL teachers first and directors secondly. Having the teaching experience seemed a natural step before becoming a director in an intensive English program.

**Theme 2: Belonging.**

*Legitimacy, Existence, and Being Forgotten*

This was the most prominent theme in the study and could be traced throughout the interviews. The discussion of legitimacy of the programs and their members was brought up in different ways by all participants. One leader answered that because their program offered PhD students a field opportunity, “that makes us legitimate in the eyes of [Large Southeastern Research (R1) University].” Another director said, “We're ... looked on as-as experts in the field of cross-cultural understanding, education.” Director Sarah commented, “We’ve tried with all of our programs to become a part of the fabric of the campus in an institution.” On the other hand, one of the directors pointed out that she had a critic who “doesn’t understand why [their] students can’t just go to the local community college and then transfer back,” though she felt that their unit was “very incorporated.” Another director compared the time before creating an academic pathway and after:

> In the past, it just used to be you know an IEP, …, we didn't have many connections with the university, but then we saw the opportunity and the need to do something in addition to just, you know, getting our students because the university needed to diversify ... [University President] actually has this agenda of internalization of the campus, so we are trying to align you know our efforts to that of the University , and in this way we work, as I said, closely with undergraduate admissions, so we travel together, we, you know, …
do all the advertisement, not only for our programs, but for the University, so when we
go abroad, we are basically recruiting for the University.

Similar to the legitimacy category, the participants spoke of their units’ existence or nonexistence within the institutions of higher education where they were housed. Four out of five participants were particularly vocal about not being known as a unit in their institution. When asked about what other units think of his department, one participant laughed as he replied, “If they even … have heard of us! If they even know we exist!” Another director mentioned that “it is still an ongoing process” of explaining what their role was. While they were housed in the Department of Linguistics, “[People] didn’t necessarily know that we existed.” She explained:

I think they thought the international office was where they found all their answers. ... We have a different reporting line now. We used to be within a department, and because of that … I mean we were not as visible. I now report directly to the Dean of the college that has given us a different kind of visibility.

When asked if other departments on campus saw the role of the IEP the same way the Director at Large Southeastern Research University A did, her answer was, “Well, that is, that is where the discrepancy lies, you know because … the department of admissions know really well who we are. Now, the rest of the university, the other departments - not so much, at least that wasn't the case before we started our bridge program.” She described that her unit started a bridge program for students who were conditionally admitted to Large Southeastern Research (R1) University A and studied intensive English first, and to transition to a degree program, they had to provide a TOEFL score, but the students could not produce a high enough score to be admitted. “That's when we created a bridge program where they will continue language development,” the director explained. The bridge program was only one semester in length. The director pointed out that
“the demand in the field” for the students to earn credit sooner instead of just studying the language, pushed the university into creating a pathway program which consisted of two levels, and students took credited classes at the LSRUA. The director pointed out that they were not a part of an academic unit, so “English for academic purposes classes are not for credit.”

Another director used different perspectives to explain how her IEP is viewed by other departments:

If I look at it from an infrastructure piece – how we engage with say … the service units on campus: the student billing office or the health center, housing - the non-academic pieces, we are very much a burden because we're not in Banner, because our students are invisible, and so we're not allowed a banner, because the old registrar, we have a new registrar, the old registrar didn't want non-credit classes dirtying the data, so it's our fault… so it's our fault that we have to have parallel systems. So the resentment comes from us even though we're not given the tools to be a good team player, so looking at it from an infrastructure perspective, we're viewed as the problem child. … When I consider academic units, I think we have good relationships because they reach out to us, we coordinate with them. When I consider the college, I think we are considered, I think for a long time we were considered … problematic, but I think that now that we've worked very hard to overcome some of those differences some of the challenges in banner, for example, and I think when our numbers grew, suddenly we were visible on campus, and we were viewed as a resource. After that, when the numbers were falling, now we're back to being the burden again because we're not lining the pockets and the coffers of the university, but I think that we made enough progress that suddenly people are looking at us as a potential resource in a different way.
One of the directors spoke about his connections with the upper echelon officers at the university, talking to them about the international students and their needs. He mentioned, “I know the president pretty well myself, so I send her emails…” The evidence of the unit’s “existence” was in the director’s explanation of the number of the university leaders and departments with which he worked and that many of them considered the members of the program experts.

Another category that resonates with the notion of existence was the theme, *forgotten*. All five participants spoke about this matter, but they focused on different aspects. One of the directors discussed that the department and the members “tend to be forgotten,” and he wished for “a more concrete position on any committee” where he could represent his unit. The other IEP directors spoke about making sure that their units are not forgotten and are included. Another director said, “So my role the way I see it is, is to, number one, you know, do a good job with the departments and trying to get our name out and letting them know what is it that we're doing.” One of the schools did not have a large international population, and that was why the director felt he needed to be “keeping the international students in everybody’s mind and their needs.” Another director, even though not necessarily serving IEP students, stressed:

I'm part of every committee that deals with international students or at least a part of the discussion, so the university has an international student committee. I am on that. We have a committee, subcommittee of, that deals with preparation for incoming students, and the articulation among all units of how that would work, so you know campus testing, you know, the student health things, the immigration stuff, academic advising - all of that is in place and ready to go when new students arrive, and that's matriculated
students. The IEP students we're taking care of ourselves, but we do have an ongoing orientation that other offices participate in.

Having a Place at the Table and Being Siloed

Having “a place at the table” strongly resonated with the tone of all five interviews. Some directors mentioned that they were treated as equals. Since Director Sarah started to report directly to the Dean instead of a Department Head, she felt that there was a lot more visibility:

Because we're there, I go to all the chairs meetings and other things, so we're not one level below, but actually are there at the table as equals, although I would not view myself as equal with a chair of a department necessarily…

She did not see herself equal to a chair because her position was not faculty, but she was working with the Dean for her successor to hold the title of faculty. Director Kirk asserted that his position being faculty and his students “not different” from fully-matriculated students, so he felt that they were treated the same as all the other units in his college. Director Pilar was able to “meet quarterly with the vice provost for finance and operations, with the dean's office,” and she said she was “glad to be at the table.” She talked about all of the meetings, committees, and interest groups that she attended to “do quite a lot of cross-pollination.”

Director Boris spoke about “being a valuable part of LSRUB” though it was not always easy. He said that if you just called people and asked to do something for IEP students, you might not have gotten any results, “so you have to go around the roadblocks and get to the right people.” Director Boris explained his opportunities:

I do have a place at the table if there’s ever a discussion on international issues here on campus, among international students. If international students, for example, have an issue with plagiarism, they go before the…the student responsibility board, or whatever
it's called. They will contact me and say okay, instead of just kicking the student out, they do understand that it is cultural a lot of the times, and they'll and then work with me or my [IEP].

The notion of being siloed was discussed by four participants. One of the directors discussed how his IEP had to go through a change from being completely segregated to what it was at the time of the interview:

When I first took over … the director who started this had, and I think this was very common, had kind of an “island” approach. We are this little island over here, we keep a low profile, no one knows about us, and that's a good thing, you know. I've changed that and, and so we've gotten more scrutiny, but on the other hand, … we're able to tap into different resources.

Another director described the isolation within her university by using the word “siloed.” She expressed her disappointment by explaining that at the university “there's no unified international goal or strategy or something that we're all working collectively towards. We all are sort of independent operators…” She described that because they were so segregated on campus, no one was sure whose job it was to internationalize. She added:

We're siloed, so whenever I try to whatever, I raise this issue. The response is, “Oh, the vice provost for [international office] should be doing that, and yet when I'm in the room with him, that’s somebody else's job, right? And I don't think that he means it maliciously or trying to get out of anything, I just think it's unclear on this campus because there isn't that international message from the top.

At LWRU, the IEP director spoke about feeling frustrated because they were “very decentralized in the University.” He elaborated:
We have our program that's in the Department [of Languages] in the College of [Arts and Sciences]. Then we have the [International Office] which does the admissions, I-20s, and then we have the admissions office that does the recruiting, so we are three different units.

He felt that his responsibility was “to try to bring things together,” and that was “very frustrating on [his] part” because the admissions team were “not really knowledgeable,” and his attempts to “facilitate more collaboration and stuff” did not always work. He added that “it's not a part of the University’s mission of recruiting international students.”

One more IEP director spoke of being segregated though she attributed some of that to the IEP being off campus. She explained that “in the past, it just used to be you know an IEP, …, we didn't have many connections with the university.” One of her stories describes how much their students were segregated from university systems in place:

Our students, for example, would get an ID, you know, from LSRUA but it’s a, you know, [IEP] student, and then that ID was… I mean, they couldn't use it anywhere, um…, to the point that we had to purchase, you know, the bus passes for them to take the bus, you know, and get around because when your [university] ID… I mean I have my ID, and I can use the bus any time because it's included, right? So [the senior administrator] has been fighting, and fighting, and fighting, and finally, two years ago, we, you know, we won this, this big battle, and, and we actually got our students… and of course that meant that students would have to pay the fees, you know, the comprehensive fees.

She also mentioned that her students were “not included for on-campus housing,” but if they were in IEP only though the Pathway Program, students were allowed to live on campus.
**Faculty and Students**

Faculty status is another aspect of belonging that was notable in the interviews with the IEP directors. All five participants specified that their instructional staff were classified as faculty. One director was especially adamant about the importance of this status: “I think really our faculty status is a huge, huge equalizer. We're in the Department of [Languages], you know, so we're just considered faculty like everyone else, so we are not different.” In this IEP, the instructors’ status had changed over time. The Director clarified:

Under the system that we were hired, master’s is terminal, so we were all hired as lecturers, but then the code changed, and as the code changed, we also changed with it. So we're associate, we're on tenure-track, so professorial, so… But now since moved into Department [of Languages], that happened a few years ago, the new department head is requiring PhDs, and we fought them against that. … We argued – one’s researching, and one is teaching degree. He said, “If you want to have, you know, master’s, then it won't be a tenure-track line; it will be a lecture line.”

The director explained that they chose to keep tenure-track lines because they “are precious” and therefore all of the new faculty searches needed to be for the candidates holding PhDs, though the director was adamant to search for someone whose “research book was really pedagogy focused.”

LNRU’s IEP director sounded proud of the university’s strong reputation and how special her program was. She asserted that her “faculty were expected to publish, they were expected to present, they're expected to be English language specialists, they were the professionals in the field beyond the classroom.” The IEP director explained that her faculty were “treated as equals until recently.” She expanded on how the inequality had developed and her concerns about it:
We unionized about the same time about four years ago just the before I came - it was a critical time in IEP’s history, and that brought all of the non-tenured faculty salary to a salary floor, so everybody has that. Everybody gets their pay raises, and everybody has benefits - it's full-time. Everybody teaches three classes, but there is no standard workload at the LNRI. Each department sets its own workload. It's very interesting, so it's hard to compare departments. If I compare to foreign languages, everybody teaches three classes. Interestingly enough, foreign language classes are five hours. Our credit bearing classes are four hours, and our IEP faculty used to teach 12 hours if they had been full-time for a long time and eighteen hours if they were adjuncts that were converted into full-time when the Union came in. We got rid of that to standardize and make everybody equal, and then with the continued decrease in students, the dean's office is forcing us to put everybody at eighteen contact hours in the intensive English program, so the, you know, I’m not the favorite person at the moment, but that's what we have to do, so right now I would say workload is very unequal, and I'm actually a little resentful of that because I think that it's a short-term, very narrow solution to the financial problem. It may get us through these couple of years, and maybe in the long run, we'll look back and go, “Yes, it was a good idea!” I just I hate to do that to my faculty. … It's so, but the foreign language faculty teach fifteen hours. So are we teaching eighteen? Is that equitable? It's pretty close. It comes down to the number of classes, not the number of hours, so in that way, maybe yes, there's equality, but there's also, because we're a financially self-supporting unit, that still puts us in some of these other questionable areas as well.
She pointed out that she hoped that one day she would be allowed to give her faculty release time for research projects and presentations though in her opinion it did not look promising at that time. Still, her faculty “hold exactly the same rank [as other faculty], and in fact, we have a promotion track as well, so there's an instructor, a senior instructor, and a senior II instructor.”

