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Abstract

A review of the literature on the nature of international education in the United States reveals that although most international students want to engage socially and academically with their peers, many encounter cultural, linguistic, and institutional obstacles. Using this information to guide interview questions and format workshops, the author explored the question of how university museums can contribute to a more holistic and enriching educational experience for international students on American campuses, using the University of Denver as a case study. Findings from workshops and interviews conducted by the author reveal similar obstacles (cultural, linguistic, and institutional) when engaging students using techniques and theories such as collaboration, participation, object agency and materiality. With the presentation of the findings from this study, the author also makes suggestions for future programming and exhibits university museums can utilize to engage with their international student population.
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CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Getting a degree is so much more than going to class. From undergraduates living on campus, to doctoral students crafting dissertations, to working adults finishing degrees, university students must navigate a complex and sometimes bewildering system of checks and requirements. For a new student, the system of applying and getting accepted into school, the process of registration, meeting graduation requirements and using the offices and resources found on campus can seem overwhelming. Eventually, the hope is that the student will learn what resources and staff are available to help, and will begin operating successfully within the culture of the school. When the student is from another part of the world, has been educated in a different system, speaks a different language, and is far from home, this adjustment process can be even more overwhelming (Lee and Rice 2007).

I hypothesized that the university museum could provide a space for exhibits, events or programming created by or created for the international student population. These would work in conjunction with efforts by the offices of internationalization to help foster a more inclusive and engaged campus environment. Specific examples of activities and findings from research will be discussed below, but I begin with a brief overview of the research questions and thesis statement.


Relevance

Museums often invoke the notion of learning, expanding one’s horizons, and gaining greater cultural understanding. They might be large, universal museums such as the Metropolitan Museum of Art or the British Museum, or small, local institutions such as Denver’s own Museo de las Americas. They vary in content, in mission, and access to resources, but they all try to foster education. Similarly, universities have the responsibility to nurture a global perspective in their students while training them in critical thinking and inquiry. University of Denver’s mission statement reads

The mission of the University of Denver is to promote learning by engaging with students in advancing scholarly inquiry, cultivating critical and creative thought, and generating knowledge. Our active partnerships with local and global communities contribute to a sustainable common good. [University of Denver 2014a]

While this may be the ideal surrounding museums and universities in the 21st century, it has not always been this way. Both museums and universities have suffered critique regarding their past behaviors and perspectives. Though the history of museums is too long and rich to detail here, it is generally agreed that museums began as the private collections of royalty and aristocracy. Some also include religious collections (Ames 1992:16; Hagen 1876:43). These collections gradually opened up to the public, though with many restrictions and much hesitation by the collectors and later curators. As society moved toward broader access to education and the growth of the middle class during and after the Renaissance, demand increased for access to museum collections as well (Ames 1992). According to Ames, this began the process of “democratizing” the public museum, which is still going on today. A critique that many museums suffer is one
that is built in to their very origin: one of elitism and exclusivity (1992). Collectors and curators viewed themselves as keepers of high culture and scholarship, and the residue of this mentality can still be experienced in many institutions today. This real or perceived elitism prevents many people from ever engaging with their local museums, and as Ames argues, the relevance of museums will depend on the extent to which they can democratize. Or, as Ames writes, “…the extent to which there is increasing and more widespread participation in decisionmaking regarding administration…educational programming…collections management…and increased opportunities for independent thought” (1992:89). A major goal of this thesis is to explore how university museums can work toward greater democratization and increased access to their resources.

Similarly to museums, colleges and universities in the U.S. were founded primarily to train male clergy and civil servants. These students were usually in the top echelon of society whose families could afford not only the monetary cost, but also the loss of labor on farms or in family businesses. Women and people of lower economic classes, it was thought at the time, had no need of an education because they were never expected to teach or hold any type of office (Cohen and Kisker 2010:26). This was the case until the mid-1800s when land-grant colleges were formed to train citizens in farming, military strategy, and other “mechanical arts” (Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities 2012:1).

Fortunately, many museums and universities are currently working to fight against their negative stereotypes, as well as open their doors to a wider public. Museums are striving to change their interpretation of objects and the stories those objects tell. They are cooperating with artists and source communities, and are creating new programs
to interact with and meet the needs of their local communities. Universities are structuring programs that allow working adults to finish their degrees. Institutions such as University of Rochester, Yale University, Duke University, and dozens of others are putting high quality content online for the benefit of the public (Coursera 2014). Others are building local and global partnerships to create learning and goodwill across borders.

Of course, not every museum or university is making changes to benefit society or become more accessible. This thesis discusses some of the historical and present-day critiques of these institutions so as to give some background about where museums and universities have been, and where they are going. Findings from the current research suggest that museums and universities continue to struggle with equity and inclusivity. Shedding light on these issues through critique helps provide a platform for reflexivity upon which these institutions can build. Though brief, the included critique helps to frame the research questions and place my findings within larger discussions of inclusivity, ethnocentrism, and accessibility within the fields of anthropology, higher education and museology.

While many museums and universities are taking steps toward increased accessibility and intercultural competence in their graduates, few have taken those steps together. There is an abundance of research relating to object-based learning, the power of museum objects, the ability of museums to teach us about other cultures, other ways of thinking, and other realities (Ames 1992; Bodo 2009; Gell 2012; Clifford 1997; Karp, Kreamer and Lavine 1992; Lynch 2011). There is relatively little, however, on these qualities and how they might relate to international students. Similarly, there are countless university administrators, faculty and staff who are concerned about
international students, their needs, and the school’s obligation to them. This is evidenced by the proliferation of offices for international admissions, internationalization, international student advisors, etc. There are educators, anthropologists, and psychologists concerned with the well being of international students on American soil and working within their expertise to encourage successful student experiences.

Despite the clear need for more outlets for internationalization, few have utilized the university museum as a tool for international student support and enhanced learning. Thus, the current research seeks to contribute to the field of museum anthropology and education by examining a potential resource for the parties mentioned above. This research is timely given the ever-increasing population of international students, and the need for university museums to assert themselves as important campus facilities when universities are more likely to trim funding from areas they deem peripheral in favor of more lucrative endeavors.

Research Questions and Thesis Statement

Though American colleges and universities are investing enormous amounts of time, money, and energy into internationalization efforts, they are still failing to meet many of their international students’ needs, as well as produce interculturally competent alumni. It is my assertion that university museums can help ameliorate this problem in two ways. One, through their collections, university museums can create avenues toward empathy and communication between students using the concepts of object agency, object biographies, and materiality. Two, through programming, university museums can help facilitate curricular or extra curricular activities to create a more inclusive campus that encourages a holistic approach toward internationalization and more closely meets
students’ needs. These can include utilizing object-based learning in the classroom, or offering the use of the museum space to campus clubs and groups. Suggestions for programming will be discussed in more detail in the conclusion.

In light of these assertions, the current thesis investigated the following research questions in order to assess the current climate of international student experiences in the U.S. and offers ten suggestions for fruitful interaction between international students and university museums.

1) What are some of the challenges that international students face while attending a college or university in the United States?
   a. How is the university already addressing these challenges, and in what ways does the university need to improve?

2) Can university museums foster increased interaction among student populations of diverse backgrounds?
   a. How can the collections themselves foster interaction?
   b. How can programming help achieve the goal of increased interaction?

The discussion of museums, universities, and their international interests form the general framework for my thesis, and serve as the foundation for my research questions.

For the purposes of the current study, the goal of internationalization and the steps taken toward that goal as they relate to international students are of primary interest. Are American institutions striving toward a holistic approach to internationalization? Are they concerned not only with the well being of their international students, but also with the intercultural education of their domestic students? If so, what are they doing to achieve this?
More specifically, this research seeks to explore what measures the University of Denver is taking to help serve its international students academically, psychologically, and socially. How does the University of Denver meet the needs of the international students on its campus? How are these priorities reflected in services, funding, and resources made available to international students, and even to staff and faculty training? Other relevant, comparably sized institutions may be referenced in comparison and contrast to DU.

Chapter 2 will discuss background information, the theoretical underpinnings of the thesis as they relate to internationalization, international students, museums, and university museums, and finally review relevant literature. Chapter 3 will outline the methods I used to gather information, and Chapter 4 will include the findings from the research, as well as some analysis and discussion. Chapter 5 will offer some conclusions and suggestions for future research.
CHAPTER TWO: BACKGROUND, THEORY AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Background

In order to provide a context for the current research, some background information on internationalization, study abroad, and the international student population itself is necessary. The introduction provided a broad overview of the thesis, but this background section deals more specifically with university museums and international education to give the reader a better idea of where the current research fits within these fields, and where many of the trends are headed for the foreseeable future.

University Museums

As can be seen above, universities have many challenges before them in the coming years to create more inclusive and sensitive institutions while maintaining high standards of education. Though many changes are already underway, one pre-existing area reflecting international interests is the university museum or gallery. University museums are assets that improve the campus experience for faculty, staff, and students. They are uniquely positioned within the institution to explore campus, community, and global issues that other offices of the university may not have time or funding to pursue. They offer all students a place to gather, to learn, to talk, and to explore that is different from the library or study hall. Within the walls of the university museum, there is a certain amount of freedom that enables the museum staff and faculty to approach important issues. These museums were often started by faculty and researchers who
would collect objects while traveling, and upon returning, donate their collections to their home university. This is particularly the case with natural history and ethnographic collections, but is also evident in art galleries. These collections are frequently used for exhibitions and continued research by professors and visiting scholars. Through purchases, donations, and faculty generated research items, university museums are responsible for many artifacts. These collections offer the potential to facilitate dialogue and learning among students and faculty. Whether it is a class in art, anthropology, archeology, geography, or a course in language or history, all of these and more could benefit from the use of a museum collection (Bonner 1985).

Based on the scope of the current research, the museum of interest in the current study is the University of Denver Museum of Anthropology (DUMA). The reasons for choosing a local site will be discussed in future paragraphs. DUMA is a small university museum with approximately 150,000 artifacts, focusing on the American Southwest. However, the collection also encompasses objects from Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The archeological material of Dr. Etienne Renaud was used to establish the museum in 1931 (Department of Anthropology 2014). The museum today is active in curating faculty-led and student-guided exhibitions, hosting researchers, and working with Native American groups for the responsible preservation and repatriation of objects under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA).

*Internationalization in Higher Education*
Higher education in the United States is big business. Public and private post-secondary institutions spend billions of dollars each year for the instruction and support of their students, as well as in research and public service endeavors (U.S. Department of Education 2014). With millions of people enrolling each year, it is no wonder that each institution is competing for the attention and tuition dollars of every student (U.S. Department of Education 2014). Increasingly though, institutions are turning their attention outward to other countries. International education is not a recent development, but its nature is changing. More and more international students are coming to the United States for an undergraduate or graduate degree.

Colleges and universities want international enrollment for a variety of reasons, the biggest one being economic. Other important reasons include an enriched educational environment that benefits from diverse perspectives, and increased goodwill across nation-state borders. Cultural competence and the ability to work with people from varying cultures are often touted as major steps in developing successful graduates and future employees. Cross-cultural interactions - especially in the workplace - are viewed as an inevitability in an increasingly globalized world. The University of Denver includes international students in its commitment to diversity. The Center for Multicultural Excellence is the office on campus devoted to issues of inclusivity and diversity. They have many publications and programs throughout the year pertaining to different issues and groups that are underrepresented on DU’s campus. They have a directory of diversity related clubs and organizations on campus, and host the Diversity Summit every year which includes students, faculty and staff from DU discussing diversity and inclusive
excellence, as well as speakers from Denver and the nation (Center for Multicultural Excellence 2014).

More specifically, the International Student and Scholars Services (ISSS) website and offices provide an abundance of practical information including visa and employment information, healthcare, housing, etc. They provide orientation information for new students, and maintain a calendar of events that might interest international students (ISSS 2014). The Office of Internationalization, which houses the ISSS, also has begun an annual conference on internationalization at the school (Office of Internationalization 2014). The details of all the activities relating to internationalization at DU are too great to enumerate here; suffice it to say that DU has established the offices and staff to pursue internationalization on campus in an earnest way.

Across the country, institutions of higher education have started devoting more time, money, and staff toward internationalization efforts in order to remain appealing in a competitive environment. Many schools have offices of internationalization, international admissions staff, international student advisors, and international houses that provide a range of services. Though their motives vary, international students are applying to and attending American schools in increasing numbers, and U.S. institutions are responding. This phenomenon - internationalization - is significant and at times controversial, but is a logical outcome of increased globalization. Below is a brief historical outline of international students in America and American students abroad.

International Education in America
International education has a long history, dating back to at least Greek and Roman times when the Sophists would attract student protégés from far and wide (Bevis and Lucas 2007:14). In the United States, schools did not attract many international students until the late 1800s, due in part to the continuing prestige of European universities, the disruptive nature of the Revolutionary War, small endowments, and poor overall quality of the nascent institutions (Bevis and Lucas 2007). In spite of all of this, the occasional international student does appear on school rosters. In 1784, for example, Francisco de Miranda from Venezuela became the first Latin American student to graduate from Yale (Bevis and Lucas 2007:41). Mario Garcia Menocal graduated from Cornell in 1888 with an engineering degree, and Fernando Bolivar, nephew of Simon Bolivar, attended the University of Virginia for one year in the mid 1800s, but did not graduate (Bevis and Lucas 2007:41). Yung Wing, a young man from China, became the first Asian to graduate from Yale in 1854 (Bevis and Lucas 2007:44). Niijima Jo, from Japan, graduated from Amherst College in 1870 (Bevis and Lucas 2007:53). Though these students are notable and went on to work on behalf of international education and international relations, their numbers remained small. This was in part due to American restrictions on visas and immigration, and European universities’ continued reputation for being of the highest quality. There also remained few, if any, formalized support systems for international students (Bevis and Lucas 2007). International student growth was slow but steady during the early years of the 20th century. By 1920, the Bureau of the Interior reported 8,357 international students in America (Bevis and Lucas 2007:61).

At the University of Denver, international students were present on campus as early as the 1914/1915 academic year. These students came from China, England, Japan,
Korea, the Philippines, and Peru (University of Denver Bulletin 1915). It is possible that international students were on campus even earlier than this; however, the Special Collections and Archives for the University of Denver does not have student rosters prior to 1914.

The history of international education is long and complicated. Some argue that the United States’ main motivation for allowing international students admission into its institutions was a political one. In other words, educating foreigners on U.S. soil was a way to propagate American ideals and systems throughout the world. For example, the *pensionado* program, established in 1903, educated Filipino students at American military colleges such as West Point, with the goal of “Americanization” in that archipelago for political ends (Kramer 2012:19). Another motive, some argue, was to educate international students in American religious colleges with the hope that they would return home and proselytize to their communities (Kramer 2012). Though interesting, the specific motives of international students and their American host institutions during the late 19th and early 20th century is slightly beyond the scope of the present research. Suffice it to say that motivations for study as well as the interest of the host institutions have changed over time, and will continue to do so as globalization increases and geo-political interests change around the world.

*Study Abroad*

The above paragraphs sketch a brief overview of the beginnings of international students in America. They do not, however, touch on the history of study abroad –
American students leaving the U.S. to study elsewhere – either in America in general or at the University of Denver specifically. Organized study abroad programs began in the early years of the 20th century. They consisted of two major categories: Junior Year Abroad (JYA) and various faculty-led trips. JYA involved a year long immersion program during which students would live in one location, studying culture and language. The faculty-led trips were shorter, and tended to tour more than one country to give students an overview of various languages and cultures (Twombly, et al. 2012). Some of the earliest known faculty-led tours were called “summer tramps” and were based out of Indiana University. Led by David Starr Jordan, they began in 1879 and became quite popular at the school (Twombly, et al. 2012; Indiana University 2013). As mentioned above, the motivations for study abroad changed over the years, particularly from the governmental perspective. For example, after World War II and into the Cold War years, the government saw American students who studied abroad as serving a diplomatic purpose, promoting the good reputation and goodwill of the United States around the world. In more recent years, study abroad programs have taken on a more pragmatic, economic role. Universities are promoting study abroad programs as helpful to one’s résumé, future career, and subsequent salary (Twombly et al. 2012).

Since the early 1900s, a wide variety of study abroad programs and international exchanges have come and gone at DU with varying degrees of success. Currently, the most well known program at DU is the Cherrington Global Scholars program, started in 2004. This program is for juniors or seniors with a GPA of 3.0 or higher. It is popular because it allows students to study abroad at the same cost of an academic quarter at DU. Other programs have included exchange programs with the University of Bologna or
faculty-led trips to destinations such as London. For years there was an exchange program housed in the Graduate School of Social Work called the Denver International Program (DIP). This exchange was largely focused on cultural education and professional development. Between the years of 1979 and 2004, DIP saw more than 300 students cycle through the University of Denver (Henry and Kester, no date).

Though the current research is not directly related to study abroad per se, it is helpful to get a sense of the environment of international education in the United States. The status of study abroad programs in terms of publicity and allocation of resources, moreover, helps give a sense of a school’s priorities within the broader goal of internationalization.

*International Students*

In order to better understand the current research in its larger context, it is helpful to understand international students in a broader context. Below is information about enrollment trends and financial statistics on a national scale, as well as reasons students give for studying abroad. This information contributes to an understanding of why this research is relevant and timely.

*Enrollment Trends*

According to the Department of Education, as of 2010, there were 21 million total students enrolled in postsecondary degree granting institutions (U.S. Department of Education 2012). Enrollment by international students in U.S. educational institutions has been climbing steadily since the 2006/07 academic year according to the Institute of
International Education (IIE). In the 2011/12 academic year the total number of international students was 764,495, which is approximately 3.7% of the total student population for that year (IIE 2012). Of those, the majority of international students on American campuses came from Asian countries, particularly China, which made up approximately 25% of the total international student population in 2012 (IIE 2012). India sends the second highest number of students to the U.S., 100,270, which is about 13.1% of the total international student enrollment (IIE 2012). On the University of Denver campus, students from China represent over half of the overall student population (International Student and Scholar Services). These statistics are helpful to know in order to direct resources and programming that will be the most helpful to the greatest number of students. The demographics of international students change over time, and having an idea of who is studying abroad the most in any given year will inform how universities approach internationalization and allocate resources.

Financial Statistics

Colleges and universities want international students to study at their institutions for a variety of reasons. The first and most obvious one is financial: international students contributed more than $27 billion to the United States economy in the 2013/14 academic year (Institute of International Education 2014b). This comes mainly from tuition and living expenses, as international students get relatively little financial aid from the United States government or their schools of choice. The Institute of International Education reports that in the 2013/2014 academic year, the federal government provided .5% of the total funds for education in America, and 19.3% of funding came from U.S. colleges and universities (Institute of International Education 2014c). Given the ever-increasing cost
of higher education in America, the fact that international students continue to produce funds for tuition and living is a testament to the desirability of an American degree. For example the annual general undergraduate cost of DU tuition plus student fees rose from $35,481 in 2009 to $40,707 in 2013 (Office of the Provost 2013). According to NAFSA, a non-profit organization dedicated to international education, in the 2013/2014 academic year international students contributed $303,398,000 to Colorado’s economy (NAFSA 2014).

Reasons for Studying Internationally

What types of forces are at work to encourage people to leave their familiar territory and travel in order to gain an education? Clearly, the literature shows that being an international student is a difficult process for most people. For Appadurai, the global flows of mediascapes, finanscapes, and ethnoscapes all contribute in their own way to internationalization. The allure of living in a place one has seen in movies, on TV, or has read about draws many people. In fact, Obst and Forster claim that the number one reason students give for studying abroad is to “experience new ways of thinking and acting…” (2005:15). Additionally, the number one method of gaining information and knowledge about study abroad opportunities is the Internet (Obst and Forster 2005:24). The promise of a more comfortable future and economic success with a degree from a particular country or university draws some (Obst and Forster 2005:16,19). The movement of family and friends to or from a place can also impact one’s decision about where to attend school. A graduate student from Honduras I spoke with chose the University of Denver because she has family in the area. Yang simplifies these global flows by claiming that while globalization is the “social processes that transcend national
borders, it is fundamentally an economic process…” (2002:82).

Some Implications of International Education

Economics drive so much of the world, and with fewer and fewer resources, universities are being forced to reconsider their commitments to internationalization on campus (Yang 2002). Indeed, Michael Haugh writes that international students are valued for their revenue potential, but also disliked for their “drag” on the quality of higher education (2008:207). Devos does not directly reference Appadurai’s mediascapes, but her article on the public discourse around international students in Australia is applicable nonetheless. In her report, Australian media portrayed international students as being valuable only for their financial contribution to the university system, and as being given passing grades regardless of their poor English skills. Devos blames the media for reinforcing negative stereotypes of international students, and arguably increasing the social distance between international students and native Australian students (2003). This popular perception of international students can have grave effects on their experience in the host culture. Volet and Ang argue that students struggle more to relate to each other as the social and cultural distance between them widens (1998:7). In other words, the greater the cross-cultural differences between students, the more difficult they will find working and communicating together.

The concept of cultural distance also references Clifford’s use of the term contact zone for the museum, which will be discussed in further detail in the following chapter (1997:192). While some students report satisfaction at how friendly those in America are, others argue that beyond pleasantries, many Americans are reticent to form deeper relationships with international students (Fong 2011). More than one student I
interviewed mentioned that Americans already have strong friend groups, and it is very difficult to break into them. One student from China even accused white Americans as being racist toward the Chinese students (personal communication with author, January 30, 2014). Montgomery also suggests that the readily available technology used for communication could stifle local friendships. In other words, the ability to communicate with one’s community at home instantly over the Internet or phone may contribute to a lack of interest in developing deep friendships in the local area (2010:68). While the museum cannot artificially create friendships, it can be a place to compress the social and cultural distances between students.

International students study abroad in part to form relationships with people from the host culture, but studies have shown that this is harder than the international students expect (Sherry et al. 2010; Gresham and Clayton 2011; Sovic 2009). Volet and Ang offer four reasons why students typically gravitate toward their “own people.” These are *cultural-emotional connectedness, language, pragmatism, and negative stereotypes* (1998:10). Cultural-emotional connectedness refers to the feeling that students from the same country “get” you; they understand cultural milieus, humor, politics, etc. Students also find it much easier to work with others who speak the same native language, even if they have passed the reading and writing competency to be admitted into an institution abroad. Pragmatism refers to the family and work commitments that many local students may have that international students lack. Since most international students are abroad without their families, they have different routines of work and recreation time compared to students who may have obligations to their family or workplace. Finally, negative
stereotypes are a disincentive for students to work together (Volet and Ang 1998). In order for intercultural interaction to be profitable, students need to be equipped with basic cross-cultural communication skills and techniques to improve interactions for everyone involved (Wright and Tolan 2009; Baker and Clark 2010).

In her work with students from a variety of Portuguese-speaking countries, Gonçalves proposes techniques for working toward a more inclusive, intercultural university. Gonçalves makes the argument that effective intercultural educational programs must “recognize and reflect the complex ethnic identities and characteristic of individual students. They should also help students explore and clarify their own ethnic identities” (2011:84). She goes on to write that harmony and conflict resolution are results of intercultural interaction, but only with the help of other key components. Exposure is not enough. She states that a supportive and safe institutional environment is key to encouraging intercultural relationships between students. Additionally, status equality, cooperative interdependence, and a normative context that incubates contact and peaceful relations between people are also important facets in the success of an intercultural interaction (Gonçalves 2011:85). These claims are corroborated by my research and interviews which will be discussed in Chapter 4. Gonçalves’ point that a safe and supportive institutional environment is key is also confirmed through interviews conducted with various faculty and staff. They repeated that international students and domestic students need repeated interactions and events that become normative on campus. Events like Festival of Nations, a once per year celebration of the different cultures represented at DU is good, but it perpetuates the idea that international interest
and concerns are special, unique, or out of the ordinary. Instead, students from around the
world should interact on a regular, routine basis (personal communication with author
April 3, 2014).

The next section discusses the theoretical underpinnings of the current research,
and includes an overview relevant literature.

**Theory and Literature Review**

One of the more cumbersome aspects of research is defining the terms one uses in
a clear and concise way. It is not uncommon for the same word to have different
definitions depending on the author and the field from which the author is writing. Many
of the terms used in this thesis are based on the movement of people, money, objects and
ideas around the world. Global flows or *globalization* and *cosmopolitanism* are important
concepts that have been extensively theorized by a variety of fields. The museum field
also has some concepts and terms that will be discussed, such as *contact zone* and
intercultural dialogue or *interculturalism*.

*Globalization*

The University of Denver and universities all over the world are actively
recruiting students from other nations and taking steps to produce more
“internationalized” campuses. The questions arise then: why are they doing this, and what
is making it possible? Students have been traveling to foreign universities for decades,
even centuries, so is there something new or different about the current state of
international education? Some would argue that within the last century, with advances in
technology and greater global political connectedness, a new form of globalization has
begun. Time and space continue to “shrink” as barriers such as travel and communication become easier (Burbules and Torres 2000:12). Whatever the case, the instances of study abroad are on the rise, and the broadest and most obvious contributor to this is globalization. Few will deny the existence of globalization, but the topic is obscured by a multiplicity of definitions and perspectives. Giddens, for example, defines globalization as “the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa” (1990:64). Another definition from Yang asserts that

Globalisation, in its broadest form, describes social processes that transcend national borders. While the concept of globalisation spans separate, overlapping domains, it is fundamentally an economic process of integration that transcends national borders and ultimately affects the flow of knowledge, people, values and ideas. [2002:82]

Globalization is widely acknowledged to be a highly social movement, while remaining a fundamentally economic phenomenon. People move, objects move, and ideas move, largely under the influence of money and financial viability. Another noted characteristic of the current globalization is the weakening of nation-state distinctions. With the help of travel and technology, individuals and businesses are less beholden to nation-state boundaries.

While one mutually agreed upon definition of globalization may elude theorists for the time being, the concept of global flows as articulated by Arjun Appadurai is a helpful one for viewing this complex issue. In his essay “Disjunctures and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy”, Appadurai outlines five –scapes he believes explain the current flow of people and things around the world. These are ethnoscrapes, technoscapes,
*mediascapes, financescapes, and ideoscapes.* For Appadurai, the *ethnoscape* is made up of all the communities of people who move around the world such as migrants, students, tourists, exiles and so forth (1990:573).

Appadurai describes the *mediascape* as that which produces information (newspapers, television, film, telephones and the like) and also the images of the world that are in turn produced (1990:574). The most obvious application of this concept is in relation to social media, the Internet, news, movies, and similar technologies, but the concept can also be applied to museums. Museum collections and exhibits both produce information and utilize images of the world that have been produced. Mediascapes are relevant to the current research because media and technology are always creating images of other places, people and events that are then consumed locally. In the present context, these images influence how students interact based on their preconceived notions of the “other.” What these notions will be, and about whom they will be is completely unpredictable and not necessarily related to a student’s country of origin.

*Finanscapes* deal with the global flow of money and commodities around the world. Appadurai uses it mainly to describe large sums moving through stock markets and currency exchanges, but for the present study, finanscapes are still a viable way to view the impacts of global and local markets, an increasing ability for many parents to send their children abroad to study, and how an international education affects students’ future financial status (as noted in Yang’s definition of globalization as a largely economic phenomenon). Finanscapes also can refer to the financial interests of the universities and recruiting agencies involved in international education. As the cost of higher education continues to rise, international students may serve as an important
revenue source for universities and colleges (Lee and Rice 2007; IIE 2014b).

As Appadurai argues, global flows follow increasingly disparate paths, and the increasing speed and scope of the global flows is so disjointed as to be unpredictable (1990:576). It is with this view of globalization and global flows that the research will proceed.

Cosmopolitanism and Engaged Anthropology

In 2010, Current Anthropology published an issue addressing engaged anthropology. The introduction is titled “Engaged Anthropology: Diversity and Dilemmas”, written by Setha Low and Sally Merry. In their introduction, the authors address the history of engaged anthropology in the U.S., present types of engaged anthropology, and discuss barriers to implementation (Low and Merry 2010). An engaged model of anthropology is one that allows and encourages new approaches to fieldwork and creates an environment in which new borders are defined and worked within. It places anthropologists inside the field in a new way, collaborating with, advocating for, and learning from their participants, as well as critiquing and changing their own society as a result. Singer asserts in defense of applied anthropology, “We live in a world of cultural contact and resulting social change that often leads to pressing problems, and we, as a result, are obliged to apply anthropology to real world challenges” (2008:326).

The field within which I will be working is one that Ulf Hannerz addresses in his book, Anthropology’s World: Life in a Twenty-First Century Discipline. He explains that for a long time, in order to be considered a proper anthropologist, one had to go abroad to a culture completely different from one’s own (Hannerz 2010). In contrast, Hannerz
discusses the shift in anthropology toward doing “anthropology at home” where the space between the researcher, topic of study, and audience shrinks significantly but remains a “geographic mini-version of that global project of building intelligibility in a context of diversity and connection” (2010:95-97). Indeed, Low and Merry’s article gives example of engaged anthropology in the U.S., including Low’s own research with the National Park Service and its stakeholders (2010:210). While more anthropologists are staying home for their work, they still enjoy what Hannerz calls a “double cosmopolitanism”, by which he means grappling with global and complex human problems on the one hand, and enjoying the sights, sounds, and smells of a diverse world on the other (2010:89). He argues that anthropologists should be “assisting in building intelligibility where both diversity and connection are ever-present realities” (Hannerz 2010:89; Clifford 1997).

Given the goals of this research, diversity and connection are realities of my thesis. International students are a diverse community with different cultures, languages, and perspectives from each other. Yet, given their physical proximity on campus as well as virtual proximity via online social media, they form a cohesive student body. This is helpful as I pursue the research questions because it reminds me not to consider “international student” as a broad, homogenous category, but rather to remember that even within that category, there is great diversity of opinions and life experiences. University museums can serve as a conduit through which complicated and sometimes difficult communications between disparate groups can occur. In a familiar place, among my peers, I explore the concepts of diversity and connection between and among people to assist in building intelligibility and empathy. A university is a complex organism, and it is my hope that the current research can contribute to a greater knowledge of how to
make that organism work better. In Hannerz’s words, the temptation remains to “assume that what is familiar is universal, or that modernity…breeds uniformity.” However, “a study of diversity remains the best antidote to unthinking ethnocentrism” (2010:49). If this is true, and I believe it is, then anthropology has a responsibility to show alternate forms of thinking and behavior to the world through the dissemination of its research and findings.

Sobré-Denton and Bardham give another definition in their book about cosmopolitanism as it relates to intercultural dialogue. According to the authors, cosmopolitanism is

About living life interculturally and in a world-oriented manner, through a certain disposition and ethical vision about the relation between the Self and the cultural Other. It is about taking an active interest in the cultural Other, being open to change and dialogue for social and global justice, and critically navigating multiple cultural attachments. [2013:37]

For these authors, cosmopolitanism and intercultural dialogue are complementary to one another, and each discipline can inform the other. This is true for the present research as well, since dialogue between students at the University of Denver would not be possible without the forces of globalization and the interests of cosmopolitanism at play.

Imagination

Another by-product of cosmopolitanism and globalization is the notion of imagined communities, or global imaginations. Beginning with Benedict Anderson, the idea of the imagination as an important component in globalization has been gaining traction (1983). Anderson argues that media and technology, particularly the printing press, began a process of national identity formation and the ability for people who have
never met to consider themselves part of a unified group. He also discusses museums, particularly national monuments and national museums as contributors to a national identity and imagination. The nation-state, by “museumizing” places and objects, creates and promotes a certain narrative about its past, present, and future that it wants the public to adopt, thus creating a unified cultural imagination (1983:178). In his book, Anderson uses Southeast Asian countries for his examples, but a similar argument can be made for museums and monuments in the United States. Some of the problems that this self-imagining can create when pursuing intercultural dialogue in museums will be discussed later.

Since *Imagined Communities* was published, many authors have expanded and utilized Anderson’s work, Appadurai among them. Appadurai considers the imagination a form of work, a form of “social practice.” He writes, “The imagination is now central to all forms of agency, is itself a social fact, and is the key component of the new global order” (1996:31). According to Appadurai, the ability to imagine living or working in a foreign place, enabled by global media, technology, new markets for labor and production, and deterritorialization contributes to the extremely diverse global flows the world is currently experiencing. Though Anderson’s national imagined communities and Appadurai’s more global view of the imagination seem to conflict, they in fact work in concert to influence internationalization on American campuses. More students now have the ability and desire to live overseas, aided by their broadened global imaginations. Once in a new country, however, many utilize the imagined communities of their home country to find and bond with other students from the same country. Given the huge land size and population of China, for example, two Chinese students may have drastically
different life experiences, but they are drawn to become friends because they feel a nationalistic bond. The same can be said for two American students studying abroad.

Why spend time discussing the imagination? According to Rizvi, “international education does appear to produce in students a global imagination in which the notions of mobility, transculturalism, and diaspora are especially significant” (2000:222). Our imaginations are also how we try to conceive of and make sense of the world, in other words, “What we imagine defines what we regard as normal” (Rizvi 2000:223). Imagining how one’s life might be different after a study abroad experience, whether fueled by curiosity, financial interests, or family pressure clearly motivates thousands of students each year to pursue international education.

Once students have decided to study abroad, imagination may also contribute to how they conceive of their time overseas. For example, when asked if they had any preconceived ideas of who they would befriend once in the United States, students gave a variety of answers. Some had never thought about it, while others had clear ideas of who they wanted to socialize with. Some were happy with their behavior and satisfied with their friend groups, but others found finding friends much harder than they anticipated and were dissatisfied. As Anderson and Appadurai have written, one’s imagination helps shape how and why one interacts with others. What students imagine, or what goals they set for their lives abroad can have a major impact on their experience, for better or for worse (Kitsantas 2004). A few of the international students I spoke with expressed inconsistency between their imagined lives and their real lives in America. They accused the American students of indifference or disinterest in befriending them.

Identity Negotiation
Of course, choosing to study abroad often becomes a major factor in how a student perceives him or herself, as well as how others perceive that student. Identity negotiation is a difficult and complex process and we are continually adjusting our identities according to the situation and our experiences. Our families, childhoods, education, and socioeconomic status all contribute to our identities as individuals; however, there is a strong connection between our individual identities and our social communities. The following section will discuss some theories surrounding how individuals negotiate their identities. Though tangential at first glance, this is important for conceptualizing how students might interact with each other as well as the institution as a whole. In other words, a basic understanding of how people create and maintain identities may inform how offices of internationalization or university museums structure their programs, marketing, clubs and exhibitionary practices to create a more holistic approach to their students, and contribute to a more empathetic environment for all.

Jan Nederveen Pieterse argues that “cultural identities are not given but produced” (2005:168). Critiquing traditional cultural relativism and the exoticizing or assimilating tendencies of ethnographic exhibitions, Nederveen Pieterse argues that museums are often the culprit of perpetuating static views of the “other”. This can lead to a sort of “intellectual racism” that then has an important impact on how we carry out our lives and treat others. What we think informs how we act. Instead, we should view culture – and by extension, the identities of others – as a fluid and continually negotiated process that acknowledges that culture is constructivist (Nederveen Pieterse 2005:168).

Wegner, as part of developing the concept of communities of practice, spends a significant amount of his book discussing identity formation. Wegner uses the concept of
trajectory to conceive of the process of creating an identity and participating in a community of practice (1998:154). He argues that our identities are constantly in motion and always being developed through practice within our communities. “As trajectories, our identities incorporate the past and the future in the very process of negotiating the present” (1998:155). For students at University of Denver, negotiating identities can mean anything from achieving high grades in class, to succeeding at sports, to making friends in the dorms, or exercising in the gym. For international students, all of the above apply, as well as additional tasks such as securing a student visa, practicing one’s English, getting a driver’s license, etc. Wegner writes of learners, “Understanding something new is not just a local act of learning. Rather, each is an event on a trajectory through which they give meaning to their engagement through practice in terms of the identity they are practicing” (1998: 155).

The process of negotiating one’s identity leads us to identification. According to Wegner, identification is the “process through which modes of belonging become constitutive of our identities by creating bonds or distinctions in which we become invested” (1998:191). In other words, we actively participate in our own and others’ identity negotiation through participating in and claiming certain identities (such as American, female, married, single, Chinese, etc.) that make up the whole of who we are. For the current research, identity negotiation is of interest because it involves choices to participate or not participate in certain activities. Whether or not a student will speak in class, attend campus events or join a club are all constitutive parts of that student’s identity. These small forms of identity negotiation will impact how each student approaches his or her time in the U.S.
Language

The languages we use, as well as our proficiency in them, are very important to our identities as individuals. Catherine Montgomery has argued that language learning and cultural learning are indivisible, so through learning a second language, students are already being opened to another culture (2010:37). Multiple studies show that language ability is one of the largest inhibitors of classroom achievement, confidence levels, and relationship building. Although for some, use of a foreign language is a major benefit to studying abroad (Baker and Clark 2010; Ha 2009). Though there is not space in the current thesis to discuss the vast amount of literature relating to language, the topic will be discussed in more detail using relevant studies and my own research findings.

Interculturalism and Intercultural Dialogue

As a microcosm of the university itself, museums can be places where domestic and international students learn how to understand each other’s languages and cultures. The museum as contact zone provides a helpful concept when thinking about intercultural dialogue. Originally introduced by Mary Louise Pratt, but promoted by James Clifford in his book Routes and elsewhere, Clifford describes the “contact perspective” as one that “argues for the local/global specificity of struggles and choices concerning inclusion, integrity, dialogue, translation, quality, and control. And it argues for a distribution of resources…that recognizes diverse audiences and multiply centered histories of encounter” (1997:214). Traditionally understood to involve groups separated by long distances, contact zones can also include large “social distances” that frequently occur within the same city, or in the case of the current research, the same campus (Clifford 1997:204).
Frequently, adopting a contact perspective also implies working with source communities. Peers and Brown define “source communities” as those groups from which artifacts are collected and their descendants today. These include many current communities: diasporas, local people, indigenous people, religious groups and the like (2003:2). Clifford was prescient when he wrote of new collaborations and alliances in a culturally complex society. In addition to collaborating with source communities and presenting co-curated exhibits, new alliances are being formed around shared patrimony, or sharing authority over culture (Clifford 1997:210). Others have picked up on and are advocating for museums as contact zones. Harold Skramstad makes a case for museums as critical community institutions. He writes that the “museum is a place for tactile, emotional, and intellectual contact with people, ideas, or objects that have the potential to inspire…. It is a place where people…can be a part of something larger and more important than their own individual lives” (1999:121).