The other three directors said that their teaching staff had faculty designation with promotion. Director Boris said, “My faculty are legitimate faculty, they have designation called Specialized Faculty. They have a promotion track - Teaching One, Two, and three. They have the binders that they have to fill out just like anybody else. My designation is faculty administrator.” Director Emma described the situation in her university:

I am considered faculty. Our instructors, we have the full-time faculty. They are labeled T&R, teaching and research but not really, it's not really a research they do. It's, it's teaching, but I guess they give have any other, other label for them, so they are instructors, non-tenured. Okay, but they get their benefits, and a nine-month contract, and they can work on a separate contract in the summer.

Director Sarah explained that even though there is no tenure, they had an instructional track faculty:

We’ve just made the switch to instructional track faculty which has the promotion built-in, so you, you’re a lecturer, and you can apply for promotion, and you go through the regular promotion process at the college, and if you want, then you go to the Associate Professor of Instruction, and then Professor of Instruction.

She also pointed out that the intensive English program’s visibility on campus could be attributed at part to other programs, such as International Teaching Assistant (ITA), that the director oversees and where her faculty was teaching.
Five participants spoke about the classes that their IEPs offer and how much weight they have. Only one director said that their classes carry credit, “Our classes are credit-bearing – up to 36 credits can be applied towards graduation.” Another director said that their classes were not for credit, but they offered a 1-credit class to all students, international and American. She elaborated:

We also have started to offer one-credit classes that start and go for the last six weeks of the semester, and the idea for this was that a lot of students end up – that’s about the drop date for students to drop classes, and they might want to get rid of a class, but then they would be below full time, so they won’t get their financial aid, and of course with international students, they can’t. So this provides them options rather than PE classes to pick up in the last six weeks.

Four out of five directors who spoke about types of classes offered were housed in an academic unit, but only one of the IEPs was able to offer classes for credit.

Language student preparedness versus other units’ perception about their preparedness were two distinct categories within the theme of belonging. Two directors spoke about how well their students were prepared. One director spoke about a study on which they had been collecting the data to see “how our students compare to other international students and compare to domestic students, and our great surprise, our students were doing much better than the direct admits and also, you know, the first-year domestic students.” She also pointed out that the students that graduate from her IEP would be “more prepared and knowing more about the academic culture where as the direct admit, you know, has no background, nothing like that.” The other director reported that his “students are doing well.” He gave an example:
Our students are well prepared, you know, they all get it at least, well not all, but the average is 3.0 GPA, so when… you know often times when we get call, “Oh, this international student, blah-blah-blah, and why are they here?” And I usually get the name, and then I look them up and find out that they are not one of our students. It’s a TOEFL admit, and I just call them back, I say, “Well, you know, they came on TOEFL, so you know…”

The perception of the English language instruction and student preparedness was discussed by three out of five participants. Even though his IEP was “considered a part of the academic mission of the graduate school,” one director spoke specifically to the perception of the intensive English instruction by the other units on campus:

They would probably see us as a place for remedial English instruction, not an academic, a place where international students learn some English, learn how to communicate, you know. … It's kind of strange because they-they don't see, in my opinion, people haven't really thought about it, don't see us teaching English in an academic way, like the French Department or German or something like that. They see us more as adult vocational type English, and yet they seem to expect miracles as you know because they don't know anything about language learning. They say, “Hey, you can get them ready and up to speed in six weeks, right?”

Another director mentioned that even though they constantly “structure [their] programs and tweak whatever [they] need to tweak in [their] curriculum,” their students were “seen as you know international students that lack …, you know, … the language skills, that they are not culturally adopted yet, that they have work to do, so unfortunately that's still the view.” The
director form LNRU mentioned that even though supported by the Dean, the IEP students were not supported by all. She explained:

I still get the grumblly email message from the graduate student who's, you know, teaching a class, and he's got to spend extra time with those international students or from the professor who's mad that they don't all have perfect English. You know, and we just, we feel these questions, and we send them on up, and it's like - that's part of the diversity. Would you be upset that somebody can't climb the stairs in your class because they have a cane and can't? … You know, … it's ongoing training.

When asked how the students were regarded by others on campus, Director Sarah answered that her students were viewed as any other international student on campus, and it had always been that way since the program had begun in the 1980s. She explained that that might be attributed to the work they did to promote IEP students:

I think they're not seen as different from any other international students on campus. I'm not sure people even to know that there's necessarily this group that is separate and therefore has less language ability. I think people view them as like anybody else. I think we do a lot of work with other units for the intensive English department’s students. … We have a compilation of student writing that we publish each semester, … our students are beginning to do some service learning, and so we try to promote those things, and so people know who they are, but I don't know that they necessarily know that they're really any different from anybody else except, you know, and they aren’t different except that they just don't have the language yet.

An important part of belonging is the student connectedness to the university and its resources. All five IEP directors spoke about connectedness. Three directors pointed out that the
students, even though they could feel more connected, did not engage as much. One director discussed that few students “made a point in actually going [to university events] and doing stuff and just feeling that learning about campus is great for them but that's only a few, not the majority.” Most of her students were in a different situation because their IEP classes did not take place on campus and other factors:

Now in terms of identity, like, “Oh, I'm [an LSRUA] student already.” I don't think so because of the nature of, you know, and the location, and how our classes take place. We already know here the LCI they see only their instructors, then they go home, then they come back here. They don't have that much exposure, so, therefore, I would say … it's almost impossible for someone who is not there on a daily basis, you know, to have that feeling of, “Oh, I belong in this community.” So for them, it's gonna be, you know, moving to [LSRUA] and transferring. It's … a change, definitely.

Another director pointed out a similar concern about her students’ connectedness to the university though because they had a difficult time separating from their communities. She elaborated:

Five or six years ago I would've said yes [about the students having the sense of belonging on campus], and I'm hoping that our intensive English students do, just because they have us as their informants on the culture and other things, and people of the State have a reputation as being very kind and accepting, and City is this little university bubble that student… people who live here are very used to persons from other countries, so I think the students feel welcome that way. We have so many students from China and that number … had grown to a very large number among our degree-seeking students as well … they’ve kind of become their own community, and so for those that I
think who want to break out of that, they can, and they can feel welcome. I think some of
them don't, and this is normal, you know, we gravitate toward what we know. … We are
really included in anything. Anything in the international office does, all of our students
are involved in that. … Any of the activities that they do, they can do. I mean, our
students can play intramural sports.

Director Kirk described all of the outreach that they had done trying to involve the
students with the help of other offices by sending out invitations, but he felt that the students
could be more involved. He discussed the reasons why:

We are providing, provide lots of opportunities for [connecting]. The students don't
always take advantage of that, you know, for whatever reason - they're busy, they're tired,
they're bored, they're shy, … but we do a pretty good job giving them an opportunity to
integrate if they want, so it's hard for me to say if they feel that they're not… we do ask
that question, and most of them say that they feel connected to the University, and they
have opportunities. I always have this sense that they're not engaging as much as they
could. Yeah, it could be cultural – we have a lot of Chinese students, and they don't
necessarily want to reach out, you know, go out and do these things, but there's lots and
lots of opportunities for that.

To feel belongingness, students could participate in university activities and events, but to
do that, they needed to be invited. One director said:

They're not being invited because people forget about us. They, they simply do, and so
I'm constantly having to “over here” wave my arm. Hey, and I learned to have a thick
skin about it and not be offended by it.
He added that the International Office invited them to events, but no one else generally did. “They'll usually remember us and invite us, but other than that… not really.” Another director presented a two-sided sentiment towards the sense of belonging. She expressed the following thoughts about the program members’ feeling that they were a part of the university:

I think there's a lot of anger and bitterness right now, and so if I were to ask people today, I don't necessarily think that they would, that would be the first emotion that they would express towards the [program] or [LNRU], being a part of the campus because I think that they feel a little beat up after this past winter and spring. The students, I think, feel connected. We do have conversation partners and tutors in our classrooms that are [LNRU] students. We hire a lot of students to work in activities and, and to staff our reception desk, and it provides support.

Overall, the theme of Belonging became the largest out of other themes and helped in answering the first research question. All of the participants spoke of the way their faculty were seen, the way their students were involved, whether the directors were seen as equals, if anyone knew about their programs’ existence and other important issues. According to the available literature, intensive English programs have always struggled with legitimacy and belonging (Eaton, 2013; Heyen, 2016; Jenks & Kennell, 2012; Strecker, 2016). The study participants raised a concern about their unit being not known by many departments on campus. Some participants explained that the departments with which they work directly know about their existence, but if they did not did not work with a department, the program members were “invisible.” Additionally, the directors mentioned that some departments and individuals on campus were frustrated with them because they were “dirtying the data” or “not lining the pockets and the coffers of the university.” On the other hand, two program directors spoke about
feeling that they belonged to the campus and one of them even mentioned that she felt they had “become a part of the fabric of the campus.” All of the directors spoke of participating in various activities on campus and being allowed to join meetings and sit on committees, which made them feel more legitimacy and have a voice. In general, the directors’ answers showed a diversity of results and provided valuable insight into the perceptions of the IEP directors about their programs and members’ sense of connection to the campuses’ communities.

**Theme 3: Funding Priority.**

Even though not as expansive as the theme of Belonging, the Funding Priority theme provided better understanding of the current situation in the participants’ programs. Three subthemes emerged during the data analysis.

One of the subthemes clarified how the programs were funded and how that related to their access to resources. All five participants spoke about receiving revenue though their focus varied. Two directors spoke specifically about being able to attain resources if they made the money. Director Boris discussed his program’s funding:

> I think because we are not E&G funded, you know the state, we don’t get the state dollars, I think we miss out on some things that we could… possibly nicer, let's say, nicer furniture or nicer computers or something like that. Like I said, as long as we have the money, we can buy the computers, you know. It's pretty nice. But other departments, for example, have, have money to go to conferences for their faculty. It's built into their budget. Well, we don't. Again, if our enrollment is down, and we don't have the money, they don't go to conferences and professional development. Little things like that.

Director Emma explained that they “generate [their] own finds” and therefore they “have everything [they] need.” She continued:
We are a unit that does not receive money from the university. We are self-supporting, so we depend on our enrollment, so that's why we are suffering now because of low enrollment. Okay! So because of that, everything comes from, from our money.

Director Pilar explained that even though she reported to a dean in a college, they were not fully considered an academic unit and did not see a lot of financial support from the top:

We are actually not an academic unit. We are considered a designated operation. We are the same as housing, and the reason we're the same as housing is because we offer training to international students which is the intent for … for study abroad, but they love us in that category, which again is absurd. … We are not allowed to operate at a deficit, so what we have done, we are, we actually ended at forty-three thousand dollars in the hole last year. We were very, very close. We used up all of our reserves. We are anticipating about six hundred-thousand-dollar deficit this year, which I was aiming for a 1.2-million-dollar deficit we've managed to reduce even further, and so if our numbers grow, then, you know, that’ll be okay, hopefully.

She discussed how much contribution her unit provided to the university by retaining the IEP students and matriculating them into degree programs:

What we've done is we've really demonstrated that all of our students that go to the University, each one of those students is multi-million dollars, so the six hundred thousand dollars to keep us afloat, really, in the long run, is generating profit for the university. Those students likely would not come back. There's a real arrogance here though. What, what do you mean they wouldn't come to the [LNRU]? We are [the Large Northwestern Research University]!
When asked if her unit received access to the same resources as other units, Director Pilar pointed out, “We do pay, you know, heavy tax, and, so the expectation is we're going to get those same resources.” She clarified that the “tax” was 10.5% and had recently gone up to 12% on expenditures and some payroll, which accounted to “about a million dollars a year.” She continued by explaining how valuable the department’s financial contribution was to the university in just the required “tax”:

I haven't figured out how the payroll is taxed, but it is. It may not be at that higher percentage, but we, we hand…I mean if we went away, the university would two years ago would have lost five hundred thousand dollars in tax. This year, I think it's 288.

Another director told a different story because his unit was E&G funded, which he said would “be the outlier for [this] study.” He pointed out that “if [their] enrollment drops too low, then [they] might get faculty cut or something like that.” Additional projects meant additional funds though:

We have some extra money because, because we're not self-funded, money just comes from the state to pay salaries, operating cost, so it's a very simple, but… but we do have some money because of these couple of external projects that we have and that’s been building up.

Director Sarah spoke about the way her department’s funds were treated in her college. She said that even though she had “free reign on what [she] wants to spend these for,” it might be a special arrangement that had been like that for years:

I feel that I’ve had some good conversations with the budget officer and the dean, and we have something that we doesn't get touched, we know that things are just, some of our money might be used for something else but that we are taken care of and we are not…
We don’t pay any rent, we pay no overhead or rent for anything, so I feel like it’s this kind of nice give and take. Right now, we’re not being disadvantaged. And when the numbers went down and instead of taking a little more money out of ours for the year, it was like nope, we are not doing that anymore [because] sometimes they used it for faculty startup, [because] it’s been really hard times in terms of money coming in from the legislature. And I feel like it would be mean-spirited of me to say, “No, this is our money,” because they could come right back and say, “We are going to charge you rent, and we want an X amount of money for overhead.” So I think it's worked out very nicely, like we have nice understanding of the budget and what we need.

Director Sarah, along with the three other participants, discussed the Fund Balance subtheme. In her program’s case, they used to have all of their funds “in just [their] account.” The Dean’s decision to “put [their] money into a quasi-endowment fund” was driven by the pressure from “central administration who had seen that money and wondered why it was sitting there.” The Director explained the way their funds were moved:

[Dean] put it into an endowment fund that than could be used for all things ESL… not the account itself but the interest from it. And then with new deans and us being moved over into the College, um… the money… I know how much is in that quasi endowment, but sometimes, but not everything went in there, and so it was a little more of a give and take, but I feel that I’ve had some good conversations with the budget officer and the dean, and we have something that doesn't get touched.

As it was mentioned previously, Director Sarah was able to use the money as she decided:

I think it's worked out very nicely, like, we have nice understanding of the budget and what we need. And I'm not… I have free reign on what I want to spend these for.
Obviously, if I’m going to spend fifteen thousand dollars on advertising up from what I’d spent before, I would call the budget officer and say, “Is there any financial reason on the horizon why I shouldn’t be doing this,” but that's all.

Even though in general they were allowed to purchase everything they needed, Director Emma was not sure what they were allowed to keep currently “because [she didn’t] deal with it.” She clarified that there was a financial director in charge of the budget. She continued:

I mean, of course, I have access to the to the budget, we discuss the budget every year. I know that we are getting to… because, you know, we used to, I remember when talking about budget, five years, six years ago, and we have this surplus, you know, account which was like awesome, and that was the time when we had three hundred students, but I know, it is a little by little, you know, we're running out of money. … There is a possibility that we might be able to request the university, you know, for some kind of line of credit or help, but I don't know of any specifics at the moment.

Even though there was plenty of discussion about access to resources in the interviews, the information about space availability stood out the most. Four out of five respondents spoke about their space and classrooms and how they gained access to them. Two directors sounded grateful when they discussed their arrangements. One director said, “They had given us a nice building we don't pay rent on, we don't pay the utilities on, we've got 10 classrooms here. Yeah. It's, it's very sweet; it's a great location.” The other director felt like they were in a great position as concerns their building, “We don’t pay any rent, we pay no overhead or rent for anything, so I feel like it’s this kind of nice give and take.” However, she spoke differently about having to rent a large space for events:
We don't have a big space on campus. … We could get a ballroom at the University Center, student union for a thousand dollars. When we have our final ceremony, we have to pay 500 for it, and then you have to have catering done by the university too, so stuff like that just gets too expensive. So every time I have the opportunity, it's a large space with cooking facilities, so that you could have a real international potluck or whatever but... hasn't happened yet. We used to have it, but they tore that building down.

The access to physical resources of these directors contrasted with the experiences of two other directors. One IEP leader spoke of having to rent space, including the classrooms outside of campus, paying for it out of their budget. She responded to the questions about the availability of resources, “We are off campus, so we actually rent this place. … We generate our own funds, and with that, you know, we pay. So we don’t have problems with classroom space.” The other director explained her program’s access to resources before a reorganization which had taken place at their institution right before she became a director there:

As part of that reorg, we were housed in three buildings on campus. We had offices in three different buildings, so faculty hardly ever saw each other. It was incredible. I've never seen anything like it. There were not enough classroom spaces, so [IEP] had to rent space off campus. My question was, “Would the math department have to rent space on campus?” Probably not, but we rented at the time for about seventy thousand dollars a year - a church, we rented two churches in fact, … and we were fully responsible for that, and we had to pay taxes on that expense as well because, and it were taxed on our expenditures not our tuition, which I think in the long run is actually cheaper for us, so I'm not complaining.
The director continued by discussing the changes that came with the reorganization and how they made her and the program members feel:

But as part of this reorg, we were given a building that was used as a swing space, so now we do have a home, so in that way, I feel like we are equal because every other department has a home in there, faculty are in that same location, so we're in an old remodeled school. Then again, we had to help pay for - we paid for 50% of the remodel, including structural things that really should be the university's cost. I don't think math would have been asked to do that, but then again, I could be wrong. I mean this is the [LNRU]. It's very much “feed yourself or starve” mentality so, you know, maybe so. It's okay. We have great space, we love it. It's beautiful – we have 11 dedicated classrooms, we have two kitchenettes, we have offices, we have conference rooms, we have a library, we have a tutoring center - we're very happy, very, very happy.

Most IEPs are revenue-generating units and are required to be fiscally healthy, even during the difficult market and political changes (Carkin, 1997; Eaton, 2013; Eskey, 1997; Heyen, 2016). It was evident from the interviews that access to fiscal resources was rather important for these IEP programs with four out of five program directors reporting that they were self-funded and used the money to support the program needs while one of them operated on E&G funds. One director was concerned about mentioning that they would like to keep their revenue because she felt that the upper administration could request them to pay overhead and rent. Some study participants explained that they did not mind being revenue-generating units because when the funds were available, they could purchase what they needed for their programs. However, during low enrollment times, they were not “allowed to operate at a deficit” and saw no fiscal support from the upper-level administration. In addition to paying “tax” to a
host institution and sponsoring initiatives, the programs facilitated the matriculation on IEP students to the university, generating additional profit in the form of tuition dollars. Because these programs are revenue-generating, it could be expected that they would provide parts of their revenue to the university. Still, the program directors felt frustration for having to rent classrooms and pay for space as well as pay for any major building renovations in addition to their other commitments.

**Theme 4: Work with University.**

Theme 4 helped answer the first research question. The participants discussed their perceptions and experiences with other departments on campuses. Four out of five participants spoke directly about their role as a feeder program into the universities’ degree programs. The director at LSRUB talked about the way they transitioned students to the university:

One [role] is a feeder program into their graduate programs, and the students come through us and then on into their programs, through regular IEP classes, and then through conditional admission. So we work with the departments there on how to give conditional admission. We get them to our place, and then get them up to speed, and move them on.

Another director described the program’s contribution as being “the major recruiter for the University.” She added, “We work very closely with undergraduate admissions.” The third leader said that the program’s role was “obviously a feeder program.” She added an important factor, “We do have conditional admission, and since that, I think people have seen that it's more of a feeder.”

The fourth director also discussed the situation in her university which attributed to her program having a feeder status on campus:
[LNRU] has always had great enrollment. We’re nationally ranked, we typically don't have to go knocking on doors for students – they just fall from the sky. That's not happening all of a sudden, and so now, there's a bit of a panic that suddenly we’re viewed, which is what of course we've been saying for years, we're now viewed as a potential pipeline.

When asked about the ways the department created visibility on campus, this IEP director immediately responded with a laugh, “We send students to the university!”

Another sub-theme that was evident from the interviews is Value. All of the resources, either tangible or non-tangible, which the IEPs provided to their students and host institutions, have been combined in this category. All five directors spoke about the value they had and how they were perceived in their universities. Director Sarah described the programs she oversaw and their function:

Our IEP is not totally separate. I direct ESL program, so I direct the IEP, our ESL support program, and our ITA program, so it's all under one umbrella which I think also helps, so we're not quite so separated in our faculty teaching all of them, and they're not only IEP faculty or whatever, so I think that helps, so it's easier for us to be a presence on campus because of the other programs in some ways. I think it plays that role, it plays the role “what do you do when you have students in your class who are having a difficulty” the… coming back to ESL programs and the IEP, also. I think the IEP performs a function in … helping the larger community understand the cross-cultural differences, language differences, how to… we perform a lot of education with our international office on academic ESL. What does that mean, and what kinds of challenges international students have in the classroom, and how better to communicate with international students from a
perspective of language? So again, I see it as performing multiple functions, and we’ve tried with all of our programs to become a part of the fabric of the campus in an institution.

Director Boris explained why the IEP was formed and all of the various services that it provided at the time of the interview:

We were first formed to serve as a research site, teaching development site for the MA TESOL and PhD program and we're still doing that. So one of the major features that makes us valuable to Large Southeastern Research (R1) University B (LSRUB) is we serve as a site for our interns who are getting their masters to come over and observe classes and, and so on. That's one. We also serve as a teaching site for the PhD students to come and teach a couple classes a semester and develop, you know. They get a stipend from us and a tuition waiver from the MA TESOL program.

He continued by explaining that they were “a resource for the graduate programs” by teaching the students and transitioning them “through regular IEP classes and then through conditional admission.” The director explained the process and added about other services they provided:

We work with the departments there on how to give conditional admission. We get them to our place, and then get them up to speed, and move them on. So… and then, the third one probably is as a resource for their international students who are already at [LSRUB] but are having language troubles and/or cultural, you know, cross cultural communication troubles, and so they reach out to us, and we help them in that way.

Director Boris pointed out that the unit was seen as “vocational type English, and yet they seemed to expect miracles” in terms of preparing students for the American university.
Two directors said that they were seen as experts providing services to the university. Director Kirk explained what they did “to better serve the LWRU students”:

Our mission is preparing students for academic study. We also, we're also looked on as experts in the field of cross-cultural understanding, education, giving workshops. I mean, since we are faculty, you know. I'm a full professor, there's other, you know, associate professors in our field, and we give workshops to other faculty. We're asked to give workshops to understand international students, to understand intercultural communication. … Our speaking classes is getting them involved in more activities around campus. You know, we have our [Student Club], where we have parties and stuff and bringing Americans, and we’ve recently connected our students with students in Spanish, and you know the American students are taking Spanish and Chinese, and things like the that.