The university is another type of institution where contact with people and ideas has the power to transform students into global citizens. The discussion about diversity within institutions such as universities is an ongoing and complex one (Yang 2002:81). In the university context, a wide variety of stakeholders work toward the goal of diversity, internationalization and interculturalism. Universities like reporting statistics about how many countries are represented on their campus each year, and recruit from countries all over the world. What are the implications of this goal, and what are authors saying about interculturalism and internationalization within institutions?

Knight’s definition of internationalization is commonly cited. She proposes that internationalization is “the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global
dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education” (2003:2).

Yang argues that universities by their very nature are international institutions. He writes

> While knowledge is often contextual, the advancement of human knowledge that is based on the common bonds of humanity is arguably a global enterprise. Universities are, therefore, by nature of their commitment to advancing human knowledge, international institutions. Historically, universities were already international as far back as the Middle Ages in the Western societies…when the academic rationale for internationalization was dominant. [2002:85]

Moving beyond internationalization toward interculturalism, Arjun Appadurai makes his case in the article “Diversity and Disciplinarity as Cultural Artifacts.” He writes that diversity in higher education is more than just numbers, it needs to comprise intellectual and curricular diversity as well. If diversity is reduced to statistics, then the university will become like any other workplace that strives toward cultural and ethnic diversity (Appadurai 2005:428). Arber contends that pedagogy within secondary education must be reflexive and aware of its Western perspective. She argues that even within science education, which is often viewed as universal and culture-free, curricula is part of a larger “cultural construction” (2012). Appadurai also argues for the incorporation of diversity within the curriculum, meaning the texts that students read. According to him, American universities are still largely holding to a canon of Euro-American texts, which does not reflect the diversity of intellectual contributions from all over the world (Appadurai 2005:429). Likewise, Yang argues that “it is the responsibility of a university to cultivate the ability to understand, appreciate and articulate the reality of interdependence among nations and to prepare faculty, staff and students to function in an international and intercultural context” (2002:86).
Matthias Otten agrees with Appadurai that interculturalism is an issue of organizational change that requires the embeddedness of intercultural practices (2009:409). For learning institutions such as universities, international mobility is key to unlocking students’ reservoirs of personal and intellectual growth (Otten 2009:408).

Within the field of education, Dietz and Mateos Cortés give a brief history of multiculturalism and intercultural logic to argue for more engaged, earnest anthropological studies in their contribution to Levinson and Pollock’s edited volume *A Companion to the Anthropology of Education*. They call for a “reflexive-ethnography” that requires the subjects of the dialogue (including the researcher) to understand each other based on the other’s “horizon of meaning” (Dietz and Mateos Cortés 2011:506). This type of ethnographic approach can, according to the authors, move education toward an interculturalism in which cultures are not essentialized or ghettoized, but which undergo an “intertwining of what is ‘mine’ and what belongs to ‘others’” (Dietz and Mateos Cortés 2011:506). Indeed Abdallah-Pretceille writes that a fixation on the differences of others typically results in exoticism and stereotyping others (2006:476).

Building on Appadurai’s mediascapes, she asserts that educators’ views of students are obstructed by the abstract and globalized knowledge of a particular student’s culture (Abdallah-Pretceille 2006:477). This relates to the ethical considerations of the project and must be considered throughout all workshops, programming, interviews, and discussions.

Changes like making one’s classroom more internationally focused can be difficult for some, and seemingly unnecessary for others. For example, the top three areas of enrollment for international students are Business and Management, Engineering, and
Mathematics (Institute of International Education 2013). At the University of Denver, the top three majors for international students, as of 2013, are Business, Engineering and Computer Science, and Natural Science and Mathematics\(^1\) (Office of Institutional Research and Analysis 2013). Some majors may see very few if any international students, therefore lessening the pressure on professors to internationalize their classrooms. As outlined above by Appadurai and others, until curricula become internationalized, that is, incorporate texts and theories from the non-Western canon, true internationalization of the institution will never occur and students will fail to develop intercultural skills (Appadurai 2005). In addition to curricular changes, professors can take steps to help the international students in their classrooms feel more comfortable and empowered. For example, one professor I spoke with who is international himself recalled his time in graduate school in the U.S. He said that working in small groups or pairs, and having to report to the rest of the class verbally helped him “find his voice.” He understands and relates to international students who struggle to keep up with the fast pace of classroom discussions, and tries to give his international students time and space to develop their thoughts and present them to the class (personal communication with author, February 21, 2014).

It is important to distinguish between the type of interculturalism defined above, and the multiculturalism that has dominated a variety of fields for several years. Multiculturalism tends toward the maintenance of cultural differences without interconnectedness. In other words, multiculturalism runs the risk of creating static views of the cultural Other, not allowing for multiple individual identities but rather

\(^1\)This claim deals only with students with declared majors.
categorizing difference and reinforcing separation between groups. Multiculturalism strives to create equal planes for different groups within a nation-state, without investing in the complex and nuanced identities of individuals (Sobré-Denton and Bardhan 2013:45). Beck writes that “among the choicest paradoxes of multiculturalism is that it emphatically rejects the essentialism of national homogeneity when defending minority rights, yet itself easily falls in the trap of essentialism” (2006:67).

While James Clifford provides a helpful theoretical contribution regarding museums as contact zones, he does so from abundant personal experience and research. According to Clifford, the essays in Routes are concerned with “human difference articulated in displacement, tangled cultural experiences, structures and possibilities of an increasingly connected but not homogenous world” (1997:2). In “Museums as Contact Zones”, Clifford describes his experiences observing and participating in various relationships between museums, indigenous populations, and the public. He uses his own experience as well as the experiences of museums to argue for museums as a prime space for the elusive negotiations surrounding material culture and self-representation (Clifford 1997:213). This essay is particularly useful because it gives examples of concrete situations and then extrapolates lessons learned that can be applied in other situations. As Clifford puts it, his “account of museums as contact zones is both descriptive and prescriptive” (1997:213).

Another more recent example of intercultural dialogue in the museum is the European project Museums Tell Many Stories. This project defines itself as a training project for museums around Europe to explore their collections and learn about programming for intercultural dialogue. The project was spread over two years, 2005 to
2007. The resulting publication highlights contributions from participants about what they have learned so far, and what they hope to accomplish within their respective institutions (Museums Tell Many Stories 2006). Immediately following this project, a second European endeavor began, called Museums as Places for Intercultural Dialogue (MAP for ID). Spanning December 2007 to November 2009, this project focused on engaging local communities to foster intercultural dialogue through a variety of projects. The editors define intercultural dialogue as a “process that comprises an open and respectful exchange or interaction between individuals, groups, and organizations with different cultural backgrounds or world views (Bodo et al. 2009:6). The publication resulting from the project is an invaluable resource for my research because it shows intercultural interaction being played out in real situations. With thirty pilot projects, MAP for ID made a major contribution to the museum anthropology field. The participating MAP for ID museums and cultural institutions placed at the forefront the “actual and potential visitors, staff, broader community and stakeholders” (Bodo et al. 2009:7).

Intercultural Dialogue and Contact Zones: Some Critiques

While notions of intercultural dialogue and collaborative work within the museum as contact zone are all well and good, they are not without faults or complications. In fact, problematizing these concepts is crucial for understanding university museums and the real and potential challenges that they face when striving toward a more inclusive campus. Since there is not space here to fully dissect these concepts, a brief overview of some of the issues will have to suffice.
Intercultural dialogue and intercultural competence are popular concepts in museum work today, and indeed play a large role in the current research. Some would argue, however, that these concepts are frequently misunderstood and misused.

Intercultural competence is a process, not an end. It is something that is always being practiced and worked out, not a task to accomplish (Bodo 2013:49). Moreover, even with hard work and dedication from staff, faculty and students, cultural change happens slowly, within the museum and in the university. By *cultural change* I mean institutional attitudes and behaviors, in this case by university museums and their host institutions.

Julia Harrison writes that institutional culture of individual museums is

...organic, fragmented, ambiguous, if not contradictory. While it must...be seen to be something dynamic, it is not something to be revolutionized over a short-time period; any fundamental change will likely be much more incremental, implicitly consensual, and sporadic, rather than directed. Fundamental to this is the recognition that in most cases core values will change only very slowly over extended periods of time. [2005a:198]

This glacial movement can be challenging for the average museum, but becomes even more so when the university museum is taken into consideration. In particular, the quick succession of students within most universities makes it difficult to foster any long-term relationships and involvement. Most students are in attendance for at most four years, with many attending a particular school for less than that. This requires a special flexibility and adaptability on the part of university museum staff (Durocher 2014).

For universities and their museums, this indicates a need for a greater commitment to intercultural interactions throughout the campus, in all parts of student life. David Coulby argues for the importance of intercultural education by saying that if “education is not intercultural, it is probably not education, but rather the inculcation of
nationalist or religious fundamentalism.” He writes that education needs to be intercultural from a young age, and that it cannot be given a timeline like other “subjects” within education (2006:246). While fundamentalism is a strong word to use in regard to American higher education, the argument for beginning intercultural education from a young age is a good one. This is clearly impossible for universities to achieve, since faculty and staff only deal with students as young adults. However, universities and their museums can approach intercultural competence as a part of life in a globalized world.

Faculty I spoke with emphasized the desire to see intercultural questions and discussions more fully integrated into classrooms and extra curricular activities, as opposed to “one-off” events or special events; for example, the Festival of Nations that happens every year as a special recognition of DU’s cultural and linguistic diversity (personal communication April 3, 2014; November 26, 2014). This is supported by Appadurai’s and Arber’s claims that higher education in the U.S. is inherently biased toward Western culture and canons, and schools should make an effort to bring in texts from global perspectives (Appadurai 1996; Arber 2012).

An additional barrier is the ontological make-up of both universities and museums. Many of these institutions were founded with and still maintain nationalist, or Western, identities. This is not to say that faculty, staff and administrators set out to inculcate their students with nationalist agendas, but rather pointing out a shared institutional history. For the university museum, this makes it very difficult to effect change and move toward a more equitable institution and increased intercultural dialogue (Ames 1994; Boast 2001:64; Bodo 2013:49). Boast writes that this type of change “...requires museums to learn to let go of their resources, even at times of the objects, for
the benefit and use of communities and agendas far beyond its knowledge and control” (2011:67).

Letting go of control, either physically of objects, or metaphorically of interpretation and presentation, is a huge topic of discussion among museum anthropologists and other practitioners. As discussed earlier, Clifford’s idea of museums as contact zones has been influential in how museum practitioners approach intercultural dialogue, but has encountered increasing critique in recent years. Robin Boast writes a pointed critique of Pratt’s and later Clifford’s contact zones while still affirming the overall intentions. Boast writes, “the contact zone is a clinical collaboration, a consultation that is designed from the outset to appropriate the resources necessary for the academy and to be silent about those that were not necessary” (2011:66). For Boast and others, the contact zone remains a place of uneven authority, or unequal collaboration between the museum and its partners. Lynch writes in response to him, “Clifford’s enthusiasm for the potential of this contact somehow disregards the museum’s fear of others that flows like an undercurrent beneath these encounters. It underestimates the museum’s need to exercise control, and its even greater fear of change” (2011:150). Lynch argues for a willingness to face these fears, recognize and acknowledge this control and inequality within the museum, and live in the dissonance that comes when people do not agree.

Drawing on political theorist Chantel Mouffe, Lynch argues that museums too often seek consensus, at the cost of transparency and honesty. Even within the contact zone, which in its ideal form allows for all to speak their minds, people tend to default to consensus, which usually means defaulting to the museum’s dominant view (2011:154).
Marstine writes “Consensus has come to signal an exclusivity and like-mindedness among contributors, as well as fixity of thought. Museums seeking change foster collaborative relationships on equal footing with diverse stakeholders and willingly assume the risks entailed by entertaining novel positions” (2011:7).

These are admirable goals, but can the university museum reach them? As stated above, intercultural competence, equitable collaborations, and meaningful partnerships are part of an ongoing ethical practice of museums. University museums also need to incorporate these practices into their operations. An important first step, however, is self-awareness and self-critique. In her writing on institutional culture and its need to change, Harrison adds that rather than becoming overwhelmed with the task, museums might understand their task

As part of the reality of the social and historical world which is, after all, what the museum has charged itself to document and interpret. Institutional self-reflexivity on its very existence could be an important factor in understanding what factors contribute to the success (or failure) of the important work of producing collaborative exhibitions.” [2005a:210]

Lynch has dedicated much of her practice and writing to discussing reflexive practices and transparency in museums (2011; 2013). Many well-meaning museum staff, faculty, and students view themselves as open, collaborative individuals, which makes reflexive practices all the more important for exposing where and how people and institutions of power wield their influence over people or communities who are at a disadvantage. Lynch writes that “Developing a reflexive practice in museums would significantly help clarify the subtle nature of the power relationships and levels of participation on offer that are too often hidden within these transactions” (2011:147). Museum staff and students have to “un-learn” their habits of privilege and power, “Museums must begin to develop
a repertoire of…reflective and dialogical skills and techniques, if they are to build trust and learn from their own practice” (Lynch 2011:158).

Again, the charges posed by the above authors are formidable. They take time, effort, thoughtfulness, humility and patience. In fact, many museums might disregard them as impossible. Museums come not just as a group of progressive curators or educators. They also come with marketing teams, boards of trustees, membership staff, and many more staff who are responsible for paying the bills. Risk-taking of the type described above is intimidating and dangerous for some institutions (Harrison 2005b:39). I argue, however, that university museums are uniquely positioned to take on these challenges. Institutional culture can be conservative and sluggish, as mentioned above, but universities are also places of freethinking and experimentation. Without the demands of revenue and visitation, university museums can take risks that public museums are not always able to.

*Constructivism and Community*

The movement toward a more engaged museology is not all risk-taking; for example, in the field of museum education, many practitioners are realizing the value of dialogue, conversation, and flexibility in learning. George Hein, in his chapter contribution to *The Educational Role of the Museum*, outlines different types of museums and promotes the constructivist model (Hein 1999). Constructivism, according to Hein, has two major components that differ from other theories of learning. First, an active participation by the learner is required. In other words, visitors must be encouraged to use their hands as well as their minds. Secondly, constructivism requires that the conclusions reached by the visitor are valid on the basis that they make sense according to the
information given. In contrast to discovery learning methods in which the participant is expected to draw preconceived, “true” conclusions based on the evidence, constructivism states that if the conclusions align with the given evidence in that context, then the conclusions are considered valid. When the evidence changes, so too will the conclusions (Hein 1999:34). Learners create meaning as they learn and are constantly re-organizing and molding knowledge within their own minds. In the museum context, visitors will derive their meaning from the exhibit, the environment, their companions, etc. and this process of learning is a constructive act (Hein 1999:76). To allow the constructivist model of learning to influence the museum is to take the visitor into consideration and to allow for differing forms of knowledge. This model has been made manifest in a myriad of ways, and is still being fleshed out with ongoing experimentation and evaluation by many institutions. Facilitating personal meaning making within the museum is becoming increasingly recognized as legitimate, appealing, and useful (Hooper-Greenhill 1999a:11).

The above model does not, however, limit interpretation and constructed knowledge to the individual. Meaning-making is also a highly social process, and we are all enmeshed in “interpretive communities” that influence how we process the world (Hooper-Greenhill 1999b:50). Falk and Dierking argue for a similar concept, which they call “communities of learners” (2000:46). These communities can be anything from a family unit to a school class or an artist guild. We all find ourselves embedded within communities that shape how we learn and operate in the world, though these are highly fluid and may change according to context. Not only do these shape how we learn, but they facilitate learning as well. Falk and Dierking, citing Silverman, state that learning
processes within the museum largely take place through social interactions with one’s companions. When people share experiences, or work through problems or concepts together in the museum, they reinforce social bonds and also forge new ones. For the present study, this contributes to the understanding of museums and their social importance for learning and interpersonal bonds between students (Falk and Dierking 2000:99).

Similarly, Wegner proposes what he calls “communities of practice” which gives a helpful perspective on the current research. For Wegner, much like Falk and Dierking, our communities of practice are those groups to which we belong that foster learning, identity formation, belonging, and social norms (1998:45). A family, a school group, a workplace, a place of worship, any of the arenas in which we dwell will almost inevitably become a community of practice at some point. For a community of practice to form, Wegner argues that two major processes must take place: practice and reification. 

Practice, according to Wegner, is performing actions in “a historical and social context that gives structure and meaning to what we do. In this sense, practice is always social practice” (1998:45). For students at University of Denver, practice means going to class together, eating in the cafeteria together, or attending sporting events, all behaviors that are socially meaningful within the context of the university. Museums also contain communities of practice. Staff, faculty, and volunteers practice together to form an institutional identity that impacts how they interact with the outside world. Being cognizant of the ways in which university museums practice this identity can help inform how they interact with their audiences.
Reification, as used by Wegner, refers to the concrete foci we use to organize our practices. In other words, “the process of giving form to our experience by producing objects that congeal this experience into ‘thingness’” (1998:58). An example of this would be a constitution or charter for a student club. By writing down the laws and by-laws, the group of students is materializing their experience of the club, and guaranteeing that future club members will continue to practice in the same way. University of Denver is a large community of practice due to its institutional rules, departments, public identity, museums, etc. Wegner finds more value in smaller groups, however, such as a specific department or club at the university where the staff and faculty know each other, work together toward a common goal, and negotiate their identities within that context (1998:131). The current study is concerned with exploring how international students negotiate their communities of practice. It is my suspicion that the majority of students fall into the communities of practice that are easiest and most natural. In other words, those communities in which there is a common language or cultural context, perhaps breaking down along age and gender lines, though not necessarily. In order to produce a more internationalized campus, it is in the university’s best interest to help facilitate communities of practice that are made up of a diverse array of students. What role might university museums play in the development of these new communities of practice on their campuses? To better outline what university museums have to offer, a brief outline of the history and goals of university museums is helpful.

University Museums

University museums have a long history of collection, preservation, and research. Some collections even outdate their host institutions; the first recorded official university
museum is the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford, which was founded in 1683 (de Clercq and Lourenço 2003:4). Collections in the care of university museums have traditionally been used for teaching and research, but they also include object display to varying degrees. These different characteristics of a museum – teaching with objects, object research, and the display of objects – make university museums unique within their host institutions. The purpose and priorities, however, of university museums have been under discussion for over a century. For example, Francis Peabody and Edward W. Forbes of Harvard, Homer Dill of the University of Iowa, and Edward Forbes of the Royal School of Mines in London among others, discuss the utility of university museums, and what they can contribute to public education (Genoways and Andrei 2008). Edward Forbes, speaking on the qualities of successful university museum staffperson in 1853, says that

> They must be men mindful of the main end and purpose in view, and of the best way of communicating knowledge according to its kind, not merely to those who are already men of science, historians, or connoisseurs, but equally to those who as yet ignorant desire to learn, or in whom it is desirable that a thirst for learning be incited. [Genoways and Andrei 2008:253]

Though the language in the above quotation betrays the social milieu of the time in which it was written, the point still stands that these professors and museum professionals viewed their role in academia as one that serves the public, the students, and the other faculty to facilitate their coursework as much as possible.