Director Pilar said that in which way the department and its members were perceived was always changing:

I think how we're perceived on campus changes depending on what's happening on campus. We're actually in the process of getting into banner. There is hope, so I know I can't tell you how thrilled I am. So once, I think, once that happens, I think that will be viewed in a more favorable light because we won't be *that* department. So yeah, so that I think, that's how we're perceived. I think we're perceived as experts. I think our students are often perceived as troublemakers because they don't use articles properly, or they don't always conjugate their verbs, or they put word stress in the wrong place. I think our students are also valued, though, because we're a very white state, and we're a very white
campus, so I think our students are valued by many people in that way and possibly
resented by others because… for the same reason, so it's a constant work in progress. …

She also added that some members of their university community saw the program in a
negatively:

I think, I mean I've had people tell me they wouldn't work in the [IEP] for anything
[because] we're a disaster, and that was by a staff member who had just received an
outstanding staff member award, I might add. Not an [IEP] staff, it was somebody across
campus. So you know but those kinds of things, right. There is this reputation, and it's
hard to change reputation.

Director Pilar reflected on which departments reached out to them and what the reasons for the
contact were sometimes:

Some departments reach out to us: the graduate school certainly reaches out to us;
admissions – absolutely, also [International office] – yes; upper-level Administration -
probably not so much. We do have a good relationship with our sponsored projects on
campus, the grants department, and a couple of times when grants have been submitted.
If they've seen a possible need for ESL, they'll mention it to the department, and, like
chemistry was applying for a grant, and, and they reached out, and they asked if they
could include us as the English language support, so of course they did. So in those
ways… sometimes if questions are asked, we'll get pulled in. Unfortunately, it's more
about money when those conversations do happen, and that's sad because it shouldn't just
be about the money. It should also be about the contributions that our students make.

Director Emma pointed out that the unit’s value, in addition to “bringing more students,”
was in “providing [their] international students the best quality possible, so that these students
are prepared when they transfer to [LSRUA].” She also described a situation when she was invited to participate in a foreign visit because she could speak that language and was asked to hire instructors to help with the visit. She added, “Some departments reach out to us, you know, for help.”

The next sub-theme which became evident after the data analysis was named Activities. All five directors spoke about the various activities that they offered to the students and university community. One director’s experience differed from the rest of the IEP directors. The uniqueness of his unit was that in comparison to many IEPs, it was not the unit’s responsibility to recruit, create immigration documents, or admit students. Director Kirk described:

We have our program that's in the Department [Languages] in the College of [Arts and Sciences]. Then we have the [International Office] which does the admissions, I-20s, and then we have the Admissions office that does the recruiting, so we are three different units.

Director Kirk’s department was “asked to do workshops to try to help other people on campus understand, you know some of the issues that come up with [lack of cultural understanding].” His unit focused mostly on the academic experience for the students while the student services work belonged to a different department in the university, though there was definite interaction between them. The director explained the relationships he had to monitor between those many departments and the IEP students:

[International office] does that, student services, and again, we work with student services, work with the people there, both on the intake of the students when they come in because they have to do an orientation with them, so we work with them to make sure
that they’re serving the needs of the students and not overlapping like our orientation. But yeah, it's very decentralized. I mean but they're. … I mean they're real, fully matriculated students, so they'll get everything that they get. So we just want to make sure that what student services is providing, is helpful for our students, and student services is very grateful for us to help them, you know, design modules, look at the website, make sure, you know… does this make sense to international students? So we work with them on that, but it's really their job. And we sort of have to monitor that stuff. [International Office], they come up with their activities, you know. They don't really ask us for input on that. They have lots of activities for international students, American students, and our students get invited to that. … We’re connecting students to other American students in their language classes, so we've been working with the faculty on that. … There's a Tea-Time that English Department has, something, tea-time that we work with them on, and [International Office] has a conversation partner… You see how these things are all going on. We are just trying to keep track of things.

Even though other departments at LWRU provided many activities, the IEP director clarified that the IEP offered activities even with their limited budget:

We have our own activities that we do internally. …but they're usually just [IEP] students [because] we don't have a huge budget, so they are [IEP] students, some of the American students that work with our students. It's not, it's not like an open invite for everybody. … Well, we take them down to … we have a small lake close by, and well we're taking them down for lunch on Friday, and we've rented, we have an outdoor rec program, so they're coming to provide a bunch of canoes and stand-up paddle boards. We’ll have a barbecue, do something like that. We have Halloween parties, we take them bowling, we take them
hiking. I've been trying to do more stuff with the outdoor rec program 'cause they have a really good rec program here. … We have workshops for them, writing workshops, we have movie nights, things like that.

The other four program directors spoke of the various activities and programs they were offering to their students and the university community. Director Boris outlined the activities which his IEP organized for university members:

I think we've done a lot here at [LSRUB] to, to bring them [IEP students] together with [LSRUB] students, one of the which is through our conversation partner program – that’s one; the other is through our TEFL [Teaching English as a Foreign Language] certificate program. These students are mainly [LSRUB] undergrads, and the part of their training is tutoring and being conversation partners with these [university] students which then gets them, allows them to take the … IEP students out into the campus and to parties and so on. … Through our student activities we're trying to do more with getting the students out to the local hot spots in the evening – restaurants, that sort of thing, football games, of course.

In addition, Director Boris’ IEP was utilized as “a research site, teaching development site for the MA TESOL and PhD program” and “as a resource for their international students who are already at [LSRUB] but are having language troubles and/or cultural, you know, cross cultural communication troubles.” He also pointed out that they successfully collaborated with their International Office:

Every Friday the [International Office] that I talked about previously, they have an International Coffee Hour, and our students are invited and more than welcome to come there and intermingle with the [LSRUB] international students as well as the American
students who show up there. And any activities we have, we’ll invite, you know, people from [International Office] over and so we again we tried to keep it mixed that way. … When it comes to different activities, if we do show up, you know, for example, there was [International Office] again has a recognition of international players on the soccer team or something like that, an international day, and they'll invite our students over, and we get in free to the soccer games, and … they have food there and stuff like that. So in that way we are invited in anything [International Center] will do.

Director Emma shared similar experiences at her institution. Her unit also had a conversation partner program and other activities that engaged both IEP students and degree-seeking students, though she indicated that because they were not centrally located, their opportunities were less than she was hoping:

We do have a conversation partner program, so our students are matched with [LSRUA] students, … or you know sometimes even members of the community, … and they have a partner … for the entire term that they're going to question, and then they change, you know, the next term and so on and so forth. Also, we have reached out to specific departments where, you know, we know professors that have …. you know, desire to, to engage their students in more international, you know, like one time we had this history professor at the time when we had a lot of Saudis here, and he was actually, you know, teaching …. you know, the Muslim culture, you know, religion and all that, so he wanted their students to have first-hand experience, so actually … he invited us to, you know, to come, and they had this conversation partner kind of thing, you know, with their students, so they were working … with, you know, … on-campus students. Also, we had for four years now in a row, we have this dinner with the [Student Military Organization], and the
honor system, and [IEP] students together, so we put these three groups of students
together and invite faculty as well, so… and then, we just, we have these games, we have,
you know, you know, bring food and drinks, and just let them, you know, mingle. … I
mean we're trying, you know, to do all these kinds of things, and of course, we get also
guest speakers, you know, professors that come to our class, or members of the
community come to our class, so I mean those are the kinds of things… Because we are
off campus, again, there are not too many opportunities.

In addition to those programs, this department offered a Pathway program, a program for
spouses, international student orientation, and others which the director described when asked to
speak about her department’s attempts at creating visibility on campus:

The pathway program is one because, you know, …. we are requesting the departments,
you know, to offer additional sections …, and of course, you know, we will pay them for,
for these classes they are offering and, and also because they understand that in this
program, when the students actually transfer, they're going to, you know, be better
students…. So the pathway program, I think … it's a good way because also with the
number of students that we're going to bring is going to, you know, increase the number
of international students in the university.

Director Emma also spoke about trying to help other units with the international students
who were directly admitted into degree programs by understanding what the needs were. She
said, “We designed that survey, and we collected the data, we did the process of, you know,
analyzing it and putting it together in a report, and then going back to the departments and giving
them some, you know, … some solutions if you will.” The director added other ways they
contributed to the international community of the university:
Because of this new J1, you know, regulation that scholars need to have some sort of English language testing before they arrive, so we … are the ones who conduct the interviews with the scholars like you and I are doing right now, via Skype. So the departments, you know, tell their, their applicants that they will have to, you know, do this interview so that we can test their, their English oral skills because they've had a lot of complaints that sometimes, you know, they have scholars coming that cannot even, you know, put a sentence together. … Another thing also that in our hope to engage more the university community is the spouse program, so we open registration to spouses of [LSRUA] faculties, graduate students, scholars, etcetera. Of course, at a very reduced … fee, but that has also been successful and that has given us also more visibility, you know, that more people know about us because of this program. We still have, you know, spouses but also [LSRUA] employees, so we give them, you know, a special rate to learn English, and I guess we have, you know, public relations.

Director Emma was also proud of the department’s collaboration with International Office on transitioning IEP students to the university through a pathway as well as other activities:

We are, you know, collaborating like in seminars that we give to students, we've been meeting and talking about, for example, the new student orientation because we want our new students to be part of the international new student orientation, so we are, you know, we're looking into that right now.

Director Pilar described her unit’s contributions which she believed were “mission critical” to helping the host university succeed, even when those activities weren’t the department’s responsibility:
We provide diversity, we provide training, we provide language support, obviously, we provide support to faculty across campus, we provide support to undergraduates, graduates, and non-degree seeking students. We further the brand when we're on the road, whether it's at a conference presenting, on a recruiting trip, whether or not we are in [State-wide Educational Event] even. [LNRU] doesn't participate. It's the IEP that does because we're the ones that need it, right?

In addition to the work outlined above and their students’ participation “in university clubs,” Director Pilar expanded about the IEP faculty sitting on committees, teaching in colleges, and loaning her talented staff’s skills to other departments:

Our faculty teach in the College of Business, … the Department of Linguistics, and I think those are the only two departments that we connect with in that way. Some of our students are conversation partners in the Japanese courses. There's been interest in Chinese and Spanish as well, if we can build up our Spanish-speaking population. We also interact on committees, so our faculty actually serve on [LNRU] committees. … One of my directors of innovative programming, she actually had a fellowship last year to work in the dean's office for innovative programming. Nuts! She's the innovative programming guru for the entire count… the world I would say, and, so it was great that they tapped into her expertise for that. … We have a first-year interest group program that's coordinated through First-Year Studies and [International Office] - we do joint projects.

Director Sarah program’s approach to conversation partners is a bit different, showing the resourcefulness that different programs have. They “match international students with faculty and staff on campus, and they sign up for a semester at a time, meet once a week.” She
described the service-learning component that they did “as a part of [their] curriculum” as well as the other services from the department’s members:

It's been working with the homeless shelter and then being volunteers at the summer music festival, um… handing our bottles of water or you know making sure that the trash bins are not overflowing, things like that. And students have really enjoyed that. … We work with the Department of Rhetoric, which all freshmen have to take a rhetoric class here, and they have a Speaking Center and a Writing Center. We staff the Speaking Center to about 20 to 25 hours a week, and it’s a part of our faculty's full-time load. And then they help with ESL students who are in Rhetoric, or you know, any second language students on campus who need some additional work. And that’s been really very nice. … I for 25 years taught the methods class. … One of our faculty teaches the structure English class and the practicum for MA TESOL students, so we're very much involved with them too and so our students are involved with them.

She mentioned offering “workshops for departments” and explained how her unit is offering a 1-credit course for all of the students at the university:

We also have started to offer one-credit classes that start and go for the last six weeks of the semester, and the idea for this was that a lot of students end up – that’s about the drop date for students to drop classes, and they might want to get rid of a class, but then they would be below full time, so they won’t get their financial aid, and of course with international students, they can’t. So this provides them options, rather than PE classes, to pick up the last six weeks. And our faculty have really liked it. It’s a mix of international and U.S. students. We’ve had several of them: one on immigration, one on personal finance, one on U.S. dialects, what else, I’m trying to think, public speaking…
women in comics, one on service learning, and that's [going to] be expanded to an eight-
week one [because] six weeks was a little too tight to do, to really plan anything. …
They read Enrique’s Journey and talked about immigration. … Those were a couple of
the ones we’ve done.

The IEP directors were passionate in describing the work that their programs do for the
university, so the sub-category called *Reaching Out* helped understand the host institutions’
efforts on including the IEP students into their events. All of the directors spoke to some extent
about whether their students were reached out to by other units on campuses. Four out of five
leaders spoke about their students being included in everything on campus. One director in
particular said:

> We are really included in anything. Anything in the International Office does, all of our
> students are involved in that. … Any of the activities that they do, they can do. I mean,
> our students can play intramural sports, … and we’ve had a, you know, an IEP soccer
> team. They've done it, so anything - everybody is involved in. … We’ve worked with
> the Sexual Misconduct Office because we have had issues with students and
> unfortunately… so we are well-known by them, they’ve come to talk to the faculty.
> We’ve helped them out – we’ve gone and presented how we have brought that message
to even a lower level English speaking student. … I’m trying to think of what else. Oh,
counseling services as well and the counseling service does have one of their faculty
members who is from Taiwan originally, and he has a support group for international
students, just come, talk, whatever about anything, and I think he holds this once a week
or every other week.
Another director mentioned, “Our students do participate in university clubs. A lot of our activities are actually the Large Northwestern Research University (LNRU) activities that our students attend.” One director stated about the university’s [International Office], “They'll usually remember us and invite us, but other than that – not really.”

The final category in Theme 3 is University Support. All five program directors mentioned how their units were supported within their institutions. Director Boris expressed his gratitude for the support which he received from his supervisor:

I thank God, I meet with my boss, the Dean of the Graduate School. We used to meet once a month, and he's just said, “Look, let's start meeting every two weeks to keep the momentum going.” Fine with me! Because he's, he's from [country], he's a physics professor, he knows and values international students, and he really believes and talks about [LSRUB] valuing the whole student and not just for this department or that department, but developing the whole student, and not just for the for the degree but afterwards. So where does that come, you know? Where do we come in on it? Well they're [going to] need English not just to get through their degree but to set them up for success in their careers.

Director Kirk spoke about having to prove to each new dean that their “practices are informed by research,” and that they taught well, but he explained that when their dean came “to a couple of our workshops and stuff and has been very impressed by, by the knowledge we have.” Director Emma said that her supervisor did a lot of outreach to other university units and that “we receive lots of support from them [the unit].” The other two directors discussed receiving support from their deans and colleges as well as other units on campus. One director discussed what kind of support her unit received when there was a bomb threat in the building:
We had a bomb threat in our building last October. … A week after we did a fire drill. We just practiced an evacuation, I'm so happy, when the police came through here. … UPD [University Police Department] is very supportive. They want to make sure that our students feel welcome. After the bomb threat, after President Trump's election, the Dean of the college came over and talked to us and the students, so there's definitely support and value in that.

The other director said that the administration had “been nothing but supportive,” and she sounded proud pointing out that even their classrooms were “the first ones [assigned]” because “we use those classrooms five days a week, so they do ours first, and they do them by hand because it doesn't fit into their computer.”

The theme Work with University helped illustrate the relationship between the IEPs and various units in their host institutions. Jenks (1997) wrote about the need for IEPs to create visibility on campuses though just the presence of IEPs makes universities more attractive to international students (Martin & Morse, 2018). The participants discussed their contribution to the university by transitioning their IEP students into degree programs. They considered it their major input into the host institution. However, it was clear that many other contributions of intensive English programs were significant for the institutions. For instance, being a field experience site for TESOL students must have a positive impact on the degree programs. Because some programs do not have enough exposure on campuses, and English language teaching is not always being considered an accepted discipline (Winkle, 2014), IEPs might be seen as “vocational” and not be given enough value. In addition, assisting the university community with understanding international students and their needs was an important topic brought up by the directors. They spoke about working with departments on creating programs
together, applying for grants, and creating workshops for the university faculty. IEP students participated in the university activities and were invited more often than not. In this theme, the directors’ answers demonstrated both the successes and challenges which they met.

**Theme 5: Director’s Role: Internal and External.**

The directors explained how they perceived their roles in building relationships between their IEPs and the larger university community. Four subthemes were identified after the data analysis.

The first subtheme to be explained is the director’s initial role or what the participants saw it as when they started working in the IEP. All five directors sounded positive when they spoke of their experiences. Director Boris felt that he wanted “to do better with the best practices and training,” but he felt as though he just “slid in as director.” Director Kirk’s position about becoming an IEP director was similar, “I felt like I could help … the program.” “I just love what I do, and … I’m so happy I actually took the opportunity, you know,” director Emma declared. The supportive environment from the very beginning of her career had a positive impact on director Sarah’s experiences:

You know, if I could continue to do this until, you know, the last days of my life, I’d be happy. It's been a wonderful, you know… It's got its stresses obviously, but you know, I love what I do, and I love the people I work with, and, and the administration as well - it's been a nothing but supportive.

Director Pilar’s unique abilities helped her initially and continued helping her in her career: “I've always been able to pull people together and unite people sort of towards a common goal.” She saw her job as both “fun and challenging.”
Another important subsection of Theme 5 is the directors’ actual and perceived role. Director Boris spoke of his official role in comparison with his actual role. “My official role, I guess, is I think I'm considered by the powers that be, by the higher-ups to be a strong resource when it comes to … internationalization.” His position on his actual role was clear:

Many things - mainly cheerleader, but mainly pain in the [behind]. I mean just like I try to go to as many meetings as I can, and I always try to, you know, I'm always the one who is, “Hey don't forget the internationals! Don't forget the international point of view!” You know. Always! And… they know me by now that they're not, “Oh yeah, here he goes again!” No, but… So yeah, what's my role?… I guess an irritant, maybe a reminder,… and I just keep selling the fact of how valuable we are or can be to the university.

Even though her official responsibility was “to make sure that this place is running the way it's supposed to run, … and make all the connections that I need” for the Pathway program, Director Emma’s official role was “educating the community about who we are and the importance of having a program or programs like the ones we have especially.” She believed that this role was “more of our director’s role to be the one, you know, that actually, you know, goes and is present.” Director Kirk’s official role was that of a department head, but as for his role in the internationalization of campus, which is his unofficial role, he said:

There's no really official role. You know, I'm always pushing. ... My job really is to try to bring things together, you know. … It's not my official role by any means, that's an unofficial, sort of subversive maybe a little bit … Bringing things up to the vice president of students, you know, because we have a regulation about not using agents. You know, I was like this is, you know, this is life, let’s consider it. And ba-ba-ba-ba-ba… So, you
know, I just get them anywhere I can. Certainly, more of an academic position the one I have. You know, making sure the program is dynamic, and the faculty are supported. Because LNRU was “very siloed” and did not have a “unified international goal or strategy,” they “all are sort of independent operators,” and it was unclear how the director was supposed to perform her role. Therefore, Director Pilar’s unofficial role in the university was to be focused both on internal and external operations. She stated, “My job is to keep the IEP running, make sure it's profitable, which it's not right now, make sure everybody's fat and happy, which they're not right now, but we're working on that.” She also clarified:

I feel my role is supposed to be externally facing. … When I was hired in I was told, “Don't worry about the operations.” In fact, the … staff and faculty were told not to talk to me – it would bother me with what I was supposed to be doing. I didn't learn this until after the fact, so we've got a lot of repair work to do, there's just so much . … We are on the right path, and now that I have basically gutted the program, by necessity, I'm doing more of those roles that I had to eliminate, so that's made me more internal facing, which I'm actually grateful for. Because when I was just external facing, I don't know that I was getting the full story or the story that I needed in order to be able to advocate for the program. It's hard when all the information is second and third-hand and … has its own slant, not malicious, just its own lens that's being presented. … And this was a new position, so I'm the first person to hold this position, so there's a lot of expectations from what the old director did versus what they wanted this position to do, and so as… I mean I was hired in … August, and that … that's when our numbers started crashing, right? So I've never actually been in the program when it was stable.
Director Pilar’s role seemed to have evolved from what her position description had stated initially, and she felt that the expectation might have been set unrealistically.

Director Sarah participated in various university committees, and she felt she was “at least a part of the discussion.” Her perceived role, however, was to advocate and to engage other members of the university community to talk about ESL. She expanded about the importance of understanding the balance:

What’s my role - to always be out there, talking to people, to making myself visible on committees, not just me, but then to oversee that faculty are out serving on committees and other things now that that they are faculty and not staff and there are places for them to, to be on … charter committees. … It's just a matter of constantly talking about ESL and about the intensive English students and how well they do and having that information and a very accredited program and on and on and on. … I often feel like there needs to be a balance too - sometimes there’s times when I’d like to fly under the radar and not be right out there, and so what I think is to figure out when you want to be out there, when it's important to be out there, and when it's strategically a good idea and when to say, “Well, let's not be the rabble rouser here. Maybe we want to sit back and take a look at this.” Or, you know, numbers maybe, I've never felt this, but, you know, numbers may not be great, and you might want to not bring our dirty laundry that we'd like to have more to the forefront. And I guess that's one of the things sometimes that I feel like sometimes faculty who don't realize the politics of things; I think there are … politics to be played, and I think a director’s role is to figure out those politics and to know when to bring things up and when to not bring things up, to try to be as transparent
as possible with faculty but to also realize that there are times when information without context is not the best thing either, if that makes sense.

The collected data showed that increasing visibility for the program is an essential role that the interviewed directors believed they had as a part of their perceived role. All five interviewees spoke about their attempts to create visibility, and they are outlined in this subtheme. The common message was the need to explain to the upper administration what the international students’ needs were. In addition to thinking of various creative programming that the IEP performs to create visibility, Director Boris saw that his responsibility was to share what the needs of his students were:

My role is again helping these departments, helping the higher-ups understand that these international students need a lot more help in developing their English and cultural knowledge, and so on if they're going to be successful in their careers, not just getting their degree in chemistry or something like that.

In a similar manner, Director Emma spoke about the way she helped her unit, in addition to her role of overseeing the program’s operations, by reaching out to various departments, tried “to do things, you know, on my own time,” and explained the reasons for her work:

I guess my role is just, you know, to make sure that this place is running the way it's supposed to run, … and make all the connections that I need, like, for example, with the departments to ensure that my students are [going to] get the classes they need for the Pathway program, to make sure that I'm [going to] get, you know, help, if I need it, from graduate students, you know, and hire them to come and do recitations …or tutoring to our students, … providing, you know, the resources that they need. … I would love, you know …to be able to make more of this, you know, happen like … making our programs
and our students more visible to the University, to the programs and gain, you know, …
more respect, I guess, not only to our students but also faculty. And that is frustrating
because our faculty are not, you know, they are not tenure track, they don't do research,
they don't do this, they don't do that, so they are not seen as, as, you know, compared to
across the street, you know, the faculty they have. But I guess it's more of educating the
community about who we are.