Today, many university museums are discussing the same issues as they did in 1853. They often find themselves caught between the responsibility of traditional museums to serve the public and the pressures of the academic administration. Ames’ perspective is that university anthropologists are accountable largely to their professional peers, as opposed to being accountable to the public as so many museum anthropologists
are. While university museums have remained largely static and protected by the institution, public museums have been required to change according to society to remain relevant and maintain funding (Ames 1992:41). Where does the university museum professional fit in to this tension? Does it need to be an either/or situation in which a university museum either devotes itself to academic, self-serving pursuits or panders to the general public, sacrificing academic rigor? Or on the other hand, is it an opportunity to use the rich resources of the university while addressing relevant, timely issues concerning the public (Ames 1992:41; Sandell 2011:133)?

Ames argues that

The relevance of museums in contemporary society…likely will be determined by the degree to which they are democratized; that is to say, the extent to which there is increasing and more widespread participation in decisionmaking regarding administration…educational programming…collections management…and increased opportunities for independent thought and action in cultural matters. [1992:89]

University museums, by their nature, will never be fully democratized. There will always be administration funding and overseeing the activities of the museum. In order to cultivate and maintain a vibrant university museum, professionals must develop an institution that is as democratic as possible and that communicates openness to the campus. In contrast to administrative restraints placed on university museums, Janet Marstine and others argue that university museums are in a position that allows riskier, more daring exhibits and programming due to the protection of “intellectual freedom” of the university. In other words, unlike public museums, university museums are not beholden to funding sources - though sometimes they are - and a strong institutional narrative they are expected to maintain (2007; Shapiro et al. 2012). They are also prime
locations for promoting a “global reality” on campus given their frequently international collections (Shapiro et al. 2012:15). Indeed, if we agree with Clifford’s articulation of museums as contact zones, then they provide the physical and intellectual space to encourage intercultural interactions and education.

Unfortunately, many people view museums as stagnant, quiet, dusty places (Hooper-Greenhill 1994:91). Some are indeed stagnant and dusty, but many are innovating their exhibitionary practices and programming in new and exciting ways. University museums have the daunting task of breaking that stereotype while also creating relevant programming to a busy and stressed student population. For college-aged students, museums fall far down on the list of leisure time activities. They are busy, anxious, and rarely consider a museum or art gallery a priority in their lives (Shapiro 2012). According to researchers Susie Wilkening and James Chung, museum visits came in 12th out of fifteen leisure time options for Generation Y (2009:89). Generation Y, as defined by Wilkening and Chung, include those born between 1979 and the mid-1990s (2009:8).

Janet Marstine, in an article titled “What a Mess! Claiming a Space for Undergraduate Student Experimentation in the University Museum” gives two excellent examples of what ambitious university museums are doing with their students. The Hood Museum of Art at Dartmouth College and the Frances Young Tang Teaching Museum and Art Gallery at Skidmore College engage with their undergraduate student population to create fresh ways of interacting with the university museum, encouraging them to find non-traditional connections between objects, for example. Marstine claims that empowering undergraduate students to curate parts of or entire exhibits allows the
students to make new connections across their curriculum, discover the fascinating world of collections, and speak to campus in a way no one else can. These students can act as “ambassadors” to the rest of campus and draw other undergraduates to the museum who may not otherwise visit (Marstine 2007). Another example is taking place at the Harvard museums, under the leadership of Wendy Derjue-Holzer, education director at the Harvard Museum of Natural History. Derjue-Holzer works with faculty at Harvard to open the museum up to classes for use as a learning space as well as presentation space for class projects (2014).

These are examples of how university museums are working to become relevant and to integrate themselves more organically into campus life. Not all of these museums’ activities are focused on their international students, but they are still helping to create connections between students, educate them about their museum resources, and produce graduates who are more aware of the roles museums can play in social and societal life, which is valuable work to learn from.

*Museum Objects and Their Biographies*

Just as students can act as ambassadors to campus communities, objects can also act as ambassadors to museum visitors. Museum objects are repositories for narratives. In other words, when interpreted well, objects tell us stories about themselves, who made them, where they have been, and where they are going (Alberti 2005; Caple 2006; Kopytoff 1986; Hoskins 2006). They are educational, and when set in the context of university museums and galleries, they can educate young people about the world they inhabit. Objects housed by university museums can contribute to internationalization by expanding students’ knowledge about the broader world, about the arts, culture and
history of other places. Just as international students are a wonderful resource for teaching their fellow students about other cultures, so too are the objects that many universities house in their museums.

In terms of internationalization, we can often glean valuable and interesting information regarding global flows of people and things through object biographies. Arjun Appadurai makes the claim that objects are attributed value through paths of exchange, and though in the West we consider objects to have no value apart from the significance given them by humans, objects-in-motion actually “illuminate their human and social context” (Appadurai 1986:5). In other words, by looking at the life cycle of objects we can see the life imbued to them through paths of exchange, transaction, and travel. Appadurai articulates his view with the help of other theorists and the ongoing conversation of economics and anthropology. One key theorist he draws from has a chapter in his edited volume *The Social Life of Things*, Igor Kopytoff. Kopytoff argues that just as people can have personal, professional, and economic biographies, objects can also have multiple biographies. The particular biography a person studies will depend on what the researcher is interested in, be it culture, economics, or politics, for example (1986:68).

From the setting of production, to exchange, to being put on display, museum objects are frequently changing meaning and value. If an object was taken from a village in the 1890s, or if a tourist bought an object in a market in 1997, these both affect the object’s biography. For example, will an object be repatriated under the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA)? Or was the object made specifically for the tourist market, thus lacking the ritual or religious significance historically imbued
in that type of object in the past? How does the museum display and interpret the object? Is it placed in an art collection or an ethnographic collection? Was it whole when it came to the museum and has since broken? These are just some examples of ways in which museum objects possess lively and usually lengthy biographies. The discussion of object biographies relates to my thesis because it informs how a viewer will interpret and interact with an object. University museums, when they are knowledgeable about their collections and biographies, can use those stories to connect to their students. Objects can serve as a platform upon which to have larger conversations that are pertinent to college students, such as globalization, communication, geopolitical concerns, economics, and much more.

Object Based Learning and Object Agency

When approached in a thoughtful manner, museum exhibits can create a space in which objects can speak to and with the visitor. “Objects, potentially at least, invite an empathic engagement with others’ life worlds and experiences across time and space” (Wehner and Sear 2010:153; Herle 2012). Interacting with, learning about, and learning from objects enables us to engage with other times, places, and people in a way that textual information does not. Wehner and Sear, while developing Australian Journeys for the National Museum of Australia, wrestled with how to communicate the dynamic and fascinating stories of their collections and the people associated with those objects. They came to define what they call “object knowledge” as “embodied knowledge” (2010:151). In other words,

When we encounter an object, we observe its size, shape and proximity. We notice its colours and register its textures. We may respond, perhaps subconsciously, to its smell, and, if we can touch it, we catalogue how it feels,
how much it weighs and perhaps how it tastes. We know how large or small something is by comparing it to other objects around it. We recognize and register colour, texture, taste and weight by comparing new sensory data to our existing knowledge of blue and green, rough and smooth, sweet and sour, light and heavy. [Wehner and Sear 2010:152]

Gaining knowledge about an object is an inherently physical act, and through this physicality, we can more empathetically place ourselves in the lives and experiences of others. Relying heavily on visual anthropologist David MacDougall, Wehner and Sear argue that “both images and objects enable us to know the material conditions of existence” (2010:152). Through looking at photos and examining objects, they write, we gain a better understanding of how the world around us feels, smells, sounds, and sometimes tastes. What is particularly special about some museums is that they have a high concentration of objects from the past, and from far away places. Experiencing and interacting with such objects can transport the visitor to a different locale, even a different time period. When successful, international and domestic students can be “transported” to a neutral third place, where no student has more knowledge or cultural capital than another. Miller contributes to this discussion by referencing Alfred Gell’s theory on object agency. For Gell, objects contain intentionality or are imbued with the consciousness of the maker. By encountering these objects, we also encounter the mind(s) of the maker(s) (Miller 2005:13).

Another way to view object-based learning is proposed by Scott Paris and Melissa Mercer. They argue that object-human interactions are transactional. What is important to Paris and Mercer is that meaningful associations are created when a person interacts with an object. For them, museums are places where people “search for features of their
personal lives, both actual and imagined selves…and their searches may lead to confirming, disconfirming, or elaborating understanding of their own identities (2002:402). Through interactions with objects, visitors are present with certain narratives. These narratives can help transport the visitor to another time and place as Wehner and Sear assert. They can also confirm information the visitor already knows or believes, as Paris and Mercer claim. Object narratives can contradict what a visitor believes and knows, or they can enhance and expand the visitor’s knowledge of the world and the visitor’s identity. Objects and humans influencing each other through transactional interactions only holds water if one believes that objects can have a certain amount of agency within the relationship.

Alfred Gell argues in his writing that in addition to human beings, objects also have agency. Gell defines agency as “…attributable to those persons (and things…) who/which are seen as initiating causal sequences of a particular type, that is, events caused by acts of mind or will or intention, rather than the mere concatenation of physical events” (1998:16). He goes on to write that “whenever an event is believed to happen because of an ‘intention’ lodged in the person or thing which initiates the causal sequence, that is an instance of ‘agency’ (Gell 1998:17). He concedes that there can be primary and secondary agency, but refuses to concede that objects are non-agents (1998:20). In his book Art and Agency, Gell is referring to art objects, but these descriptions can be expanded to include other elements of the museum experience. For example, Nina Simon defines social objects as “the engines of socially networked experiences, the content around which conversation happens” (Simon 2010). One example of this was spearheaded by Celine West of University College London. West
explored what would happen if she and colleagues took one object out into the public with the explicit purpose of fostering conversation. The goal of *The Thing Is*...was simply to engage people in meaningful conversation outside the museums walls. West got mixed responses, but overall was pleased with the outcomes of the project (2013).

Another example is found in the work of Rupprecht Matthies, a German artist who is interested in using his art as a catalyst for learning and conversation among people of different cultural or linguistic backgrounds. The objects created by Matthies and his participants are literally extensions of themselves, recalling Alfred Gell’s theory of objects as social agents (2012). In his work, *¿Being Home?*, he asked recent immigrants and refugees in Denver to find words that reminded them of their homes. With help from volunteers at the Denver Art Museum, he then created large 3D pillows of the words, Plexiglas cut-outs of the words and wooden statues of the words, all to create an extraordinary space filled with people’s different languages and handwriting. Matthies helped facilitate the creation of these objects, which in turn became social agents, communicating things about the speakers, but also reaching out to viewers’ own life experiences (Matthies 2009). Since its first installation in 2009 at the Denver Art Museum, it has been re-installed twice, with additions from community members (Matthies 2009). Projects like *¿Being Home?* are good examples of how museums can work collaboratively with the public to help foster empathy among people who may seem very different. Matthies exemplifies Hannerz’s concept of “diversity and connection” well, creating connections among members of a very diverse public. Matthies’s work uniquely engages with the two prongs of the thesis statement, one being object-focused,
and the other programming-focused and can serve as a model university museums can follow as they pursue ways to bridge gaps between their different audiences.

Visual anthropologists will assert the importance of visual media for communicating aspects of ethnographic work that cannot be conveyed via text. Ethnographies, historically, are overwhelmingly text-based accounts. What is lost by translating lived experience into words on a page? Clifford reminds us that we must remember what has “dropped out of sight” when we try to translate diverse and complicated ethnographic research experiences into a meaningful whole (1988:40). The power of images, moving or still, and objects, is slowly starting to re-enter the conversation between and among anthropologists (Degarrod 2010:131). Lydia Degarrod is a cultural anthropologist and visual artist who used her research to create art pieces as a way to communicate her findings from her time in Chile. She displayed the pieces in two university galleries and one city-run art gallery. Part of her motivation in creating these pieces was to convey images, emotions, and knowledge about Chile and the religious cult that cannot be adequately addressed in a traditional ethnographic text.

This over reliance on text can be extended to the university setting as well. Higher education, particularly the humanities and social sciences, consists largely of reading and writing texts. Following these theorists’ and practitioners’ examples, university museums can and should work to engage students and faculty in a different, more embodied way. As was proposed in my thesis statement, museums and galleries on campuses have a chance to create empathy with others’ life worlds, teach about the past, question the present, and contemplate the future through sensorial means.
Furthermore, Miller, in his work on materiality, argues that anthropologists should be concerned with the daily, common things that philosophers, in his view, are not. In other words, philosophy and religion according to Miller are oftentimes concerned with transcending the material to access the “reality” behind it. Miller argues that quite the opposite, the materiality of our everyday lives is of great importance, and is the content with which anthropologists should be concerned. Miller, though not addressing museums directly, is affirming the importance of the presentation and interpretation of museum objects as a way to empathize with others (2005:14).

Two final examples of social objects in action are the Museums As Places for Intercultural Dialogue’s (MAP for ID) project called Choose the Piece and another called Tongue to Tongue. In the first project, immigrants, or, “new citizens” of Modena, Italy, were invited by the Archeological and Ethnological Museum of Modena to adopt one of thirty objects. The participants were given a historical overview of the city, and presented with the object choices. Pieces were chosen with the help of museum staff, and based loosely on the participant’s personal tastes, life history, interests and memories. Then participants gave a short biography, and talked about why they chose a particular piece. Professional photos were taken of participants with their objects, and these were published in a “multicultural diary” that was presented to them in a ceremony at the end of the project (Bodo 2011). This project is one example of how museum objects can create a space in which people learn about each other through story telling, learning together, and creating something together. The participants now have a greater sense of what their local museum has to offer, and some came back to visit the museum with their families after the project was over.
This project also served the dual purpose of educating museum staff about intercultural programming and developing skills that can be used in the future (Bodo 2011: 59).

The second example is from the University of Turin. This exhibit was called *Tongue to Tongue: a Collaborative Exhibition* (in Italian *Lingua contro Lingua. Una mostra collaborative*). The Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography of the University of Turin was created in 1923 and is housed within the department of Anthropology at the University. The museum collaborated with the Centre for African Studies (CSA) to design a co-curated exhibition. “Cultural mediators” were selected and asked to choose objects from the ethnographic collections that they connected to “culturally and/or emotionally” (Bodo 2009). The objects were then displayed alongside personal objects owned by the cultural mediators. The goal was to create somewhat autobiographical displays that highlighted the “subjective heritage” of the museum objects as well as to emphasize the emotional power of objects. This project not only called into question the institutional knowledge of the museum about its objects, it also facilitated intercultural training for the participating students and museum staff, creating new skills for all involved. The title’s logic is that the “tongue” of the institution is in dialogue with the cultural mediator’s “tongue” (Bodo 2009).

It should be noted that meaningful, change-inducing, agency-filled interactions with objects within the museum context might be rare. People have a myriad of motivations for visiting a museum, and not all visitors are interested in engaging with deep reflective work every time they visit.
Museum & University Programs

The above examples set high standards for museum practice. What are museums and universities currently doing to foster intercultural interactions or reach out to their international community? One example is the Buffalo History Museum in Buffalo, NY. Museum staff work closely with refugee resettlement agencies in the area to create programming for newly arrived refugees. This programming includes a “Museum Introduction Program” during which visitors learn museum etiquette, how to navigate through the museum, and the types of resources the museum provides. The museum also partnered with local organizations such as the CEPA Gallery and Journey’s End Refugee Services to conduct artistic training to create a photography exhibit called Buffalo: Through Their Eyes. This exhibit was housed in the Buffalo History Museum and included newly accessioned artifacts donated by the refugees themselves (Lyons 2013). According to the program manager, Tara Lyons, these programs are not only to teach new residents about Buffalo, but also to teach native Buffalo residents about the new and changing face of their city (personal communication August 21, 2013).

University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archeology and Anthropology has a thriving classroom outreach program called International Classroom. The museum recruits international students on campus to visit local K-12 classrooms and give talks about their home cultures. International students also speak in other venues such as businesses, teacher workshops and community organizations. The University draws from a pool of about 150 international scholars each academic year (Penn Museum 2013). The students are recruited at the beginning of the year during the orientation period, and are often recruited by their department head or advisor. This is helpful because the recruiting
message is coming from someone they respect and have met, rather than from a stranger in a different office (personal communication October 12, 2013). University of Iowa (UI) has a similar program called *International Classroom Journey*, in which international volunteers speak in K-12 classrooms about their culture (University of Iowa 2013).

University of Iowa also has English Language Discussion Circles multiple times per week that anyone interested in practicing their own English skills or helping others practice can come and meet each other (University of Iowa 2014b). Finally, UI has a more intense program called *Bridging Domestic and Global Diversity* (University of Iowa 2014a). After applying and being accepted into the program, students undergo a variety of intercultural training sessions and activities, culminating in the *Bridge Open Forum*, an event meant to bring intercultural issues to students’ attention. This program focuses on bringing underrepresented American students together with international students (University of Iowa 2014a).

Another example from University of Newcastle in Australia is called *Community Connections*, which is a partnership program between Australian students and international students (Gresham and Clayton 2011). University of Denver has a very similar program called *Pioneer to Pioneer*, in which two students are partnered with each other over the course of the quarter and expected to socialized, learn from each other, and act as liaisons to one another’s culture.

Other universities around the country have active international initiatives, such as University of Minnesota’s *Culture Corps* program. International students in this program receive a stipend to fund a small project that can be a one-time event such as movie screening or lecture, or a project to take place over the course of the semester (University
of Minnesota 2014a). The university also hosts a coffee hour called Small World Coffee Hour that takes place every other week and has approximately 250 attendees each week (University of Minnesota 2014b). University of Oregon has the Mills International Center, a program space, lounge, and study area that welcomes both international and domestic students. At the Mills Center, there is a weekly event called The Meet. It is meant as a place to meet people from all over the world, as well as learn about campus programs and offices. Each week is sponsored or hosted by a different office or program (University of Oregon Mills International Center 2014).

The University of New Hampshire is experimenting with faculty partners by hosting faculty training in their art museum. One example of this is a program called “Art of Conversation” and it was a training day for English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers. In this workshop, the participants learned about object-based learning techniques, created a group poem, wrote interview questions for an artist, and wrote about a piece of art of their choosing. These techniques are meant to facilitate English language practice through speaking and writing, while also introducing the museum to the campus community. By holding one training day for faculty instead of hosting multiple workshops for individual classes, the museum is making the most of its staff time and resources. In return for paying the costs associated with the training day, the museum requires each faculty to bring a class at least once during the following semester (Derjue-Holzer et al. 2014).

What is notably missing from the survey of museum and university activities is the combination of university, museums, and international students. University of Pennsylvania is a notable exception. The current study seeks to find ways to combine all
of these factors in various ways, using a framework of public anthropology and the anthropology of museums that anthropologists inside and outside of academia have presented. The following section will discuss this movement to conduct public, or applied anthropology, as well as the social role museums are expected to play in the 21st century.

The Anthropology of Museums and Public Anthropology

While studies regarding international students, higher education, and internationalization are crucial to my thesis, and greatly inform my research, it is ultimately an anthropological study. Within the movements of the anthropology of museums and public anthropology, practitioners are working out their responsibilities and contributions to the dissemination and creation of knowledge, as well as the roles museums can play within their communities. My research fits in to this ongoing conversation with its practical concern for fostering dialogue to impact its immediate community and constituents.

During a large portion of the 20th century, disciplines such as anthropology moved from the museum into the university, entering what Sturtevant called the “University Period” (Ames 1992:39). Bouquet writes that as studying material culture has regained traction within anthropology and other fields, museums have also enjoyed a renewal of scholarly interest in their collections (2012:loc 303). She also argues that anthropologists have methods that are particularly well suited to the study of museums, namely, participant observation. Ethnographers are accustomed to long term projects involving close looking, watching, and reflecting (Bouquet 2012:loc 228). Anthropologists are not only interested in the objects inside the museum, however. More and more, anthropologists have become interested in the museum itself as a cultural
artifact and visual media, as well as the human-to-human interactions that are happening inside the museum walls. Ames writes,

> Museums are…repositories of culture, machines for recontextualization, and platforms for the creation and promotion of cultural heritage. As such, they provide numerous opportunities for social anthropologists to examine cultural patterns…as they are actually being conceived, practised, manufactured, transformed, disseminated, used, and misused. By studying museums in their social and historical settings we can study the making of culture in its concrete reality. [1992:47]

In the quotation above, Ames describes museums as active, changing, creative institutions. Not long ago, however, museums were considered staid, neutral, objective places that one visited to align oneself with accepted tastes and trends (Ames 1992:21). To accept Ames’ and Bouquet’s claims that anthropologists should study and work within museums is to take on a large and complicated field of study. What do we hope to gain from studying museums, and why study them from an anthropological viewpoint?

Toward the end of the 20th and into the 21st century, there has been a growing group of anthropologists and museum professionals dedicated to working for the public good. Trained anthropologists are increasingly working in diverse fields, re-orienting their practice toward more collaborative, equitable relationships with their participants, and are working harder to disseminate their research to the broader public (Kurin 1997:93). Among these are museum anthropologists and concerned museum professionals. When looked at as cultural artifacts or cultural performances, museums become artifacts that can teach us about how we view others and ourselves. They can communicate values and norms that may or may not be acknowledged by the museum, and they can perpetuate stereotypes or help to break them (Ames 1992:44). This work is
self-reflexive, processual, and requires study and analysis either by the staff working in the museum, or by outside researchers such as anthropologists. By studying museums, anthropologists “question how the displays of objects transform them into cultural valuables, illuminating the social and political processes taking place behind the scenes” (Bouquet 2012:loc 228).

It has already been mentioned that museums are not static institutions, they are, either knowingly or subconsciously, creating and promoting cultural heritage (Ames 1992:47). Hooper-Greenhill writes,

> The ways in which objects are selected, put together, and written or spoken about have political effects. These effects are not those of the objects per se; it is the use made of these objects and their interpretive frameworks that can open up or close down historical, social and cultural possibilities. [2000:148]

If we agree with this, and I do, then what does that mean for how museums should comport themselves in the 21st century?

For those museum anthropologists and other museum staff who adopt the perspective of Ames, Hooper-Greenhill, and others, there is a great sense of responsibility. What are the various roles that museums can, or should, play within their local communities and larger society? Richard Kurin has written widely about his time in museums and his view that museums are first and foremost institutions of public education. He readily admits that this is difficult and often falls short of the ideal, but as an anthropologist and staff member at the Smithsonian Institution, he maintains that a key role museum anthropologists can play is as “cultural broker” who, as he writes, “study, understand, and represent someone’s culture (even sometimes their own) to nonspecialized others through various means and media” (1993:19). Kurin, Ames, and
others call for museums to help be liaisons between academic research and public education (Kurin 1993; Ames 1992; Bouquet 2012:loc 228).

However, some argue that museums have responsibilities that reach beyond the strictly educational. Richard Sandell, for example, has written extensively on the social role of museums, particularly about how museums can help ameliorate inequality within society. He readily admits that museums do not exist in a vacuum and they are often complicit in the inequality they are trying to change (2002:8). He writes “Social responsibility requires an acknowledgement of the meaning-making potential of the museum and an imperative to utilise that to positive social ends” (2002:19). Within her edited volume, Janet Marstine writes, “The relations between museums and communities rest upon the moral agency of the institution – its participation in creating a more just society” (2011:10). Because of these calls to action, it is all the more important that museums are reflexive, transparent, and humble in their efforts to co-create a more equitable narrative through their exhibitions and interpretation (Lynch 2013; Bodo 2013:53). Going forward, museums will need to use their imaginations, as defined by Appadurai (1996:31), to transform the way they interact with their communities, and, these authors argue, become advocates and partners with them in striving toward a more equitable world.

The discussion above is presented to clarify where my research fits into the larger framework of the anthropology of museums as cultural artifacts as well as cultural producers. Ames, Kurin, and Bouquet discuss how and why anthropologists have the appropriate theories, methods, and interests for studying museums and acting as liaisons between academia and the public. Sandell, Hooper-Greenhill, Kurin and others discuss
the various social roles museums can play in individual lives, local communities and the larger society. In the current context, I am interested in how museums can use their meaning-making potential to foster intercultural interactions, as well as how reflexive practices within the university museum may reveal ways in which these museums are acting in exclusionary ways. It is with this framework in mind that I conducted my research, and the next chapter will discuss methods chosen for said research.
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Within the social sciences the theoretical concerns of a study can greatly influence its methodological approach (LeCompte and Schensul 2010:85). Such is the case with the present study. As discussed in the previous chapter, a wide variety of theoretical concepts and previous studies inform my approach to the topics of international students, university museums and intercultural communication. For example, globalization as discussed by Giddens, Appadurai, and Yang gives a helpful framework through which to view global movements of people, ideas and goods. Museological theories as discussed by Clifford, Ames, Bouquet and others inform how this study approaches the idea of museums and their utility, and also contributes a further understanding of how the DU Museum of Anthropology (DUMA) could enrich the lives of students, faculty and staff. Wegner and Nederveen Pieterse discuss identity formation and provide possible definitions of in-groups and out-groups. These contributions helped develop interview questions and facilitate thinking about the social dynamics of students on the University of Denver (DU) campus. Finally, cosmopolitanism and engaged anthropology as discussed by Low and Merry, Hannerz, Sobré-Denton, Bardham, and Kurin help to narrow the focus of the study while maintaining a global perspective.

While the scope of globalization and cosmopolitanism may seem broad, Hannerz and others give us conceptual tools to help us narrow the scope to a study conducted locally. Travel is certainly still a common and well-respected practice for anthropologists
today. However, with the increased ease of mass travel and technologies allowing fast, long distance communication, more and more people are living in places other than where they were born. According to Appadurai, the world is full of increasing flows of people, media, technology, money, and ideas. Because of these flows, one can experience a vast array of people and cultures without having to travel far, if at all (1990). This increased exposure allows for a greater opportunity to conduct *anthropology at home* as defined by Hannerz (2010). Hannerz argues that there are new ways of conducting research as an anthropologist. Anthropology at home is one way to study one’s local community. Another example in the field is practitioners studying “sideways”, or working with people whose practices are not altogether different from their own. Anthropologists are also “studying up”, “studying down”, “here”, “there”, “through”, “backward and forward.” In other words, anthropologists, in aggregate, are re-defining the meaning of “the field” and “fieldwork” and are exploring new avenues of information and new ways of gaining knowledge (Hannerz 2010:60). Using Hannerz’s view of anthropology in the 21st century, I am able to study phenomena happening locally from an anthropological perspective. A facilitator of anthropology at home is the fact of increasing global cultural flows, as defined by Appadurai. Appadurai’s work on globalization combined with Hannerz’s view of doing anthropology in one’s backyard both inform and guide the current research questions, goals, and methodology.

The goals of this chapter are to outline the various methods used to gather data, answer the research questions, and test the thesis statement described above. The methods are highly qualitative, though some statistics are used when relevant. The main methods I
will use in the current research are participant observation, interviewing, case study methods, and bibliographic research.

Choosing a site

Choosing a site for the current study was relatively straightforward. The University of Denver was chosen because of the nature of my research questions, and my access to both the population in question and the museum of Anthropology. Angrosino gives a few helpful aspects to consider in the process of choosing a field site. He suggests looking for a “site in which the scholarly issue you are exploring is most likely to be seen in a reasonably clear fashion” (2007:30). The University of Denver has a robust international student population, with over 1,000 international students in the 2013 enrollment year (Office of Institutional Research and Analysis 2013). The University of Denver also has multiple gallery and exhibit spaces. The Shwayder Art Building houses the Victoria H. Myhren gallery, as well as a smaller, student run gallery. The department of Anthropology has the Museum of Anthropology in Sturm Hall. The newly opened Anderson Academic Commons (AAC) has several spaces that are used to exhibit special collections and a wide variety of material relating to the past, present, and future of the school. This building is also friendly toward students and community members who want to exhibit projects or art there. To display projects, one need simply apply and get approved by the board. There are other, less conventional spaces that students regularly utilize such as the Driscoll Bridge, the lobby of Craig Hall which houses the School of Social Work, and each individual school typically has an exhibit space that informs students and visitors about the history of that department. The combination of a
sufficient study population and options for museum activities make the University of Denver an appropriate site to explore “the scholarly issue.”

Additionally, Angrosino says to “…select a site that is comparable to others that have been studied by other researchers, but not one that has itself been over-studied” (2007:30). To my knowledge, studies have been conducted at DU regarding international students, but none have been conducted with a special interest in museums. Thirdly, he suggests that researchers select a site “with a minimum of ‘gatekeeping’ obstacles.” And lastly, he says to “select a site in which you will not be more of a burden than you are worth to the community” (Angrosino 2007:31). Since the research is being conducted where I live, I did not burden the research population by requesting housing or food from them. The current study fulfills all of these suggestions.

Participants

Based on Ritchie and Lewis’s book, *Qualitative Research Practice*, the sampling procedures for the current study are a mixture of purposive or criterion based, and convenience. According to the authors, purposive sampling is sampling in which certain criteria are set to determine the eligibility of participants (Ritchie and Lewis 2003:78). The criteria for my study are quite broad, beginning with: is the participant a student of DU or a pre-matriculated ELC student? The second criterion asks if the student is originally from another country, or was born in the United States. Most of the interviews are conducted with international students, though a few are native U.S. citizens. Amid these criteria, I also used what is described as opportunistic or convenience sampling to procure volunteers for the study (Ritchie and Lewis 2003). As will be discussed below,
volunteers were largely found through person-to-person interaction, or through electronic means such as group e-mails and mass messaging via Facebook.

*Participant Observation*

Participant observation is perhaps the most ubiquitous research method employed by anthropologists. Participant observation serves many purposes, not least of which is gaining an understanding of the physical and social layout of one’s field site. It is also used to build rapport between the researcher and the community in question. In order for the researcher to become unobtrusive in people’s minds, participant observation is useful for getting people used to one’s presence. This way, they will act normally, not modifying their behavior for a stranger (Bernard 1995).

I used participant observation mostly in university-organized or sanctioned situations. I attended International House (I-House) luncheons sponsored by various offices or clubs on campus each month. These are free lunches from 12:00-1:00p.m. twice per month in the I-house building located on 2200 South Josephine St. They are open to all faculty, staff and students who are interested. Either a club or an office on campus that is interested in advertising their services or activities will sponsor them. Each lunch has food from a different country and a projector plays a slideshow giving facts about that country. These luncheons are advertised on the International Student and Scholar web page (ISSS). I also participated in the Pioneer-to-Pioneer (P2P) program during which a domestic student and an international student are paired with each other for the duration of a 10-week academic quarter. I was a partner in the P2P program for three academic quarters. Through meeting students at various events as described above, I introduced myself into the community. Other research was conducted via observation.
During certain university events, simple observation of who was sitting with whom, and how they behaved helped to piece together a picture of the social dynamics among and between international students.

Upon successful defense of my research proposal in May of 2012, I began exploring my research questions in depth through bibliographic reading, conducting interviews, observing, and attending events through the spring of 2014.

*Interviews*

Other than participant observation, interviewing is the most common method used by anthropologists. Decisions about which interview techniques to use are based largely on the purpose of the interview, the nature of the information sought, the setting in which the interviews are conducted, and the personalities of the people involved. According to Rubin and Rubin, “if what you need to find out cannot be answered simply or briefly, if you anticipate that you may need to ask people to explain their answers or give examples of their experiences, then you rely on in-depth interviews” (Rubin and Rubin 2005:2-3).

The presence of international students alone is not enough to reach “internationalization.” In light of this, I spoke with a handful of faculty and staff who work or have worked with internationalization efforts at DU. These ranged from staff people at the I-House to faculty who simply have an interest in furthering international education and knowledge through their work. These were helpful conversations because they gave a better sense of faculty experiences within the university, as well as their opinions on topics such as internationalization, behavior in the classroom, institutional support, etc. As the research shows, the internationalization of a campus is not a straightforward, easy task. There is a kaleidoscope of interests, motivations, and struggles
involved given the organizational complexity of colleges and universities. These contextual conversations helped me understand the complicated nature of internationalization and international education. This type of informal interviewing is quite common among anthropologists and is useful to help “get the lay of the land” in regards to the University, its goals toward internationalization, and to meet people who might be helpful later on in the research process (Bernard 1995:143).

These informal interviews, combined with reading outside texts, helped me develop questions for the next stage of interviewing with semi-structured interviews. Semi-structured interviews are those in which the interviewer has an interview guide, and asks specific questions, but the questions are open ended and allow the interviewee to answer according to his or her experience (Rubin and Rubin 2005:4; Bernard 1995:209).

I chose semi-structured interviews for a variety of reasons that are suggested by Bernard (1995). First, I was never certain of the availability of the student I was speaking with. In other words, I learned that international students have a higher likelihood of leaving DU by returning to their home country, transferring to a different school, or finishing their exchange program than domestic students. I wanted to have some structure to the interviews so that I could ensure more of my questions got answered in case I lost contact with the student. Secondly, based on my research, informal interviews, and participant observation, I developed a particular set of research questions about which I was interested in learning. The types of questions I wanted answered, such as, “Who do you find are your closest friends here? Who do you hang out with the most?” may not come out in regular conversation, so having an interview guide helps steer the conversation toward particular research interests. Semi-structured interviews, though they
tend to have guides, are flexible enough to allow for tangents and probing. That is the third reason I chose a semi-structured format, to allow for conversation and answers that I may not have anticipated. This also allowed me to change or add interview questions in an iterative process to create more appropriate and helpful questions for future interviews. The most common way I scheduled interviews is through e-mail or Facebook messaging.

As I continued networking on an individual basis, I also began to target specific clubs and organizations on campus with a more straightforward approach. This was due largely to time constraints, and my inability to attend every event and every club on campus (LeCompte and Schensul 2010:48). I began by using the Office of Internationalization website to find the leaders of various internationally focused clubs on campus. I then e-mailed all the people on the list, introducing myself, briefly explaining my research and why I was contacting them in particular. In the e-mail I asked for permission to attend one of the club’s meetings and introduce myself in person to the group, then ask for volunteers to interview. I also contacted the International Student Organization Facebook group, sending out a mass message requesting volunteers. From this, I acquired seven interviews. The president of the ISO sent out my call for volunteers along with the organization’s weekly newsletter. Several students subsequently e-mailed me offering their time and feedback.

*Interview Questions*

The interview guides I used throughout the research can be found in Appendix A. Though the questions vary in foci, collectively they relate to the thesis in a couple of ways. One, I wanted to find out more about international student experience at DU which
can shed light on whether or not the university is meeting the needs of the international students. Many of the questions are interested in whether or not all the energy spent by the offices of internationalization is benefiting the students. In addition, I wanted to find out more about how international students spend their time, with whom they spend their time, and what types of activities they are interested in. These data can help determine whether the assertion that university museums can address student needs with their collections and through programming is feasible or unrealistic. Below are the brief explanations of the questions and why I was curious to learn more about them.

Questions 1-3 relate to overall student experience on campus. For this iteration, I used a Likert-type scale to get an initial rating, then asked students to elaborate on their rating (Jupp 2006). I did this to get a more consistent way of rating of DU according to students, while still probing for details of their experiences and what types of factors played a role in their ratings (Bernard 2011). Question 4 relates to how students typically complete schoolwork. I am curious about this because I want to know more about how students learn and complete their coursework. For example, do they utilize on campus resources such as the Math and Writing Centers, or go to their professors during office hours (Heffernan et al. 2010)? Given concerns expressed in the literature about international student academic performance, I felt these questions were relevant (Devos 2003; Haugh 2008; Kim 2011). Questions 5-6 relate to what the student views as the best and worst thing about attending the University of Denver. These questions are open-ended to see both what the student values and finds most troublesome. I wanted to make room for new themes to emerge that I might have been missing in previous research. Question 7 asks about the process of coming to the University of Denver in the first
place. This question is intended to learn about why students chose DU for their education, including interest in other universities, fields of study, familial support or lack thereof, etc. Questions 8-12 all relate to social relationships and leisure time activities. These questions were included to explore the social dynamics at DU, and if, as the literature suggests, most international students befriend students from their home countries, or if students are forming relationships outside their native culture and language. I also want to find out if students are satisfied or dissatisfied with their current social circles. There is always the possibility that students are not creating friendships across cultural lines, but are satisfied and comfortable with that, which would be an interesting and significant finding. Questions 13-16 relate to language. These questions seek to explore the process and contexts in which students learn English, as well as how they view their language skills. Potentially, what someone thinks about a certain language is revealing about how he or she views the use of that language as well as the people who speak it (Ha 2009; Koehne 2006; Noels et al. 1996). Questions 17-18 seek to determine whether communication with family and friends in the home country may influence relationships developed in the United States (Montgomery 2010). Finally, questions 19-21 relate to museums and cultural exchange.

Utilizing Social Objects/ Case Study Method

The previous methods were used to try and develop a response to my first research question. In attempting to explore my second research question, different techniques were required. One of these is using a social object to try and spark conversation. The previous chapter discussed object biographies (Appadurai 1986; Kopytoff 1986) and the power of museum objects to communicate with viewers in a way
that text cannot. Museums are, first and foremost, known to be repositories of material and visual culture, but they are increasingly becoming places of social interaction and learning as well.

Below are two experiments conducted with object based conversations and social learning in mind.

It became apparent early in my bibliographic research as well as in interactions with international students that language was a huge issue for these students. All international students must pass minimum language requirements for admission into DU, but these do not always reflect a high level of speaking and listening ability. Students told me they feel embarrassed and left behind in class when they struggle to articulate their thoughts and keep up with fast paced discussion. They also felt that some American students get frustrated or are not patient enough with them to encourage meaningful interactions.

In light of these struggles, I wanted to design an activity that would not only encourage communication in English with the participants, but would also encourage them to think about language in a direct way. I used Rupprecht Matthies’ piece ¿Being Home? as a model for my activities for its accessibility, versatility, and success at the Denver Art Museum (Matthies 2009). In two workshops that took place in DUMA, I presented a set of prompting questions for students to use. These questions can be found in Appendix B. Once they chose a word to answer one of the questions, they wrote the word on a transparency and that word was then projected on the wall. After taping a large piece of poster board on the wall, the students trace their word in large lettering, using the
projected word as a guide. Once that was finished, the students cut out their words and we hung them on the wall.

These workshops functioned to bring people together around a common cause or goal: to think and talk about language, and ultimately create something together. These students were largely students I had met before, though three of them I had never met and they came as a result of an announcement made at an I-House function.