At LWRU, Director Kirk’s IEP differed from the other participants’ units because it was
a state-funded department where the director was a department head like any other one in an
academic unit. However, his rhetoric resonated with his counterparts’ one. Director Kirk’s work
was a facilitator of “more collaboration between units” and “bringing things up” to achieve
normalcy for his IEP students even though “it’s not a part of the university’s mission of
recruiting international students.”

As a part of creating visibility, Director Sarah spoke of how she saw it through her
perceived role because she viewed that responsibility as being similar to the one of a department
chair:

I would think that that [chair] has the same view about his role that I have for mine is that
getting out there what the division is doing, bragging about the faculty and what they're
doing. I mean that's part of my job too is to talk about the faculty in a way that
showcases them for the good job that they do and all the professional development, and
then I feel like I've been successful because I have had the Dean say, “An ESL is an
example of lecturers, non-tenure-track faculty, who have a strong professional
development,” you know. They're very strong in professional development. Now, we
provide funds because we can do that. … Other lecturers don't get the travel money for professional development that we get.

She also pointed out that to create additional visibility, she encouraged her faculty to participate in various university activities including being “elected to faculty assembly from the college.” She gave numerous examples of “always [being] out there, talking to people, making herself visible on committees” and of “constantly talking about ESL and about the intensive English students and how well they do and having that information and a very accredited program and on and on and on.”

Director Pilar saw her role in creating visibility as different from the one others assumed she had. She stated, “My agenda is to get students on this campus to attend the University or to diversify the University, so I think I perceive my role very differently than how others perceive my role if that makes sense.” To make sure her unit and internationalization were visible, her perceived role became the following:

I have to sort of put myself at the table, and I have to remind people that we are here, and we deserve to be at the table, so I'm it's, it's a tricky role. I think it changes each term. I think it changes each year, the way I would love to have some consistency, where after a few years, I could say, “This is my role.” I view my role … as taking the brand international in a unified way, because I think, when it comes down to it, I think, and I don't want this to sound… but I think I'm the only one that that speaks for the entire university because admissions only recruits for undergrad, grad school doesn't recruit, [International Office] has their own agenda.

The director explained that her initially “outward-facing position” became different because of “so much internal” work, so “it's hard to do as much as I was, and my work load never changes,
of course. I just take on everybody else's role too as we reduce.” Even though her job
description differed from the other participants’ ones, she performed many of the similar
functions because of the reduced staff and the overall nature of the IEP director’s work. Director
Pilar explained the ways she reached out to the broader university community and any other
international initiatives:

   It really is about the relationships. That truly is the bottom line is relationships, and it's
not just me; I try to make sure that everybody is empowered to know that they can sit on
a committee if they wish to, they can run for Senate. We've, I think, we've always had
somebody from [the program] on Senate. In fact, a former faculty was on, and then she
rotated off, and then I rotated on, and so can we maintain that? I don't know, yeah, um,
yeah, I think it's just it's all about the relationships. That's what we do. … I always try to
make sure that we're meeting with partners, that we're meeting with prospective partners.
Yeah, whenever somebody comes to campus and try to make sure that I'm included, and
we're doing better, we're getting there.

   The final category in the Director’s Role Theme is called Future Work. Every participant
in the study spoke about their aspirations for the future work that they would like to start or
continue for their programs. Their plans varied from creating greater partnerships to acquiring
physical resources. For instance, Director Sarah’s dream was to get their own space on campus
to reduce the costs of renting the space and catering for the events: “If the one thing I could get
before I retire that would be is a big space on campus that people could be brought in, you
wouldn’t have to pay for.” She also discussed a personal shortcoming that she believed she
could work on to help the program:
I think in some ways I could be doing more. I'm not very good at … sort of cold calling. I think about [another IEP Director], and he says as soon as somebody is on campus who's new, he's there saying, “Hello, how are you? I am so and so.” I'm not good at that. If I find myself in a situation where I'm in a meeting with that person, then, you know, I will make myself known and those kinds of things, but I, you know, sometimes I wish I were better at that …, but it's not in my comfort zone.

Director Kirk, whose program was solely performing educational functions and was state funded, thought he could “be the best person” for recruitment:

I mean right now with the low enrollment my main concern is getting more students, … and I've tried to work with the admissions people, the recruiters. We have a couple of international student recruiters that I think are doing a crappy job. And I've sort of told that to the Dean and to the president, but, you know, because we're so decentralized, nobody… They're not [going to] say, “Hey, you know, crappy job [because] we are not getting any students.” So I, you know, I've taken on the role of, you know, trying to do some recruiting, limited amount of recruiting, and it might be an area I push a little bit more on myself, so that's… And again, that shouldn't be my role. I know for many directors it's an important part of their role, but, you know, we're not self-funded.

Having a team which could meet about international issues would be essential for his university according to Director Boris:

I think the director of the IEP should be hand-in-hand with the VP of international outreach with director of the [International Office]. There should be a core group, small group of international people on campus... We have a loose committee, but it's, but the director of the IEP should be an integral part of any international committee on campus.
Then, like I said, where we tend to be forgotten and, and unfortunately. So yeah, that's my answer, I guess, is a more concrete position on any committee.

Director Emma saw the potential in working with graduate programs. “Our goal is to someday also work with a graduate school but because they are their own entity, they are, I mean it's… been harder for us… to get, you know” and even “get, you know help… from graduate students, you know, and hire them to come and do recitations… or tutoring.” She also mentioned that there was “a lot more to do” and that “I’m, you know, willing to do as much as I can.” She was ready to embrace something new:

Everybody is doing things that we didn't used to do, like I'm now. I was told that I'm going to start, you know, doing, making some trips, you know, abroad… and marketing and selling the program. So I'm [going to] have to start doing that because, you know, we cannot hire. We used to have, you know, a person doing that, but now our budget - we're trying not to touch it, so everybody steps up to a little bit. So we'll see, I mean we'll see how this goes.

With no “international message from the top,” Director Pilar hoped for an “opportunity to educate [an upper level administrator]” and reduce “arrogance and ignorance.” She pointed out that at that time there was a feeling of superiority within the university, and therefore, there might be a lack of understanding of the current reality:

“What do you mean they wouldn't come to LNRU? We are the Large Northwestern Research University!” … Yeah, that’s a great school, but there are other schools that are competing for our students too, that some are better. I mean, let's face it, some are not, but, no, some are better!
Director Pilar also explained that there was a false assumption about their students, and she needed to educate the top that “not all of our students are university bound,” but “these kids go home, and they … talk about us. They tell their friends.”

IEP directors are expected to be innovative and skillful to keep the program successful and overcome challenges which their programs face (Pennington & Hoekje, 2010; Stoller, 1997). IEP directors encounter “ethical and moral issues around incorporating business practices into education,” the need for balance between the students’ instructional and support service needs, the pressure of generating revenue, and other difficulties (Eaton, 2013). The participants of this study voiced that advocating for their programs and “making [themselves] visible was an important role which they hold. Only one director said that their position was “external facing.” The rest of the participants took that role upon themselves because they believed that reaching out to others around campus would benefit their programs’ constituents.

Summary of Cross-Case Findings

The purpose of this study was to contribute to the current research base in the field and to provide representation for IEP directors in regards to their program’s place within host institutions and their role as administrators in developing relationships on campus. After the transcription and analysis of five interviews, five distinct themes emerged: planned happenstance; belonging; funding; work with university; director’s role. Within the themes, numerous subthemes helped organize the data. The collected data allowed for ample examples and rich description.

The collected data echoed prior research and literature available about the intensive English programs. Themes belonging, funding priority, and work with university helped answer Research Question 1: How do IEP directors perceive the treatment of their programs and
students by university leaders and university departments in comparison to other programs on campus? Overall, the directors stated that their programs were mostly treated as equals on their campuses. However, there were some concerns expressed about their programs’ sense of belonging and legitimacy in those institutions. Some departments knew that IEPs were located on their campuses only because they worked closely with them. There was a general discontent with other units knowing of the intensive English programs’ “existence.” Four out of five programs were located in an academic department, which based on the literature, should have increased their chances of legitimacy (Winkle, 2014). Also, Jenks (1997) claims that IEPs are marginalized when they are not sitting on committees and do not have promotion tracks, among others. This was not necessarily true for the participants of this study because even though some IEPs were in academic units and had promotion opportunities, they still felt that their units were “siloed,” “segregated,” and marginalized.

Themes Planned Happenstance and Director’s Role provided answers to Research Question 2: How do the IEP directors perceive their role in fostering connections between IEP program constituents and the broader campus community? The IEP directors in this study believed that their main role was to create visibility on campus by reaching out to other units on campus, developing various programing to attract other members of the university community, and participating on committees. They needed to understand the politics within the university but still educate the upper administration about the needs of international students.

The following chapter contains the highlights of the findings and discussion of the study as well as recommendations for practical applications of the knowledge and further research.
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION, APPLICATION, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND CONCLUSION

Introduction

Intensive English programs differ from other units on campus because most of them cover both the students’ educational needs and their student service needs. Trapped between the increased competition from other intensive English programs in the United States (De Angelis, 2015) and marginalization within their host institutions (Eaton, 2013; Pennington & Hoekje, 2010), IEP directors juggle the multitude of roles to keep these complex organisms successful (Eaton, 2013). Program directors are often charged with ensuring that the programs are lucrative (Eaton, 2013) and advocating for their programs to the university community and the administrators who do not fully understand the program’s contributions (Staczek & Carkin, 1984). There has not been a lot of empirical research done on intensive English programs (Eaton, 2013). Therefore, the findings from this study will inform the field of intensive English program administration in the U.S. public higher education institutions and will provide additional information for decision-makers.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the IEP directors’ perceptions about the treatment of their programs by other university departments as well as to understand how they saw themselves in the process of building the relationships with the rest of the university community. Sociocultural theory, as the theoretical framework for this study, provided the researcher with a lens to utilize during the review of literature. Because an IEP is a multifaceted organization, mediated relationships between its constituents and within the web of increasing globalization, immigration regulations, and its host institution were exposed through the review
of literature. Qualitative methodology was selected for this study because it would allow for the researcher to understand a unique phenomenon and “construct a clearer reality” (Stake, 1995, p.101). The case study research strategy was selected to help the researcher learn and provide an understanding of the issues, give voice to the participants about the phenomenon, the IEP (Stake, 1978, Tellis, 1997; Yin, 2003). Merriam’s (2009) cross-case analysis allowed the researcher to focus on understanding the phenomenon of IEP leadership practices and the value of IEPs instead of only giving attention to individual participants. The case study approach allowed the researcher to explore in depth the two research questions which guided this study:

1. How do IEP directors perceive the treatment of their programs and students by university leaders and university departments in comparison to other programs on campus?

2. How do the IEP directors perceive their role in fostering connections between IEP program constituents and the broader campus community?

Five case study participants were carefully selected to meet the outlined criteria. First, they responded to a short demographic questionnaire. One-on-one interviews followed a 10-question interview protocol to help with answering the research questions. The data was transcribed, coded, and analyzed using the Constant Comparative Method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Merriam, 2009). The cross-case analysis of the data helped locate similarities and construct generalizations.