The motivation for the word making workshops was fourfold: to encourage interactions between students in English as a way for international students to practice their speaking skills. The museum environment can provide students an informal, yet structured setting in which to talk. Secondly, to explore a possible avenue to reach beyond the typical museum protocol of displaying polished, curated exhibits within the museum space. Shapiro et al. found that, according to campus museum directors, students want museums to be authentic, be inclusive of their voices, and to have an ‘insider’ perspective on the process, not just the product (2012). Thirdly, I wanted to invite students to participate in a DUMA activity, to open the museum to student artists (whether they define themselves as artists or not), student experts, in a sense (Marstine 2007). Activities like this one are good examples of what might draw more students into the museum, if they have a chance to be a part of the process and feel like they have authority over the final product. Finally, I wanted to explore taking the resulting work out into campus. As has been discussed, university museums often have to fight a stigma of being stuffy, obscure places that are not engaging for students. By bringing art into a popular space such as the library, showing the work that other students had done, and naming DUMA as the facilitator, the hope was to break through that stigma just a little
bit. The motivation for bringing student creations into the public was not just to help break a stigma, however. It was also an attempt to raise student awareness of the great diversity of cultures and languages represented on campus. Bringing work like this, particularly products that highlight different languages and cultures, can help address the stated goal of creating more empathetic and aware students. It may be all too easy for American students to ignore or forget about the richness of cultural diversity that they are near every day, but this display was a small way to refresh their memories.

Unfortunately, given the casual and unmonitored nature of the display, it was not possible to do evaluation of the students who stopped, looked, and perhaps wrote a contribution on the chalkboard.

Another person-object-person activity occurred during an I-house coffee hour in the spring of 2013. The events are meant to be social, low-key times during which students and staff can drink coffee or tea, eat snacks, and socialize with one another. I brought several objects from DUMA’s collection and placed them in the center of a large table. The activity started by giving participants small pieces of blank paper and asking them to write one or two questions they had about the objects. I had prepared several questions beforehand just in case. We then placed the papers in a bowl and went around the table with each person choosing a question and then discussing its answer. Some were academic, such as “what was this object used for?” and some were more conversational, such as “if you could have one of these objects in your living room, which would it be and why?”

Object-based conversation is a well-documented method of creating interaction between people who may not know each other. The motivations for the I-house coffee
hour activity were twofold. First, I wanted to experiment with object based discussion and using objects as agents to facilitate discussion (Gell 1998) Visual anthropology and museum anthropology theorize about the social power of objects to create conversation and discussion. Particularly in a setting in which few people, if any, know each other, these types of activities can give a central object around which shy participants can gather. These objects form a foundation for conversation that can then extend to other topics. The other motivation was again, to bring the name and reputation of DUMA into the wider campus community. Most students are unaware of the collections that DUMA holds, and activities like this one are a way to educate the campus community about this resource that is within their reach.

Bibliographic research

Bibliographic research is a major source of information for every aspect of the current study. Theoretical insight is used from accomplished, well-respected practitioners in anthropology, museological theory, education, globalization theory, and more. This theoretical background informs the researcher’s thinking, helps guide research questions and approaches, and helps interpret data collected in the field. Extensive reading in various fields also helps ensure that the research being conducted is helpful, new, and contributes to the field.

As well as theoretical reading, extensive reading of relevant studies is also useful. The majority of studies pertain to international students in higher education, identity formation, language acquisition, and museum programming and exhibits. These studies are also immensely helpful in that they give insight into the broader scene of these phenomena. One researcher may be able to describe his or her individual experience, but
with access to studies conducted all over the world relating to one’s research interests, one is able to gain concrete knowledge about phenomena that would otherwise be nothing more than speculation. The presence of these studies in my research and interpretation of data allows me to compare and contrast University of Denver to other universities and museums around the world.

In addition to bibliographic research, another helpful tool is statistical information about the University of Denver and other schools around the world. These statistics help give a snapshot of the schools regarding their size, international student population, popularity of certain programs, etc. Alongside qualitative research methods, quantitative information can be helpful to give a backdrop for the study results or things said in the interview setting.

Limitations

All research designs have certain shortcomings and weaknesses, and researchers approach their questions with biases and blind spots. All researchers have personality traits, insecurities, and biases that influence research in some way and the current study is no different. One shortcoming of the current research is the level of depth in the participant observation. Unlike a lot of ethnographic work during which the researcher is living in a community, isolated from his or her family and friends, and solely dedicated to the research tasks, I conducted my research in the same places where I lived and worked. One advantage to conducting research at the University of Denver is that I experienced the school from the point of view of a matriculated student as well as a researcher. This allows me to speak with confidence regarding the school and what a typical student might experience during his or her time on campus. As a researcher, it allowed prolonged
access to the research site, as opposed to having only a finite period of time to accomplish one’s research goals when travel is required. When new information arose, or a certain approach was not successful, I had time to adjust and change.

The downside to this is that the helpful sense of urgency, felt by many anthropologists with a finite length of time in the field, was lacking. This contributes to a slower pace of research and perhaps an easier “out” when conflicts arose. Part of the difficulty with living full-time in or near one’s research site is the fact that other life concerns encroach on the study. For example, other school obligations, job commitments, and family ties all take time away from dedicated research. This is not to say that research cannot be accomplished in this environment. Local, applied anthropology is an increasingly recognized approach within the field (Hannerz 2010; Ames 1979; Kurin 1993). It is to say that with this technique, new and different concerns arise in the midst of fieldwork that may not be addressed in the more traditional methods manuals.

Another issue with many anthropological studies is sample size. Those concerned with quantitative data may view small, qualitative studies with skepticism as to their validity and objectivity. While some of these critiques are valid, Bernard also eloquently argues that the human sciences rely heavily on both quantitative and qualitative data, and that different research demands different approaches (2011:20). The size of the current study is largely limited by the fact that the research was conducted by one person with very limited funding, and limited experience doing fieldwork. One way to bolster interview data is to compare it to other studies done with similar research concerns. This way, claims made within a small, qualitative study can be backed up by larger, more extensive studies done elsewhere. Another advantage of this type of research is that
though small, the study allows for real students to speak their concerns to someone who is sympathetic, non-threatening, and accessible. Some students may feel that their administrators are unreachable, and that DU is too large to take their concerns into account. My hope is that when the research is complete and made public, the University of Denver will have an insight into the lives of some of their students and understand more of how international students experience the school on a day-to-day basis. The types of concerns and joys that students experience while at DU cannot be expressed through large statistical analysis.

Another limitation was the changing nature of the interview questions. Though all interviews were valid and used to contribute to the overall conclusions of this study, the last set of interview questions was the most fruitful, and it would have been more helpful to use a consistent set of questions throughout the research process. However, I also value this process as a learning experience relating to the importance of preparation as well as the need for adaptability and flexibility when in the middle of a qualitative research project. I found that the hardest topics to ask about and discuss were relating to museums or spaces of cultural exchange. As will be discussed in Chapter 4, few students considered museums as places of meaningful exchange or even as places for amusement. This proved to be a difficult concept to communicate, and revealed that though some people find museums to be educational and enjoyable, others have little familiarity with the institutions and therefore find it somewhat confusing to discuss museums. This was also a learning process about the tendency to embed oneself in a certain field and use narrow concepts and jargon. As an interviewer, it is the researcher’s responsibility to communicate clearly and easily to the interviewee.
Another shortcoming is that I did not complete a physical exhibit or large-scale activity involving international students. My workshops were small scale, one-time events. This was due in large part to insufficient planning, as well as a difficulty in garnering enough interest in potential participants. Though disappointing, this was a learning experience and it contributed to my data collection in that it communicated certain things to me about the place of university museums on campus. It showed me that researchers may have ideas about what is feasible and even desirable, but it is critical to have the support of any participants present, as well as key contacts within the larger institution. Gaining support for my project from different staff and administrators was surprisingly difficult. Much of this reticence may be due to time restraints on the part of all faculty, staff, administrators and students on DU’s campus. They are very busy people and each experiencing their own pressures at work and school. Anthropologists may have good intentions, but no project comes together without a whole group of people in support.

Finally, I would have liked to do more workshop activities like word art making and object-based conversations to help develop the skills involved with running them, as well as gathering more feedback from participants. The word art making activity was casual, interactive, social, and easy. It required no before or after work on the part of the students, which I think it useful because busy students are hesitant to engage with anything that requires a lot from them (Shapiro et al. 2012). Findings from the workshops that took place will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter.
Ethics are a huge area of concern and discussion among all researchers, including museum anthropologists. Ethics guide how one makes decisions within one’s research project, as well as how one views the research itself (Wiles 2013). Of course, the current research strives to be as ethical as possible, following current standards in research ethics. As is required for any research regarding human or animal subjects, I needed to submit my project proposal to the University of Denver Institutional Review Board (IRB) for approval. This occurs once, with a re-submission an annual basis, requiring the researcher to state any changes in the research methodology or findings that may impact the prudence of continued research. The IRB reserves the right to withdraw approval if the board finds troubling ethical or safety issues arise. My IRB application was accepted and approved with minimal review, since the research questions are not particularly intrusive, nor does my research endanger anyone involved.

**Reflexive Practices**

Ethnography, originally idealized as an objective study of the ‘Other’, has been exposed as a subjective science. Clifford writes

> It becomes necessary to conceive of ethnography not as the experience and interpretation of a circumscribed “other” reality, but rather as a constructive negotiation involving at least two, and usually more, conscious, politically significant subjects. Paradigms of experience and interpretation are yielding to discursive paradigms of dialogue and polyphony. [1988:41]

> From this point of view, considerations about the researcher cannot be ignored. Being a Caucasian, American female inevitably played a role in the way I interacted with my participants. LeCompte and Schensul discuss various factors
that may impact one’s research, including unchangeable aspects of one’s personality such as gender, race, and age (1999). Being female could impact how male students interacted with me, particularly when one considers the wide range of cultures that are being represented within the sample set. For example, a male student from a socially conservative society may find it inappropriate to conduct an interview with a woman in a private room. It is also important to maintain a relationship with a participant that does not imply any inappropriate intentions.

Race is another identity factor that LeCompte and Schensul point out as a potentially important factor. The University of Denver campus is mostly white, and in that regard I fit in very well. When attending events on campus or conducting interviews though, I interacted with students from around the world with a wide variety of racial identities. LeCompte and Schensul claim that there is evidence supporting the idea that matching interviewers and interviewees in regards to ethnicity improves data quality (1999:37). From this perspective, interviewees may open up more and be more honest with someone they feel connected to in some way. However, since I am not part of a diverse research team, only a lone researcher, it is not possible for me to match every interviewee.

Another factor is my age. In some respects, I feel that my age is to my advantage while attending events on campus and conducting interviews. My close age to the people I most often interact with allows me to blend in well and be less intimidating as an interviewer. My age could be viewed as a disadvantage in certain situations, such as meeting with administrators and professors. In these situations, being older may have lent me more credibility as a researcher.
I have life experience that is not shared with all of my participants, and vice versa. Unfortunately, there is little I can do to obviate these influences, or to understand the intricate ways my politically situated personhood influences the participants as we interact. What I can do, however, is to be reflexive about my own biases and barriers that may interfere or influence the research. LeCompte and Schensul call this “disciplined subjectivity” defined as “the practice of rigorous self-reflection about one’s own impact on the field, as well as how one’s preferences, prejudices, biases, hopes, and concerns affect the course and outcomes of research” (1999:66). The social anxiety of meeting new people, being in foreign situations, not knowing the language, or hesitancies involving decorum all play some sort of role in my research, whether I am conscious of them or not.
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDING AND ANALYSIS

Findings

Formal Interviews

In total, I interviewed two American students and eighteen international students, fourteen of whom were enrolled in graduate programs, and four who were undergraduates. The interviews ranged in length from twenty minutes to over an hour. I began by interviewing people I knew or had met at various international student events or activities at the I-house. I sometimes asked if these interviewees knew anyone else who might be willing to conduct an interview with me, though this technique did not yield consistent referrals. Eventually, due to time restraints, I sent out mass requests for interviewees on the International Student Organization (ISO) weekly newsletter and the ISO Facebook page, which resulted in several volunteers. Below is the breakdown of the interviewees by class level and country of origin.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The interview questions went through three iterations, after finding I needed to make certain changes in order to get higher quality information more specifically relating to my research questions. Most changes were minor and did not affect general information such as student experience on campus. For the final iteration of my interview questions, I adapted the first three questions into a Likert type rating system. I did this in order to get a more quantifiable grasp on student experience (Bernard 2011). Unfortunately, the introduction of the Likert type scale was late in the research so the sample size is too small to perform any sort of statistical analysis that would be significant. All three iterations of interview questions can be found in Appendix A.

Informal Interviews

Like the students I interviewed, the staff and faculty I spoke with acknowledged that intercultural relationships and internationalization are difficult. Many faculty members have the energy and motivation to serve on committees, to mentor students, or to sponsor clubs, but are discouraged or prevented from that due to various factors. One
large factor is institutional support. There are talented, highly qualified staff who are working on internationalization efforts, but their budgets tend to be small, and the larger institution infrequently publicizes their activities widely. In addition, staff and faculty are very busy teaching, researching, and writing as part of their own career goals and job obligations, making it difficult to spare time and effort for intercultural endeavors.

Activities

In the previous chapter, I described three activities that I conducted, one of which was an art-making workshop based on the work of Rupprecht Matthies. I held two afternoon sessions of approximately two hours each in January of 2014. These were relatively well attended, with the first workshop having 10 students, and the second with 6 students. During the workshops, there was some interaction between students, but overall, the participants conversed with and stayed close to the students they arrived with. As the researcher, I moved around the room engaging with everyone, but there was little interaction between people who had never met. This was disappointing as the goal was to help foster interaction between the students, but not entirely surprising. During other group activities, in particular the monthly I-house lunches, I noticed that most people conversed with those with whom they had arrived. If attending an event with a friend, students sat with and talked with that friend, unless otherwise prompted. In all my interactions, all the students were friendly and willing to converse with me, but given the opportunity, students would converse in their native language with their friends. The lack of meaningful interaction between participants in the workshops, then, fits in with this trend.
After completing the workshops in DUMA, the words produced were moved to a small display area in the Anderson Academic Commons. I added a small description panel, as well as a few prompting questions and a chalkboard on which students could write to add to the display. This was left for twelve weeks before being de-installed. When removed, the chalkboard was full of text, some of it sincere and some of it silly. This does show, however, that students were walking past and spending a few minutes reading the panels and thinking about the questions. It also shows that the Anderson Academic Commons is a viable option for displaying museum content in the future.

Another activity mentioned in Chapter 3 was an I-house coffee hour in the fall of 2012 that involved bringing several objects to the I-house and discussing them. This activity was successful insofar as the participants were engaged, but there were very few participants. At this time, the I-house coffee hours were generally poorly attended despite the efforts of I-house staff. This meeting was attended by four graduate students who worked at the I-house, two international students who attended voluntarily, and myself. This coffee hour was cancelled for the 2013/14 academic year due to poor attendance. There are a number of reasons why this event may have foundered, and I will not try to dissect them all, but two reasons seem most likely. The I-house at DU has struggled at times due in part to its location off campus. By being on the periphery of campus, this could potentially communicate that it is also located on the periphery of campus culture.
In an interview with Elizabeth Robertson, then Inclusive Excellence Fellow, International Student and Scholar Services, she stated that she firmly believed students disregarded the I-house at times due to its location, particularly in inclement weather (October 12, 2013).

Another important factor to consider is the relevance to students’ lives and how events are promoted. According to Marstine, students tend to be ambassadors to the rest of the campus by word-of-mouth promotion (2007). She encourages this in her article about campus museums, but the concept can be applied to any campus activity. In the case of the I-house coffee hours, it is worth considering how the I-house publicized the event and if students promoted it by word of mouth. The low attendance and the subsequent canceling of the coffee hour shows that it was not, at least in 2012, perceived as relevant to international students’ lives. This data, however, can be used to further inform both the I-house and the university museum about where their energy might be better directed.

Comparative Research

As mentioned in Chapter 3, I relied on bibliographic research to provide expanded information regarding university museum programming as well as internationalization efforts on other campuses. Relating specifically to university museum programming and international students, I was disappointed with the paucity of information readily available on college websites, academic articles, blog posts, or any other form of reporting. It was difficult to find professors, students, or staff reporting on their museum’s programming, whether successful or not. It is unclear whether this is because there is little programming or exhibits going on around the country, or whether these events are simply not being written up and disseminated on the Internet for others. I
suspect the latter, given my exposure to museum programming in informal settings, such as the New England Museum Association’s annual meeting. There, I attended a session specifically regarding university museums that was well attended by museum staff and faculty all working to broaden their impact on their individual campuses (Derjue-Holzer et al. 2014).

Analysis and Suggestions

Below are four themes that I felt arose from interviews and bibliographic research. They are numbered and italicized to identify them as the author’s voice, as opposed to quotations from students that have been pulled from the interviews. Along with the themes and some analysis, I have included suggestions for what actions universities and their museums might take to address the themes. The suggestions are by no means exhaustive, but rather are meant to provide a starting point for thinking about simple steps that might prove helpful in the process of internationalization.

Themes

A clear finding that arose from the research is that very few international students had strong relationships with American students. This is not surprising given that all the studies I read reported low friendship rates between international and domestic students, and I suspected the University of Denver students to fall within that trend.
**Theme 1)** Generally speaking, international students, particularly those whose country of origin is well represented on campus, find it easiest to make friends with other students from their home country.

- “There are a lot of Chinese students at DU, and it’s easy to make friends with Chinese students together.” – female graduate student from China

It is appealing to befriend other students from your home country. Volet and Ang assert that friendship patterns among international students tend to follow along cultural distance patterns. In other words, same country/cultural background students have the highest rates of interaction because this provides students with the easiest, most supportive friendships. Generally, students with different country/different cultural backgrounds have lower rates of friendship and interaction (Volet and Ang 1998:19).

This may account for the difficulty in finding participants for my research. Given the convenience and snowball sampling techniques, it is possible my sample group self-selected for those who are interested in cross-cultural relationships, but these students may be in the minority when compared to the overall international student population. Another factor is that students may not have felt safe or supported when presented with an open ended, drop-in style activity. This presents a lot of unknown scenarios to students who may feel most comfortable in situations that are more predictable.

**Theme 2)** Though international students expressed a desire to make friends with American students, making friends with Americans is hard, and takes time:

- “I thought I would spend most of my time with American friends, but the truth is the opposite.” – female graduate student from Mongolia
• “To make friends with American classmates, it’s a little impossible.” – female graduate student from China

• “Maybe DU can host some other clubs so the international students can meet more American students.” – female graduate student from Mongolia

Of course, not every international student wants to make friends with locals. Some students are a) simply in the United States to get a degree and leave or b) happy to remain in a small social circle of other students from their home country. However, a strong contingent of students would like to make friends with students from countries other than their own. Doing this, though, seems to be harder than the students originally thought.

The students I spoke with who had the highest rates of success befriending American students were those who had spent time in America before attending DU. Students who were very forward about wanting a diverse group of friends tended to have previous experience in the United States. One Chinese student I spoke with had studied in Ohio during her high school years, and complained that she didn’t like California because it has “too many Asians” and she wants to socialize with Americans while in America. She said she is acquainted with many Chinese students, but only really spends time with them when she wants to speak her native language or be with people who understand her culture better. An Iranian student I spoke with said that when international students first arrive on campus they want to find friends as fast as possible, and this is usually easiest to accomplish with people from the student’s home culture. He mentioned that for his first year at DU, he only spent time with other Iranian students, but that now, he is trying to branch out and meet people from other places.
Of the two students I formally interviewed who were highly competent and confident in befriending Americans, one was a graduate student who had done her Bachelor’s degree in Indiana, and the other was an undergraduate who had spent four years in California during his high school years. For example, the graduate student remembered times in her undergraduate years during which she met with prejudice from the American students.