**Discussion of Major Findings**

Even though the study participants came from different institutions, the responses to the interview questions had similar ideas and touched on specific topics. The data could be
categorized into four major themes. The five themes were: (1) Planned Happenstance; (2) Belonging; (3) Funding Priority; (4) Work with University; (5) Director’s Role. Themes two, three, and four helped answer the first research question. Themes one and five provided answers to the second research question. The themes became evident after multiple subthemes emerged. Theme two had the most subthemes – 10 and themes one and two both had the least subthemes – three. Theme one was written as a story of each director’s journey. The theme of Belonging became the most prominent after the data analysis because it included the most themes and was the most evident from the participants’ responses. Subthemes or categories gave depth to the themes and helped identify the most pressing topics the participants discussed.

**How the programs are treated on campus**

Three themes supported the answer to research question one. The theme of Belonging encompassed the discussion of the presence or lack of belonging to a university as well as the desire to establish belonging. The literature discusses the legitimacy of IEPs on university campuses (Eaton, 2013; Heyen, 2016; Strecker, 2016). The results of the study remained consistent with the previous research. All of the IEP directors expressed the concern about the unit’s belonging on campus. There was a common discussion about being forgotten or not even knowing that the unit existed. Words such as, “island,” “decentralized,” “silod,” and “non-existent” were prevalent in participants’ responses. One program, which could be considered an outlier, was a fully academic unit operating on state funds did not feel different treatment from other departments or upper administration. However, the director expressed the concern about not having in-house recruiting and admissions, which made the unit “decentralized” as the director struggled to bring together all of the other departments. The other program directors spoke about having to make connections and “get to the right people to achieve access.” Even
though four out of five programs in the study were housed in academic units, their perceptions of belonging or legitimacy on campus did not increase as it should have according to some literature (Winkle, 2014).

As for the program members, only one program’s faculty were classified as full or associate professors. The other four IEP directors spoke about faculty or instructors on a promotion track, though they were not seen as other faculty and were teaching more than their peers in other units. According to Jenks (1997), faculty should feel less marginalized if they are eligible for promotion. Getting their name out was a similar sentiment from all of the participants. They expressed the need always to be “a part of the discussion,” “keep the internationals in everybody’s minds,” and “get our name out.” Even though the IEP students were better prepared than the international students who were directly admitted, the IEP was “seen as a place for remedial English” or “non-academic.” Only one program offered credit-bearing IEP classes. The other programs offered non-credit bearing classes in their programs even as a part of a pathway. In three programs out of five, the students were treated the same as other international students. However, two directors spoke of their students feeling connected to the university though in one case they were not actually engaging as much. The other two directors discussed that their students did not feel belonging either until they broke “out of their community” or “until they transfer” to a degree program. One director expressed that the IEP students just were not invited to anything. The participants’ perception of their IEP members’ belonging resonated with the work of Heyen (2016) who wrote that some IEP members had a feeling of “separate identity” – the work done at IEPs differs from the one performed by other university departments (p. 356). Even though the IEP directors talked about having a place at the table, there was still an underlying subtle discontentment that their program members did not
fully belong to the larger university community – either their faculty were not equal to their peers in other departments or their students were “seen as lacking.”

The theme called *Funding Priority* gave insight into the way the fiscal and physical resources were allocated in the IEP programs. Many IEPs are revenue-generating and pressured to stay lucrative (Carkin, 1997; Eaton, 2013; Eskey, 1997; Heyen, 2016). They have been called “cash cows” (Eskey, 1997), and most of the programs’ revenue is allocated to support various other programs and departments (Heyen, 2016). Only one program was funded from E&G funds, though they were allowed to charge and keep money from additional projects. Four out of five study participants indicated that their units were revenue-generating. In terms of having the access to the fiscal resources, one director spoke about having to pay a “heavy tax” to their university on their revenue and how “absurd” it was that they were fiscally treated “the same as housing.” In addition, any renovations or even “a home” for that IEP could only be attained if the department paid for it, which was not the case for other academic departments on campus. It is understandable that units that are self-supporting will have to generate fiscal resources and contribute to the university’s needs. Though, the passionate explanation of one of the directors is also clear about having to pay for major construction and classroom rentals in addition to a hefty overhead amount. Two other directors described their fiscal and physical resources as only being available if they made money, including paying rent for space. The fifth program did not have to pay rent for their space or an overhead, though some of their revenue was put into a fund and could be used “on the needs of the college.” The data from the study confirmed that the fiscal and physical resources were still attainable only if the IEPs generated revenue and that the IEPs fiscal resources were often at the discretion of outside forces.
To help answer the research question about the perceived treatment of IEPs by other departments, the theme *Work with University* shed light on their value, outreach, the work that they do, and the support that the IEPs have in their host institutions. Four out of five directors stated that their programs’ main contribution to the university was being a recruiter and feeder to the degree programs. Intensive English programs can make the universities housing them more attractive for international students (Martin & Morse, 2018). The students studying in the IEPs can be potential candidates for the degree programs afterwards. The participating programs mentioned that when working with their students, they created the institution-wide outreach to ensure that other departments knew about their programs. They worked on partnering with programs and involving their students into university classes on auditory bases. The IEP members were invited to sit on some committees. Four directors discussed that their students were invited to the university clubs and campus activities. One director mentioned that sometimes they were invited to events, unless they were “forgotten.” As for their services, the IEP directors described their programs as strong resources for international students; they provided training to university faculty on international students; they helped with testing, orientations, and etcetera. Two IEP directors spoke of offering the program as a practicum site for the students in the masters’ programs. The directors felt supported by their immediate supervisors, and one director referred to the support from her dean as “amazing.” However, some directors mentioned that they did not get the feeling of support from everyone on campus. Overall, this theme resonates with the literature that IEPs are expected to publicize themselves on campus (Jenks, 1997) and that they are “seen as desirable by upper administration because they have the potential to generate significant revenue, which can then be returned (at least in part) to the same institution that marginalizes them” (Eaton 2013, p. 177).
IEP Directors’ Roles

Themes 1 and 5 helped understand how the IEP directors perceived their role on campus. Theme 1, *Planned Happenstance*, gave the insight to the participants’ motivations when becoming an IEP director. The directorship position is considered rather demanding and requiring multiple skills (Forbes, 2012; Eaton, 2013; Pennington & Hoekje, 2010). IEP administrators are faced with a multitude of pressures – they are often torn between looking out for the overall success of the program, making sure that the instructional and support services are adequate, planning their budgets and securing the funding, receiving pressure from the top to deliver consistent revenue, promoting the program on campus and outside, and many others (Christison & Stoller, 1997; Eaton, 2013; Kaplan, 1997; Pennington & Hoekje, 2010). The participants’ responses echoed Forbes’ research about the skills needed to direct an IEP. For instance, one director described one of the skills that she had, which helped her as a director – ability “to pull people together and unite people sort of towards a common goal.” All of the participants of the study accepted the IEP director positions because they wanted to make a difference in those programs or the field. Four out of five participants held terminal degrees and three became directors right after they completed their doctorates. Two directors said that they “slid in” or “fell into” their positions. One director stated that he refused that role for a while until he finally agreed because he “felt like he could help… the program.” Another director jokingly said that she “was stupid” when she took the job. Her comments echoed Eaton’s work (2013) when she said that some people think it was a “glorious” job, but they did not know about all of “the tears at home” and “all no-win situations.” The participants commented on their love for their students and their “incredible” employees. The personal stories of becoming IEP directors, some humble, some boastful, were inspiring and showed how much passion the directors had for their programs.
Director’s Role exposed the internal, external, and perceived roles that the participants had in creating connections within their institutions. Though IEP administrators are often not regarded on campus as equals, their job responsibilities have such a wide scope that their positions are closer to that of a dean than a department head (Eaton, 2013). The scope of IEP directors’ responsibilities is extensive (Christison & Stoller, 1997; Eaton, 2013; Kaplan, 1997; Pennington & Hoekje, 2010). In addition to a variety of the activities and creating programing, the most profound role which could be articulated from all of the interviews was the directors’ desire to promote, advocate, and create visibility for their programs. Even though only one of the participants had this role as a part of her job description, other four participants claimed the high value in being on the “forefront.” The directors spoke of their initial, actual, and perceived roles, and those roles ranged from being a “cheerleader” to an “irritant” to a “facilitator.”

Visibility on campus was one of the most prominent ideas that surfaced during this study. Some participants thought that it was not their responsibility to create their unit’s visibility, though some thought that was an essential part of their jobs. The IEP directors spoke about both lack of visibility and about the ways to achieve it. The participants described various ways they personally create it, and how they encourage their employees to do the same. The participants stressed the importance of constantly reminding the university community of the existence of IEP programs and students. They felt that their role was to educate others about the programs in order to gain the community respect as well as to make their students and programs more noticeable. The participants also perceived their role to be making sure that their IEP students continued their education in their university, adding the necessary diversity. The IEP directors explained that they wished they could do more in order to be recognized and to help their program members gain visibility. One participant hoped that one day a core group would be
created, and he could participate in it. This core group would meet and discuss international students and their needs. Another director hoped for an international message from the university’s upper administration so that her work then could have more impact on reducing the “arrogance” and “ignorance” about international students. Other directors hoped for better integration of units as well as developing better relationships with more units and even getting a better space. The voices of the participants rang in unison and had a clear message – they want to be heard, and they want to do more.

**Application**

The findings of this study are valuable to other IEP directors and especially their supervisors who may be making decisions about the future of their university’s IEP which will either support its integration into the institution’s network or further marginalize the department. Based on the findings from this study, suggestions for upper administration and potential benefits to the university will allow for practical application of this study.

The legitimacy of IEPs on university campuses has been discussed in recent literature (Eaton, 2013; Hayen, 2016; Strecker, 2016). This study’s theme of belonging provided information about the IEP directors’ perceptions on this matter. The university administration can help support the program and improve its feeling of belonging to the community if it does not segregate an intensive English program. As a result, the IEP could focus on its mission more instead of focusing on achieving legitimacy. In this study, it was evident that some universities do not allow the same access to resources to IEPs and their members as to the rest of the university community.

The participants mentioned that they were not a part of the university student management or student learning systems. There would be fewer wasted hours and funds if IEPs
had access to the same resources and systems as the rest of their campus. If an IEP had access to its university’s student management system and learning management system, there would not be a need to purchase a costly separate system and train the staff. Additionally, IEP students should have access to the same resources as degree-seeking students, especially housing. Research suggests that students who live on campus have better academic outcomes (Thompson, Samiratedu, & Rafter, 1993) and student retention remains high (Schudde, 2011). If IEP students lived on campus, they might have a stronger bond with the university, learn English faster, and might continue as degree-seeking students.

IEPs should offer classes for credit to their students which would increase recognition of intensive English studies and provide students with additional options. As one of the participants mentioned, the IEP market has changed because international students are not looking to study English before they can matriculate, they want to start receiving credit while still at an IEP. Unfortunately, there is a belief that if you can speak the language you can teach it, and it makes ESL teaching seem less valuable (Eaton, 2013; Eskey, 1997). In the literature, it has been reported that English as a second language courses are often viewed as remedial (Carkin, 1997; Stoller, 1997), and the study results echoed this sentiment. However, one study participant out of four said that their courses received credit and faculty members were treated as equal to others on campus. Inability to receive credit may be attributed to the argument that intensive English programs teach skills to the students instead of content (Eaton 2013; Eskey, 1997). However, the same can be said about the study of any language, and language departments are not marginalized. The study of English as a second language is equivalent to studying any other language, such as Spanish or French. Therefore, the same opportunity should be given to the IEP students as it is given to the university students receiving credit for a foreign language.
Because intensive English faculty is teaching language courses, they should be regarded in the same way as other language faculty is treated on campuses. IEP instructors are experts in English language training and should be treated as such. The faculty teaching in the programs is expected to have master’s degrees in the field (Core Faculty, 2017) and some even have doctorate degrees with many years of experience. Considering the IEP faculty’s expertise, collaboration with an IEP might benefit other university programs, such as TESOL. Some of the study participants mentioned that their programs were used as practicum sites, so this kind of collaboration can be positive.