- “I found that some of them were more close-minded than I’d expect… you know but sometimes its hard when they tell me that, you know, ‘You can’t speak English as well me because its not your first language.’ And I’ll be like ‘Thanks, but are we not having a conversation right now?’ There have been some experiences like that but I’ve, you know, looked past it and I feel like the better way is to just talk and not get angry about it.” – Female graduate student from Thailand.

Despite experiences like these, she also gained cultural and linguistic knowledge from her American friends and roommates through prolonged, sustained interaction.

- “I was actually really shy, at the beginning. I felt like everyone was already really close, and you know they had their own hometown connections and everything so it took me a while to get used to it. But my roommate was American, and you know she’s one of my best friends now so I’m really glad they paired me up with an American student the first year. And I mean I went – I really liked that they took me to their hometowns to meet their families, and for Thanksgiving and for holidays. I really enjoyed it a lot I did so many things like Thanksgiving, and we
went to look for Christmas trees, and um, you know October festivals, so I enjoyed that a lot.” – Female graduate student from Thailand.

The undergraduate made it his goal to “stay away” from other Singaporeans. When asked if he had any expectations of what his friend group might be upon arriving at DU, he responded that in California he had gone to high school with a lot of students of Asian descent, and he wanted a change from that.

• “Me and my sister made an agreement to stay away from Singaporeans, we told ourselves, ‘you know what, look, there’s a reason we’re going overseas for school.’ I also said…’you know what, I’m going to try and not hang out with any Asians this year.’ Which is a pretty dangerous thing to say here because, I want to say, 80% of the international students are Chinese.” – male undergraduate student from Singapore.

These statements are meaningful because they draw attention to the fact that it typically takes a long time for someone to adjust to a new culture. Statements like these shed light on what might be realistic to expect from newly matriculated international students. One graduate student from China asserted that “As for language, if I came here like five years ago, I would probably speak, like, Americans do.” Learning a new culture, making friends in that culture, and becoming comfortable in a second language all take time, and many students are only in the U.S. for the few years it takes to gain a degree. Is that long enough to become totally comfortable at DU?
There is no way artificially to decrease the time it takes for some people fully to adjust to a new culture, but university museums can perhaps provide resources to help that process.

One large component of making friends in a new culture is language, as is evidenced by the abundant studies citing it as such (Baker and Clark 2009; Ha 2009; Sovic 2009; Coulby 2006; Fong 2011; Waters 2008; Montgomery 2010; Harris 2012). Professors struggle to know how to grade international students when their grasp on academic English is not up to par with their American counterparts, and universities have been accused of relaxing requirements for admission and graduation for international students (Waters 2008; Devos 2003). For example, the Writing Center on DU’s campus released a document guiding teachers on how to grade ESL students (Benz et al. 2014). Language barriers also can make it hard for students to fully participate in group projects for class (Volet and Ang 1998; Sovic 2009; Fong 2011). Language can also be a facilitator or barrier to relationships outside the classroom. For example, if international students are too shy, or American students too impatient, friendships that involve language barriers will be difficult to develop. However, when the two parties invest in creating meaningful connections, both parties benefit (Gresham and Clayton 2011; Noels, Pon and Clement 1996).

The term “invest” is important in regards to creating meaningful connections. Investment can be seen in the most successful programs and projects, like Matthies’s community art projects, or Durocher’s ESL faculty training workshop. These were successful in large part due to extensive planning, preparation, and participant investment. From my workshops, it is clear that a certain amount of curating, or structure
is needed for success. The workshops I conducted were “drop-in” style, which communicates informality to participants. High quality interactions need some structure and guidance, particularly for students who may not be familiar with museums, object based learning, or group work. Though one of the hallmarks of museum education is its informality, learning and creating new understanding takes mental energy and engagement. For successful museum workshops, participants need to have an understanding of the mental work that is expected of them, and be willing to commit to it.

Suggestions Based on This Theme

a) The I-House can do an English language workshop for one group while the museum creates an English language workshop for another group using object based learning techniques. This way, the museum helps share the burden with the I-house while fulfilling its own mission of serving the campus community. As mentioned previously when discussing Durocher’s work at University of New Hampshire, a faculty training workshop could also prove valuable, as it is a way to train a few people who will then reach out to many more. Events like this would help make the university museum a critical part of the campus in relation to internationalization efforts, as well as reach students shortly after their arrival, establishing the museum as a resource early on in their tenure at DU.

b) A program utilizing the skills of international students who are confident in their cultural and linguistic understanding could serve as a sort of bridge between American students and newly arrived international students. As was mentioned above, the students who are most confident usually have some sort of previous experience in the U.S. or have lived here for a significant portion of their lives.
However, these students still relate readily with international students. Given their unique sets of skills, these students can help answer questions or give tips in a non-threatening way.

**Theme 3**) *Museum visitation ranks low as a leisure time activity among the international students, and when asked about places of cultural exchange, few said “museums.”*

Given museology’s relatively narrow reach, I found interview questions about museums difficult to articulate and make sensible to students. I eventually started framing the questions using more general language of culture exchange instead of using vocabulary specific to museums. I found this to be helpful in communicating my ideas and discussing these topics with students.

Answers varied from student to student, but many students said they felt that there wasn’t a place of real cultural exchange in their home cultures; there were suggestions of schools, marketplaces, an organization called the Human Library (http://humanlibrary.org/index.html), religious sites, and festivals. Even these suggestions, however, were vague and tentative. This led me to believe that though practitioners in museum anthropology and museology hope for and strive toward intercultural dialogue and exchange, these goals remain elusive. Below are some responses that exemplify the way students answered when I asked if there were places of cultural exchange or dialogue within their home country.

• “Ok, we um, we plan to go to Seattle this Thanksgiving, and I heard that there are many museums in Seattle, yes, famous museums. I don’t know, uh, I am interested in the museums in Seattle, but I have no interest in our school I don’t know why.” – female graduate student from China
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• “To be fair Singapore is quite a closed society. We don’t really like new ideas, and that stuff it scares us…new concepts and new ideas and new ways to do things kind of shakes us. Because we’re super new as well, on the scene, we’re only 48 years old, 49 years old this year…and, I don’t know if you’re thinking just like ideas or culture, probably like, food fairs would be like a good, like a big one in Singapore.” – male undergraduate student from Singapore.

• We have museums but we don’t have a place for international groups, or I don’t know. But I know there’s uh, how do you say that? Hostel? Like they’re a huge group of international, mostly visitors, tourists, yeah.” - male graduate student from China.

The lack of museum visitation or familiarity with museums was a little surprising. I incorrectly assumed that international students would be at least occasional museums visitors, given their openness to travelling to and living in other countries. Upon reflection, however, it makes sense that international students may not visit very many museums in the United States. The literature reveals that of those visiting museum regularly, most are Caucasian, middle to upper class, and well educated. Families with young children also make up a large portion of the visiting population (Wilkening and Chung 2009). Many museums struggle to increase their visitation numbers from lower income and minority visitors for a number of reasons. If visitors feel that the museum does not display art or objects from their culture, if they do not understand or speak the languages used in the museum (usually only English in the U.S. although increasingly Spanish as well), or if they feel the staff demographics do not reflect their experience
with the wider population, they may choose never to visit their local museum. One faculty member I spoke with pointed out one inhibiting factor in internationalization is a lack of diversity among faculty (personal communication with author February 21, 2014). In 2011, the American Alliance of Museums released a data “snapshot” of museum worker demographics from 2009. It reported that 79% of museum workers are Caucasian (American Alliance of Museums 2011). Contrast this with the increasingly diverse demographic make-up in the United States, and it becomes understandable why many communities do not feel they are well represented or valued in museums (Falk and Dierking 2012; Hooper-Greenhill 1994).

Another reason might be that relatively few international students are studying the arts, social sciences, history, and natural sciences where the museums are. Most university museums are art galleries, natural history museums, or ethnography museums. Given that most international students are studying business, finance, engineering, and medicine they may not feel that university museums have anything to offer them (IIE 2013).

This is an opportunity for university museums. If students are indifferent to the idea of visiting a museum to learn about history or look at art, then university museums need to rethink how they are approaching all their students, including the international students. In other words, this gap in visitation from international students can be seen as an indicator of relevance. If university museums are not relevant to students’ lives, how can they become so? Falk and Dierking’s visitor research shows that people visit museums to fulfill a need, whether it is social, intellectual, physical, emotional, etc. In order to create an enticing environment for students to visit, museums need to meet a
need. The two types of student needs that a museum could address are intellectual/academic, that is, the student needs the museum to complete a school project, and social/emotional, that is, the museum provides a place of refuge where students can feel safe to learn or study or talk to each other (Falk and Dierking 2012).

Suggestions Based on This Theme

a) University museums can become more of a study space where students can work on schoolwork in a quiet, pleasant environment. For example, the University of Colorado Museum of Natural History has a space they have named the BioLounge. This is meant to be a flexible, functional exhibit space that encourages students to sit, drink coffee or tea, study, or socialize (http://cumuseum.colorado.edu/exhibits/biolounge).

b) Museums can also gear more of their programming toward international student needs such as conversation hours during which they can practice their English, as well as meet other students. Other museums may find offering their space as an outlet for student groups or clubs, in which students can develop exhibits in partnership with museum staff, or act as a performance space for them. For example, DUMA partnered with the Native Student Alliance at DU to produce an exhibit titled *What Tribe*, using artwork by Douglas Miles (April 1–May 6, 2013).

c) Professors can utilize university museums in their classes. They can borrow objects from the museum collection, or visit the museum space itself for a class assignment (Bonner 1985). For example, given the high rates of science and business majors among international students, bringing out the science collections, or telling the business-related stories behind the collectors, or talking
about old technology and inventions, might prove valuable or interesting to
students from the hard sciences or business departments. Create exhibits and
programming that professors in other departments will find valuable, and
collaborate with them when appropriate (King 2001). An example of this is the
Harvard Museum of Natural History’s partnership with a writing professor who
takes her freshman writing classes to the museum for an exercise in close looking
and object analysis (Derjue-Holzer 2014).

d) If there is no staff time available for community research, departments could also
utilize their work-study students, if present. These students, particularly the
undergraduates or graduate anthropology or museum studies students, could be
assigned the task of researching where there might be potential interest in the
community. They could attend club meetings, develop relationships with groups
on campus, and perhaps administer surveys in order to inform what the museum’s
future exhibits might look like. This way, students would gain valuable research
experience, and the museum would benefit from community feedback (Ames
1992:45). This may yield higher visitation rates, or lead to partnerships with other
areas of campus.

The two workshops within DUMA and the object discussion held at the I-house, in
the end, did not seem to spark additional interest in museums for the international
students with whom I spoke. At the second word-art making workshop, two new
attendees came with a friend who had attended the first one, recalling Marstine’s
argument that word of mouth is a powerful tool with students (2007). However, the
overall attendance at the second workshop was lower than at the first. This leads me to
believe that the activity was not engaging enough to encourage repeat attendance. In relation to the current research questions, we can see that even when provided with opportunities for cross-cultural interaction, international students need other incentives for attending events and programming. Museum programming needs publicity, engaging topics, and to be relevant to international students’ lives. Finding this combination of factors can be difficult and requires significant time and investment. Unfortunately, university museum staff are often also professors or staff who have many obligations, and do not always have time for research that might reveal community interest.

Theme 4) Even though interviewees expressed a desire to meet more diverse students, when asked, they didn’t have many suggestions for how to go about doing that.

- “American students, they, its kind of hard to make friends with them…unless you go all out and yeah, try to get close to them…” – male graduate student from Korea

- “I’m satisfied with the friends I have now, they are very nice people, but I wouldn’t mind having more friends, just to diversify from time to time. It wouldn’t hurt to have friends from different nationalities, different backgrounds, to learn a bit more, is always good.” – male ELC student from Angola.

- “I still, uh, explore the way to find American friends, but I can’t figure out, maybe the I-House, the international office, they will hold meetings sometimes and I can’t participate in. Uh, maybe a church, but you know I don’t have any religious beliefs, so that would be hard for me, it would torture me if I had to go into a church.” – female graduate student from China
All of the international students I spoke with affirmed a desire to meet a more diverse array of students. They did not, however, have a lot of concrete suggestions or ideas about how to do this. In other words, when asked, the interviewees could easily mention a few hypothetical events or activities such as “sports” or “music” or “parties” where they felt they could meet people. What they did not say were concrete suggestions such as a specific club, or a specific musical event, or a specific party that they were planning on attending in an effort to meet others.

Few people feel comfortable approaching strangers and starting a conversation; this is not typically how people meet each other. There is usually a social object to facilitate a conversation and around which people can gather (Gell 2012). This can be a physical object, such as an art piece, or a non-physical object, such as a topic or issue that sparks a discussion. A university museum could feasibly become a sort of social object around which students can gather and meet each other; however, university museums need to be intentional if they want to create more space for student encounters (Gresham and Clayton 2011). As was mentioned in theme number two, my workshops and public events show that a more successful activity is one that has structure and some guidelines that participants can follow. Object agency can be a powerful force, as discussed by Gell and others, but can it stand on its own? My workshops showed that though students will readily engage on a superficial level with activities or objects, it is much more difficult to foster more meaningful encounters between humans and objects or human-to-human.

Suggestions Based on This Theme
a) Create an exhibit concerning a current event, historical event, or debated issue, and inviting knowledgeable speakers and students to a discussion or debate surrounding that issue.

b) Host a moderated discussion session between groups of people who may have historical conflict or view current events from different perspectives. For example, in 2012, DUMA hosted an exhibit titled *Borderlines*, which dealt with the question of immigration and emigration between the United States and Mexico. As part of the programming for that exhibit, the museum hosted a dialogue facilitated by two DU faculty – Lisa Martinez and Michelle Moran-Taylor – and Julien Ross of the Colorado Immigrant Rights Coalition. This was a lively discussion informed by three people with unique perspectives on the topics of immigration and immigrant rights.

c) An easy measure to take, and one that DUMA currently utilizes in its exhibitions, is incorporating more participatory activities into exhibits to encourage visitors to interact with each other in a fun, low pressure environment. Special interest groups on campus may have an interest in hosting their events in a university museum (knitting, sewing, gaming, sports, etc.).

d) The museum could exhibit objects related to games and sports, leaving one wall empty to stream the sporting events such as the Olympic games or the World Cup and advertise it as a place to watch the games on a big screen. International competitions such as these would draw a diverse audience. With a shared interest in an event or topic, students are more likely to converse and interact in a meaningful way.
Discussion

An increasing number of colleges and universities have offices of internationalization, international admissions offices, deans of international students, clubs and happy hours geared toward international students. Places such as University of Iowa and Emory University have thriving international student populations with high attendance at campus activities. However, the above findings indicate that there are aspects of internationalization that need continued improvement within universities. Overall, the issue of international students coming to America (or the UK, Canada, or Australia) and not finding a place where they can feel welcome or at home is a persistent problem. Many universities give relatively little assistance to these students, and beyond the visa workshops and short orientations at the beginning of the year struggle to create outlets and programming for their international students. In the discussion section that follows, I will outline some factors that, based on my research and bibliographic research, I feel contribute to an overall lack of successful internationalization and intercultural interactions on DU’s campus, that can be extended to other American campuses.

Lack of Programming Throughout the School Year

Year-round programming is difficult in part because the population of international students is very diverse. It is difficult to create programming for such a wide array of home cultures and languages. The I-House staff I spoke with expressed feeling that they do not have the time to do all of the programming they want to. It seems reasonable then, for institutions such as DUMA to share the burden.

DU has a weeklong orientation for international students prior to the arrival of domestic students, at which point they proceed through orientation together. During this
orientation, staff cover topics such as visa issues, social security numbers, housing, American culture, American classroom behavior, etc. Though helpful, sessions relating to U.S. culture are not repeated with regularity throughout the quarter, so students lose out on valuable opportunities for continued learning in an open, comfortable environment. Having more meetings with the orientation committee throughout the quarter would allow students to bring questions or real life examples to talk about. These types of questions may arise organically throughout the quarter and can be discussed with volunteer domestic students or I-House staff.

_Suggestions Based on this Factor_

a) While these meetings could occur in an I-house building or another meeting room on campus, a museum could offer its space as a quiet, comfortable place to have such gatherings. Efforts like these could create a reputation on campus that the museum is used for exhibitions and education, but also for public meetings and more unconventional uses.

_Motivations_

I also learned to explore the reasoning behind the various internationalization efforts. I learned that throughout the history of DU, international education has changed significantly and has had different successes and failures. Most recently, a strong motivation for different admissions procedures and internationalization efforts relate to the financial viability of the university (Lee and Rice 2007). As mentioned in the introductory chapter, this has not always been the case. Different political and economic factors have influenced international education for centuries in different ways. For example, the Institute of International Education was founded in 1918 after World War I
in an effort to promote peace through international education (IIE 2014a). According to IIE, most international students today are funded by their families (IIE 2014b), which is not unique to international students, but some families give up their whole savings, they sell their houses, they go to great lengths to send their children to college in the United States (Fong 2011). Given these sacrifices, universities and colleges should encourage them to use all the resources befitting a fee-paying student. Of course, technically international students do have access to the resources on campus. Sometimes, however, subtle barriers to various resources exist due to cultural or linguistic obstacles. For example, though most international students could benefit from targeted help with writing assignments, the Writing Center’s mission does not include helping with writing issues stemming from writing in a second language or culturally mediated writing differences. The international students who make appointments at the Writing Center will certainly get help from the staff, but it may not be the type of help they really need.

Inequality

Museum studies scholars like Sandell, Kurin, and Lynch write eloquently about the social roles of museums and museum practice. They call for a renewed vision of what museums can and should be doing in a world full of complexities, colonial histories, and inequalities. This is a formidable task, yes, but one that needs to be pursued nonetheless as we move deeper into the 21st century. Museum anthropology can help us be more self-reflexive and self critical, examining our colonial pasts and how to behave in the future. It can also inform how museums interact with their source communities as well as the communities in which they exist. In society and our practice, where are the inequalities
and what can museums do to help address them? Similarly, on university campuses, where are the inequalities and what can university museums do to try and address them?

There are many different types of inequality, but in the current research, I would argue that international students experience the University of Denver and other American universities as unequal partners. There are many reasons for this that range from large and glacial, such as institutional culture, to smaller and more manageable, such as information dissemination. The international students I met are hard-working and ambitious, but they also deal with issues and complications that many American students have the privilege to ignore. Because of these additional hurdles, such as visa and work issues, language difficulties, and housing concerns, they often barely have time to complete their coursework, let alone spare time to invest in museum projects or workshops. In light of very real time constraints for all involved, a good place to start might be to partner with people on campus already working with international students. Finding partners can be difficult, as I found, but by working to integrate museum practices into classroom activities or curricula, the museum could become part of the campus in a more integrated, organic way.