Many international language students want to transition to a degree program in the United States, but they are faced with strenuous admission requirements. Many universities require SAT or ACT scores for international student to enter. Often, international students are not prepared to take those standardized tests but may achieve the necessary score if they have been taught to the test in their home countries, take it multiple times and “show a practice effect”, or if they cheat on the test (Fass-Holmes & Vaughn, 2014). Standardized testing should be eliminated for international students. Universities should also consider offering international language students a way to enter a degree program through a conditional admission or a pathway. There is evidence in this study and other literature that the students who are admitted to the university after an IEP are better prepared than the students who are directly admitted to the university with a language proficiency score (Toner, 2017). Having a more direct admission path might help them choose their current institution instead of a competitor’s institution.

IEPs have been considered “cash cows” by their host institutions (Eskey, 1997) and are often highly dependent on a number of variables to stay lucrative to match the demands of their universities (Eaton, 2013; Kaplan, 1997). Often, programs either pay high taxes to the
universities, as one of the participants mentioned, or may be required to fund other university projects (Eskey, 1997). IEPs should have full control of their fiscal resources in the same way as university deans, for instance. This would allow program administrators to regulate their revenue, retain a healthy fund balance to cover the expenses during the times of low enrollment, and offer scholarships to international students, lessening the university’s burden. Giving IEPs the ability to control their revenue would raise their status in the university, may improve their sense of belonging, and give them more stability.

Being seen as second class (Soppelsa, 1997), IEP programs at times are not given the same resources as other departments on campus. The participants in this study mentioned that they had to rent classrooms and pay for remodeling, including structural restoration of a building. One of the directors asked a valid question, “Would the math department have to rent space on campus?” An IEP should be offered a building on campus and should not be asked to fix structurally unsound buildings and pay rent, as the same would not be asked of another department. Another director spoke about renting space “across the street” because their institution could not provide them with a space on campus, so the students in that program were not involved in campus life. If an IEP is located on campus, the students may be more involved in the university life and may be retained for a degree program, generating international tuition funds for the institution.

The role of an IEP director is demanding and requires a variety of skills (Forbes, 2012). However, many non-ESL colleagues see it as being “second-class” (Kaplan, 1997) and believe it does not involve a lot of knowledge (Dvorak 1986). Many program administrators work in fear of their programs being closed or that they cannot produce enough revenue, make staffing cuts, and negotiate with their institution for legitimacy and support (Eaton, 2013; Sopelsa, 1997;
It is essential that program directors receive support from their upper administration and are afforded an equal opportunity in the discussion about internationalization and international students. The extensive knowledge base which IEP directors possess may contribute to the discussions and may provide creative ideas for decision-makers. Currently, many IEP directors’ status is not equal to their non-ESL peers, though their job responsibilities are those similar to deans (Eaton, 2013). The university’s upper administration should recognize IEP directors as equals, invite them to participate in the applicable university’s business and this will reduce marginalization from the directors and subsequently IEPs.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Although the present study examined the perceptions of a specific population – IEP directors – which has been overlooked previously, this study provides a foundation for future research. The first recommendation would be to expand this study, adding more participants to give voice to more IEP directors at different institutions. That study could focus on the programs housed in for-profit institutions and compare with the results of this study. This would allow for a more comprehensive study about the perceived IEP treatment and director roles.

Another recommendation for future research is to reverse the focus of the study. If one were interested to research the perceptions of other university members about IEPs, that study could provide an interesting perspective to the readers. A case study of one institution could be possible in this case, and the researcher could get the data from both the IEP side and other units on campus.

The final suggestion which could contribute to the minute body of research that exists about IEPs would be collect data from decision-makers. The current study has a lot of valuable information for the upper administration; therefore, a study of the decision-makers’ perceptions
of the IEP contributions to the university would be appropriate. The results could provide more insight about the reasons why IEPs are still marginalized within higher education institutions.

**Conclusion**

This study addressed a gap in literature about the intensive English programs on public university campuses. The literature review provided the foundation of knowledge for this study about the available knowledge base on international students, the existence of intensive English programs, and the relationship between IEPs and their host institutions. In this study, the researcher was able to gain insight into the current state of the field by giving the voice to five IEP directors about the way they saw their programs and their members’ treatment by their institutions as well as what their roles were.

The results of the study were somewhat consistent with the literature currently available. Some of the participants felt that their programs were marginalized, and some participants believed that they were well-integrated into the university structure. However, it was evident that the integration was sufficient at best, as there were some incongruous responses. Because this study is a study of perceptions, the opinions of the directors was what mattered though some answers sounded positive on the surface. For instance, the director whose program was in an academic unit, financed by the state, and treated as equal to their academic peers showed disdain when speaking of the hurdles he must go through because there was so much division within the institution.

As for the IEP directors’ roles, this study supported the idea that IEP directors take on multiple roles and have to make sure that their programs are successful inside and out. Even though they did not always believe that it was their responsibility to oversee so much, all of them fostered connections with other departments on campus and created partnerships which could
benefit not only their departments but also university as a whole. Some of the directors recruited for the university in addition to their IEP, made sure that their students added diversity to university classes and campus activities, and advocated for all of the international students on campus. In addition to giving voices to the participants, this study provides valuable insight into how to better support IEPs on campus, which in turn contributes to the overall success of the institution.
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APPENDIX A: EMAILS TO PARTICIPANTS

Initial Email

Dear …

I am a doctoral student in the College of Education and Human Services at the University of North Florida, working under the direction of Dr. Luke Cornelius and Dr. Amanda Pascale. I am conducting a study about the intensive English program (IEP) directors’ perceived treatment of their programs and students by university leaders and other departments. The purpose of this study is to fill the void in research about the position of IEPs in their host institutions, giving voice to language program administrators, and providing practical resources for the practitioners.

I would like to invite you to participate in a survey about your program. The interview should take about one hour. Participation in this study may not benefit you directly. However, the knowledge obtained from your participation, and the participation of other volunteers, may inform best practices for IEPs that will ultimately benefit IEP administration, faculty, and students.

Your participation in the study is completely voluntary, and all of your responses will be kept confidential. No personally identifiable information will be associated with your responses to any reports of these data.

If you are willing to participate in this study, please contact me at Redacted

Follow-up email

Dear …

Thank you for indicating that you would be willing to participate in the study about the perceived treatment of the IEPs in universities. The Skype video call should last approximately 60 minutes and will be audio and video-recorded. I am attaching to this email a consent form, which provides a detailed overview of the interview process. When you have reviewed the consent form, please let me know when we can set up an interview and provide me with your Skype name. Please email a signed copy of the consent form to me before we can begin the interview.

Your participation in the interview is completely voluntary and all of your responses will be kept confidential. No personally identifiable information will be associated with your responses to any reports of these data.

There is a short demographic questionnaire attached to this email as well. Please fill out the questionnaire at your earliest convenience and email it to me before the interview.
If you have any questions about the consent form, the questionnaire, or the study, please do not hesitate to reach out to me.

Hope to hear from you soon.
APPENDIX B: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is your name?
2. If you would like, please provide an appropriate pseudonym that could be used in the study. If you do not provide one, a pseudonym will be assigned to you.
3. How long have you worked as an IEP director at your current institution?
4. How long have you been in the field of intensive English?
5. What is your appointment type? (Faculty, staff, tenure-track, non-tenure track)
6. Where in the university is your IEP located? To whom do you report?
7. How many IEP students do you have in an average semester?
8. How many full-time staff members does the IEP employ?
9. How many full-time instructors does the IEP employ?
APPENDIX C: INFORMED CONSENT

Title: Do We Belong: Understanding How Program Directors Perceive the Role of Intensive English Programs on University Campuses

Principal Investigator: Irene Silas, EdD student, University of North Florida, College of Education and Human Services, Department of Leadership, School Counseling and Sport Management

I. Introduction:
You are invited to participate in a study designed by Irene Silas, a doctoral student at University of North Florida, Department of Leadership, School Counseling and Sport Management under the direction of Dr. Luke Cornelius and Dr. Amanda Pascale. Before you agree to participate in the study, you should have enough knowledge about it to make an informed decision.

II. Purpose:
Using a case-study design, the researcher of this study seeks to explore how the directors of English language programs that are members of UCIEP in public universities in the United States of America perceive the way their programs and students are seen on university campuses by other units or upper level administration. The researcher will attempt to understand how the directors view their role in facilitating the program and students’ sense of belonging on their university campuses.

Intensive English Programs provide instruction and support to the international students who come to study English in the United States. Very little research exists about the leadership of IEPs and about their roles on campuses. This study aims to address this gap in the literature by asking IEP directors about their views about the current status in the field. The director interviews will be recorded and analyzed to understand the phenomena and contribute valuable information to the current knowledge.

III. Procedures:
- You will be interviewed over a Skype video call at a time that is convenient to you. Your interview is expected to last approximately 1 hour.
- The interview will be recorded with a video recorder and a backup digital audio recorder.
- The interview will be transcribed and major findings of this study will be written up and emailed for your approval.

IV. Compensation:
There is no cost to you for participating in this research project.

V. Risks:
The anticipated risk for participation is minimal.

VI. Benefits:
The participation in this study may or may not benefit you directly. However, the knowledge that is contributed through your participation might help scholars, other IEP directors, and upper administration in colleges and universities. It may also improve the current practices for IEPs.

VII. Confidentiality:
This research is confidential. Confidential means that some information about you, such as your role in the IEP and how many years you have been employed in your current role, will be available. However, any other identifiable information, such as your name and the name of your institution, will not be disclosed. The researcher will keep this information confidential by limiting access to the research data and keeping in a secure location. All interview recordings will be stored on the secure UNF drive, protected with a password. The data may only be available to the UNF Internal Review Board and the research team.

Participant’s Initials: ________________

VIII. Study Dates and Disposal of Data:
It is anticipated that the data will be collected between August 2018 and September 2018. All of the electronic data collected, including video and audio files, transcripts, and signed consent forms will be deleted from the storage, and any hard copies will be shredded one year following the dissertation defense.

IX. Participation and Withdrawal:
Your participation in this study is voluntary and you may decline participation at any time without any penalty to you. You may also refuse to answer any questions with which you may feel uncomfortable.

X. Contact Information:
If you have questions at any time during research, contact Irene Silas at Redacted. If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you can contact the UNF’s IRB at irb@unf.edu.

Participant’s Name: ___________________ Signature: ___________________ Date: ________
Researcher’s Signature: __________________ Date: ________
APPENDIX D: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

R. Q. 1

1. Can you describe how you decided to pursue the career of an IEP director?
2. What are some of the roles you believe that the IEP performs on campus? What do you think other units view as your department’s role on campus?
3. What role (official or unofficial) do you have in the internationalization of your campus? What are some examples that you can share about it?
4. How are the intensive English program students regarded on campus by other departments, staff, faculty, and students?
5. Describe the various resources available to your department.
6. How do these resources compare to the resources of the other departments on campus?

R. Q. 2

1. Tell me about the interactions between your program and students with other departments on campus.
2. Tell me about the ways your campus includes the IEP and its members into its community.
3. What role do you hold in ensuring that the IEP is visible to the rest of the university community? What role do you think you should have in this process?
4. Describe how your department creates visibility on campus.