Another way international students are part of an unequal partnership with the school is in regards to empowerment. By this I mean all the ways the campus communicates to students that they are not valued in the same way American students are for their insights and unique perspectives. For example, one student I spoke with complained that his graduate program did not have many resources for helping him find a job in the United States after he graduates. He wants to stay in the U.S., but finds it difficult to network and find potential employers who are interested in hiring
international graduates. Another example is a student from Thailand who attends the Joseph Korbel School of International Studies, telling me that in class they mostly discuss American examples, as opposed to drawing on examples from all over the world. She felt that international examples would be helpful to all students, as well as give her a chance to contribute some of her perspectives as an international student.

A third example comes from my own attempt at developing a partnership with a group of Angolan students. Upon meeting to discuss possible activities in the DUMA gallery, I mentioned a few ideas I felt would be enjoyable and relatively easy to accomplish. These included ideas from Keri Smith’s book How to be an Explorer of the World (2008) and a word art activity inspired by the work of Rupprecht Matthies. After presenting some options, I encouraged anyone in the group to offer suggestions. Eventually one student asked to look through my copy of Smith’s book, and another offered that the word-art making workshop sounded interesting, at which time several others agreed, and it was decided to try a word-art making session in DUMA’s gallery. This quick and unchallenged consensus was unsettling because it begs the question: were the students genuinely interested, or had I inadvertently pressured them into a decision? How do I balance my knowledge of what is feasible within the museum context and letting participants have more of a voice? She was quoted earlier in this paper, but Marstine’s sentiment regarding consensus is relevant here for a second time:

Consensus has come to signal an exclusivity and like-mindedness among contributors, as well as fixity of thought. Museums seeking change foster collaborative relationships on equal footing with diverse stakeholders and willingly assume the risks entailed by entertaining novel positions. [2011:7]
Collaboration and equal participation are delicate and difficult goals. Lynch writes honestly and provocatively about her own struggles toward equitable exchanges in her work. One example she gives regarding the issue of empowering partners to be confident and voice their thoughts is called *Talking Objects*, held at the British museum. In this intensive exercise, young people spent a week at the museum, using the museum as a forum and theater playback techniques to create alternative biographies for one object, in this case, the Rosetta Stone. All of the activities and discussions were aimed at helping these young people develop confidence in debating or questioning the museum staff and the museum’s interpretation of the object (2011:156). While *Talking Objects* is too intensive and time consuming for many university museums and students to commit to, it shows one method used to empower museum visitors to use their own language and knowledge sets to enter into “creative conflict” with the museum (Lynch 2011:156). Lynch writes that this type of meaning making in the museum “means that people can begin to clearly and confidently express their views without being dependent upon Eurocentric academic language or forms of communication” (2011:156). One of the biggest challenges to inequality within the university context is making room for non-Western voices and interpretations from the students, faculty and staff.
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

Review of Research and Contribution to the Field

This thesis addresses the purposes and uses of museums today, in a time when museums are pressed to justify their existence and purpose to visitors, donors, and in the case of university museums, their host institutions. I began with the statement that though American colleges and universities are investing enormous amounts of time, money, and energy into internationalization efforts, they are still failing to meet many of their international students’ needs, as well as produce interculturally competent alumni. It is my assertion that university museums can help ameliorate this problem in two ways. One, through their collections, university museums can create avenues toward empathy and communication between students using the concepts of object agency, object biographies, and materiality. Two, through programming, university museums can facilitate curricular and extra curricular changes to create a more inclusive campus that encourages a holistic approach toward internationalization.

Based on this thesis statement, I began researching the climate of internationalization in the United States and at the University of Denver, and developed the following research questions:

1) What, if any, are some of the challenges that international students face while attending a university or college in the United States?
b. How is the university already addressing these challenges, and in what ways does the university need to improve?

3) Can university museums foster increased interaction among student populations of diverse backgrounds?

   a. How can the collections themselves foster interaction?

   b. How can programming help achieve the goal of increased interaction?

As a student at DU, it is edifying to be able to contribute a small amount of knowledge back to the university. The international students at DU are bright and ambitious. They can offer valuable cultural, linguistic, and academic enrichment to the campus. Unfortunately some of them feel the university is underserving them as contributing intellectual and financial members to the community. When asked what the worst thing about DU is, one student getting his Masters degree in Public Policy immediately said, “The tuition? Can I say that? Its so expensive.” He then went on to make the critique that

“We’re not offering a program or a service to international students to try to build their connections here to get a job. Like professional connections, like, a lot of us, like most of us, want to get a job after we graduate. But…we’re getting help but you know its, I still don’t think its enough. You know its really hard for international students, especially we’re in the program of this international studies…public policy…you have to compete with all the Americans, like if you’re not in the mathematics, or science or technology or engineering. So, I think DU should do a better job on this, like helping international students to get more involved in the city of Denver…”

The majority of international students struggle to align their desired identities as active members of the academic and social community at DU with their day-to-day practices such as fraternizing only with other students from their home countries. By
making this research public, I hope to shed some light on how DU might make its students’ experiences better.

Additionally, I explored the role of university museums in internationalization efforts and their relevance to college campuses. This research is timely given the ever-growing population of international students, and the need for university museums to remain important campus facilities when universities are deciding where to allot space, resources and budget dollars. I also offered ten suggestions for how university museums can take advantage of the opportunities they have with such a dynamic and resourceful visiting population. International students are not just potential museum visitors, but also a potential resource to help interpret collections, utilize the museum’s space, and teach about their wide-ranging experiences.

The current research also contributes to the growing body of literature surrounding applied research. By researching in a local setting, the findings feed directly back into the community of interest. The study hopes to communicate to its readers that far from being dusty, antiquated institutions, university museums have immense potential for innovation, research, and becoming dynamic parts of the overall university environment.

Main Findings

One finding is that university museums are doing relatively little to reach out to, to program for, or to open their resources up to international students. At the outset of this research, I anticipated finding a) strong interest from international students and/or staff in offices concerned with internationalization to work with me and b) to find examples of other university museums in the United States and abroad that are working consistently
with international students. There are museums that have successful programs, but considering how many universities operate in the United States and how many of those have museums and galleries, there could be more collaboration between international students and museums.

After months of researching, reading, and talking with faculty and staff around the DU campus, I have a better understanding of why there is a dearth of successful intercultural collaborations on university campuses. Finding staff and faculty on a university or college campus to work with is much more difficult than I anticipated. Though supportive, many people I spoke with did not express interest in collaborating, or expressed that they did not have the resources (both time and money) they felt would be necessary. Though an organic approach to internationalization in which international questions and activities are a part of the day-to-day operation of the school is the ideal, there is still a strong “silo” mentality prevalent in higher education that stymies partnerships and collaboration.

Another main finding is in regards to the assertion made earlier that museums and their objects possess a certain agency or influence over the viewer. Examples such as Lydia Degarrod’s work, Ruprecht Matthies’ involvement in the Denver community, and Alfred Gell’s writing on object agency all contribute to the proposition that human-object interaction can be powerful, transformative, educational and entertaining. The findings from this study also suggest, however, that in order to be successful, human-object interactions need to be carefully planned and framed for the untrained viewer. In other words, experiences with objects will be meaningful if there is interest on the part of the viewer and if there are engaging elements to the encounter such as discussion with
another person or information about the object that the visitor may be interested to learn. In the museum context, interpretation often takes this challenge on, and staff create ways to facilitate meaning making by using their knowledge of the object, display techniques, hands-on projects, tours, etc. (Wood and Latham 2014:31). It may not be for lack of interest on the museum’s part, but rather a lack of interest from the student body. In light of this, the burden is on museums to integrate their missions, their collections, and their spaces more into student lives. As Marstine has pointed out (2007), the most effective way to spread enthusiasm for campus museums is through the students themselves. If the students get excited about the museum, they will tell their friends.

Finally, universities and museums can start creating a more inclusive campus by practicing self-reflexivity. Becoming more transparent and open with audiences, as Lynch calls for (2011), will create a more open dialogue with them and what they need. Empowering students to engage with the museum and by extension each other is a difficult process, and may not be feasible in every case. However, As Richard Sandell writes, “These challenges…should not deter progress towards the development of more socially engaged, responsible and ethically informed museum practice” (2011:126).

Is It Worth It?

Given the statistics regarding the financial trappings of international education, the numbers of students coming to the U.S. every year, and the mixed reports regarding the experience of students in America, it is easy to simplify internationalization to a business transaction, and nothing more. The benefits of internationalization and international education are long-term, and at times hard to quantify. Benefits for successful campuses are increased language and cultural knowledge for students, faculty
and staff on campus, and hopefully increased empathy toward other countries and cultures. Diversified classroom experiences, including non-Western texts in the syllabus and diverse stories told from student perspectives contribute to this goal. Campuses should also be concerned with increasing social and psychological well-being for international students to feel welcome and empowered by their host institution. Additionally, with a better experience students will be more likely to donate and financially support the institution in the future.

With regard to university museums, increased access to and use of the museum collections would help create more interest in developing and attending events at the museum. Students might gain a stronger sense of place, not only by sharing where they come from, but also by learning about others’ stories. As a result, the university could produce more engaged museum visitors going into the future, who realize that museums are dynamic places that can play a formative part in their adult lives (Marstine 2007; King 2001).

There have been variations in museum theory over the years, with some contending that preservation and collection are the primary *raison d’etre* of museums, while others aver that access to the objects for learning and entertainment is the most important purpose. People such as John Dewey, Luigi Palma di Cesnola and Frederic Lucas all praised the public missions of museums even a century ago (Hein 2012; Genoways and Andrei 2008). David Mandelbaum wrote a brief but pointed article about the purposes of university museums and their need to become more relevant to students in all disciplines. Though written in 1953, this article is still pertinent today and is a good reminder of the great potential university museums have (Mandelbaum 1953).
Reflections

On Partnerships

This section contains reflections I have on the nature of partnerships with the museum, on institutional culture, and on what a researcher picking up a similar line of research should keep in mind.

No matter how good a museum’s collections or spaces are, nothing can be done without human involvement. Partners, audiences, staff and volunteers are all critical people in creating an engaging – and engaged – museum. For the research leading to the current paper, this was the most difficult piece of all. Staff and faculty are busy doing their own important work and reticent to partner, and students lack interest in the museum’s activities unless they relate directly to them. In an effort to be open and flexible as I approached potential partners, I chose not to create a firm and defined plan for a project. In future research projects, I propose that developing, if not a complete plan for partnering, then at least a tentative idea with goals delineated and resources found is a good starting point when approaching potential partners. This way, a partner can assess the proposed project and decide if he/she, the department, or the office would benefit from the partnership. When approached with no clear plan, potential partners fear that they are being asked to complete the process of brainstorming, researching, and marketing. Had I proposed clearer ideas for what a partnership with DUMA could look like, I may have had more success in finding partners.

Another conclusion in regards to partnerships is that a successful partnership develops only after a relationship develops. In other words, a future researcher may have more success by targeting one specific department, club, faculty member, or office on
campus and working to build rapport with those people specifically. With a deeper relationship comes deeper understanding of the researcher’s goals and intentions, which may yield a more fruitful partnership.

Another factor is the transient nature of a student body. In order to more fully incorporate the values of intercultural education, researchers should develop relationships with faculty and staff instead of targeting students exclusively. This is because an energetic student may gladly partner with the museum one year but graduate the next. For longer term, more in-depth partnerships, the relative stability of faculty and staff is better.

While great partnerships can take many different forms and include almost any faculty, if international students are a target audience for the museum, faculty with the highest rates of international students in their classes should be of particular interest to the researcher. For example, DU has high rates of international students in the business and science departments. With this in mind, university museums can partner with business professors and science professors in particular if they want to see higher rates of international students in their space.

On Institutional Culture

While this research focuses specifically on the university museum, there are many other facets of a university that all contribute to successful internationalization. The university museum cannot shift institutional culture or meet all students’ needs on its own. In order for the museum to be successful, it needs the support and backing of its host institution. In addition to the museum, universities can support the goals of internationalization in other ways that encourage and allow international students to get the most out of their time in the U.S. Placing offices of internationalization in central
locations encourages serendipitous encounters between students, having designated writing centers for ESL students can help students be more successful in classes, or offering training to teachers who need help adjusting to the new cultural diversity in their classrooms, these are just a few suggestions for how the institution as a whole can support internationalization.

Though DU is already supporting internationalization in some ways, a notable barrier to success is the fractured nature of DU and universities in general. One department may be making great strides toward internationalization, but its work goes unnoticed due to the academic “silos” in effect. One important way DU is combating this is by implementing campus wide conferences to expose various research and data on the matter. Each spring, DU hosts its annual Internationalization Summit. In April 2015, the theme is “Internationalization at Home” (Office of Internationalization 2015). DU also holds a Diversity Summit every year to discuss issues of racial diversity and inclusivity on campus (Center for Multicultural Excellence 2015). These and events like these are important steps toward disseminating thought and research across disciplinary and departmental lines.

On the Research Process

Given the short time frame that a Master’s candidate has to complete research, certain aspects of research may fall short of the ideal. The current research is no different. As this paper nears its end, there are a few points about the research process that may be helpful to future students interested in qualitative research.

Above I outline how potential partners can be approached differently to yield better results. Though my process did not result in a deep or long-term partnership, I
nonetheless spoke with many faculty and staff interested in issues of internationalization. I met with faculty and staff from the Department of Languages and Literatures, the Department of English, the Center for World Languages and Cultures, the Office of Internationalization, Daniels College of Business, and the Department of Anthropology. Their thoughts and comments influenced the direction my research took and many are included in this text. Their individual names and offices are not cited, however, because I did not pursue informed consent from the people I spoke with. Informed consent allows researchers to enrich and enhance any text by including the personal voices of people concerned with the issue at hand. At the time of my application for approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB), interviews with faculty and staff were not included because I did not know at that point who I would be speaking with. Careful thought and planning in regards to research process are important, and future researchers are encouraged to consider all of their potential participants, including faculty and staff.

Suggestions for Further Research

Any research project creates questions as well as answers them. Below are a few areas that I feel would help enhance the research on international students’ experience in the U.S. These include creating a collaborative exhibit or program with international students and conducting summative evaluation regarding that process to get feedback from the students about what could be done better. If such research were to be published, other museum staff and faculty could use it in their museums.

Another area of research that may prove helpful, especially in the American classrooms and how university museums interpret their collections, would be exploring more deeply culturally formed ways of learning. It is my suspicion that some
international students under-utilize museums because they may not be accustomed to the informal, free-choice learning that museums provide. A deeper understanding of these differences may help university museums develop their exhibitionary practices to be more inclusive of diverse learning styles.

A third suggestion is in regards to the role of technology in how students relate to each other and their campus experiences. Exploring online communities and how these impact students’ day-to-day lives on campus could prove to be useful in guiding administrators and museum staff in how they program for their students. Starting a museum Instagram or Facebook account could be another way to reach out to students and get them interested in museum activities. On a university campus, not all international students are all in one place. Almost all of them, however, are online.

Finally, an interesting research topic would be the importance of place and space within the realm of internationalization. Briefly discussed, but vastly under-explored here is the impact that the placement of the various international offices and gathering spaces has on attendance and perception on university campuses. A better understanding of if, and how, campus location influences perceptions of certain offices, gathering spaces, and university museums could contribute to a better understanding of how we build and create university campuses.
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Appendix A

Interview Questions

First Iteration

1. What attracted you to DU; in other words, why did you choose DU over other universities?
2. Are you affiliated with a specific program, like an exchange program, sponsorship, church group, or a scholarship? If so, is there a corresponding group in Denver that you are a part of?
3. With whom do you spend most of your leisure time?
4. Where/how did you meet these people?
5. Are these the people you expected to spend time with when you arrived on campus, or are they a different group of people than you expected?
6. Would you like to expand your social circle and meet more people? If so, how would you like to do this?
7. Are you aware of DU programs available on campus? If so, which ones, and how did you find out about them?
8. What is your perspective on the events and programs DU has in place to encourage interaction between students of different backgrounds? Are they good, bad, helpful, unhelpful?
9. What other kinds of programs and events do you like to attend?
10. Are you aware of the museum of anthropology in Sturm Hall? If so, have you ever attended an event there?
11. If an event was being planned at the museum, what type of event would interest you?
Second Iteration

1) What attracted you to DU; in other words, why did you choose DU over other universities?
2) With whom do you spend most of your time?
3) Where/how did you meet these people?
4) Are these the people you expected to spend time with when you arrived on campus, or are they a different group of people than you expected.
5) Would you like to expand your social circle and meet more people? If so, how would you go about doing this?
6) Is English your second language, if so, can you tell me about how it is to go to school in a second language?
7) Do you keep in a lot of contact with people at home? If so, what methods do you use to keep in contact with them?
8) Do you ever go to museums in Denver, or at home?
9) Have you ever heard of the museum of Anthropology in Sturm Hall? If so, have you ever attended an event there?
10) I am planning an event in the museum right now, what kinds of activities would you like to see?

Third Iteration

1) How would you rate your experience at DU so far? Very good, good, okay (neutral), bad, very bad.
   a. Can you tell me why you gave it the rating you did?
2) More specifically, what has been your experience with American DU students? Very good, good, okay (neutral) bad, very bad.
   a. Can you tell me why you gave that the rating you did?
3) What has been your experience with American teachers in the classroom? Very good, good, okay (neutral) bad, very bad?
a. Can you tell me why you gave that the rating you did?

4) When you write papers or do homework, do you utilize any offices on campus like the Writing Center in the library, or your professors? Do you do a lot of your work with your fellow classmates?

5) What has been the best thing about attending DU so far?

6) What has been the worst thing about attending DU so far?

7) Why did you come to DU? Can you explain the process you went through to get to attend DU?

8) Who do you find are your closest friends here? Who do you hang out with the most?

9) Are these people you expected to hang out with when you left your home to attend DU? In other words, before coming to DU, who did you expect to be friends with?

10) If you could change or expand your social circle here, whom would you choose to be friends with and why?

11) Do you have any ideas how you might go about expanding your friendship network?

12) What are some things you enjoy doing in your free time?
   a. Who do you normally do these things with?

13) When did you learn English?

14) Why did you learn English? How do you normally get practice speaking English?

15) Do you think knowing multiple languages is a good thing? Why or why not?

16) Do you consider the different languages you know to have different purposes or values? In other words, how do you choose which language to use in any given situation?

17) How often do you communicate with people back home?

18) How do you communicate? Phone, email, skype, letters?

19) Some people view museums as “contact zone”, meaning a safe place where different cultures can interact with each other to discuss and learn. From your perspective, do you feel that in your home culture there are places such as
this? Cultural meeting places, or a place to exchange ideas with people? If so, can you tell me what those places are and why they are safe places for cultures to interact?

a. Is there somewhere you, as an individual, go to exchange ideas and interact with different people? (can be a physical place or virtual)

20) (Skip if they didn’t attend the workshop) You attended the word art activity at the Museum of Anthropology. In your opinion, do you think activities like that (meaning open activities that invite any student to join in) are helpful or successful at bringing students of different nationalities together? Can you think of other activities that might be successful?

21) If you could plan an activity with the goal of bringing different students together to meet each other, what would that look like?
Appendix B

Word Art Activity

Questions to Think About

(Your answers can be in English or whichever language you choose)

1. What’s one word that you would use to describe Denver, CO?

2. What’s one word that reminds you of home?

3. Choose a word to describe the University of Denver

4. What is your favorite thing about DU?

5. What is something you don’t like about Colorado?

6. What language makes you feel like you are at home? In other words, what language are you most comfortable speaking?