Making Sense of Internationalization via Strategic International Research Partnerships: Faculty Members' Experiences in a Canadian University

by

Girmaw Abebe Akalu

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Educational Administration and Leadership

Department of Educational Policy Studies
University of Alberta

© Girmaw Abebe Akalu, 2017

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to explore the experiences of academics at the University of Alberta who were involved in strategic international research partnerships with institutions located in two overseas countries both as part of their university's commitment to internationalization and the provincial government's interest to establish long-lasting economic relations with the two countries. More specifically the study was intended to find out the meaning these academics attributed to internationalization in the context of these partnerships, the rationales undergirding their international engagement, and the implications of these on their professional practices in their home university. The following central research question guided the study: How do faculty members engaged in strategic international research partnerships with overseas institutions chronicle their experiences of internationalization?

In order to locate the present study in broader and pertinent scholarly works, the literature review particularly focused on the intersections between globalization, internationalization and the discourse of the knowledge-based economy. Further, in order to examine whether academics in this study reproduced the discourses of commercialization and/or entrepreneurism in their narratives of their international experiences, I employed a theoretical framework informed by globalization and academic capitalism. To achieve the study's purposes, I employed a qualitative case study methodology (Yin, 2014) based on the naturalistic paradigm (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) with a focus on understanding the subjective experiences of participants. The overall purpose was "to capture the deep meaning of experience in the participants' own words"

(Marshall & Rossman, 2011, p. 93) while maintaining the view that participants' realities are subjective, differing from one another (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).

Sources of data for this study included document analysis, reflective journals and 25 semi-structured interviews with 16 faculty members involved in the two strategic international partnerships at the university. Data were analyzed using conventional qualitative data analysis techniques including coding for themes and categories, writing analytical memos, offering interpretations, doing constant comparative analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Marshall & Rossman, 2011), and finally asking key questions throughout the data analysis.

Analysis of data resulted in the following key findings. First, there emerged competing voices on the meaning of internationalization. Internationalization was understood as branding an institution internationally, as a cross-border activity comprising exposure to a new location and condition, collaboration with overseas partners, communication/connection among scholars, a learning encounter which involves knowledge sharing between academics, and, finally, an opportunity where academics developed their intercultural sensitivity and competence. Second, the rationales for international engagement included extending academic horizons, reputation and profile building for academics as well as exposure to a different academic culture where academics learned new practices. Third, the study indicated that international engagement was important for enhancing academic quality, for learning new practices from a different academic context, for the integration of the international dimension in the curricula and for enhancing students' intercultural competence. The study concluded that even though faculty members saw internationalization from its educational and

socio-cultural benefits, they also articulated the economic and the reputational benefits of their international experiences. This was evident not only in their framing of internationalization as branding but also by rationalizing their international engagement as a means of access to funds as well as for advancing their own international reputation and profile.

Recommendations in this study included the need to conduct further studies across the university in order to better understand how faculty members understand internationalization from their unique disciplinary perspectives; to take stock of lessons learned from international partnerships so as to better inform future internationalization policy within the institution, and finally the need to take an ethical approach to internationalization; that is; to reframe internationalization within the institution broadly as "a vital means to achieving global-level civic engagement, social justice and social responsibility and, ultimately, the common good" (Rickets & Humphries, 2015).

Finally, this study was significant because it offered a grounded, contextualized and an original account of the meaning of and rationales for internationalization from academics who were actually engaged in international partnerships with overseas universities. Equally important were faculty members' accounts of the impact of their international engagement on their professional practices in their own university.

Preface

This thesis is an original work by Girmaw Abebe Akalu. The research project, of which this thesis is a part, received research ethics approval from the University of Alberta Research Ethics Board, Project Name "Internationalization through international research partnerships. Case studies of North-North and North-South International Research Partnerships at the University of Alberta", No. 00063734, April 15, 2016.

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my late father

Abebe Akalu Kassa

You were more than a father. You told me you'll make it through the operating room on that day but only came out to say good bye. We parted ways when we both least expected it. I will always miss you.

To my beloved mother,

Enquaye Dessie

whose presence makes life worth living. My gift from God. You deserve my love and my gratitude. Thank you Tatey!

To Asku, Sam and Bethel

for the challenges we passed through, and for the prayers, hugs, and laughter we all shared.

And to Mesfin and Serash

whose thoughts and prayers have sustained me. Thank you for trusting in me.

I dedicate this work to all of you.

Acknowledgements

To my Lord and Savior **Jesus Christ**, I honor you, love you, worship you, and praise you with all my heart for your grace that sustained me in my hours of difficulty and for opening doors no one can shut. You guided and strengthened me as I passed through the many valleys of life. Without you, I could never have done it. I witness you are the way, the truth and the life.

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Frank Peters, whose encouragement, advice, guidance and humor made the writing of this thesis less stressful than it could have been. Thank you also for those memorable and fruitful conversations we had, not only on my work but also on life, family and beyond. You have been a wonderful supervisor!

To dissertation committee members Dr. Jose da Costa, and Dr. Heather Kanuka, I am extremely grateful for your assistance and invaluable suggestions on my work which I found extremely helpful. I owe you a great deal.

To Dr. Tim Goddard and Dr. Elaine Simmt for your insightful comments and questions on my dissertation which I found extremely useful.

To Dr. Ali Abdi, Dr. Paul Newton, and Dr. Darryl Hunter for your support and encouragement and making yourselves available in time of my need.

To other members of my beloved family Yeshiye, Asse, Fasil, Tedi, Hani, and Nega, I sincerely thank and love you for your thoughts and prayers for your brother whom you always longed to see him succeed.

To Asrat, Sariye, Lulitye, Beti, Mom and Redi, I thank you all for your prayers and encouragement and for the times we shared together every Friday as we seek to know our Lord better through His Word and His Spirit.

To my friends and fellow graduate students Birhanu, Chouaib, Grace, Michelle and Tashika, I thank you all for your support, and for all things we shared together as we struggled with our individual projects and campus life.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter I: Introduction

Background to the Study

Over the past few years, internationalization has been foregrounded as a key policy agenda in Canadian higher education (Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), 2014; Advisory Panel, 2012; Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada (DFATDC), 2014; The Government of Canada, 2013b, 2012). Signaling this development are several new policy initiatives on internationalization which have been mandated by federal and provincial governments. In particular, the role played by Canada's federal government in recent years has come to be remarkably conspicuous. Consider this: In October 2011, Canada's federal government set up an Advisory Panel on International Education and subsequently unveiled, in August 2012, its major report titled *International Education: A Key Driver of Canada's Future Prosperity*. The report, as is made manifest in its subtitle, has the "goal of making international education a key driver of Canada's future prosperity" (Advisory Panel, 2012, p. 98). In the following year, *Economic Action Plan 2013* (The Government of Canada, 2013b) allocated $23 million over two years to international education initiatives, i.e., "to strengthen Canada's position as a country of choice to study and conduct world-class research" (p. 87).

In 2014, the federal government released another seminal document titled *Canada's International Education Strategy. Harnessing our Knowledge Advantage to Drive Innovation and Prosperity*. The strategy, which, as per the Honourable Ed Fast, Canada's Minister of International trade, is "a blue print to attract talent and prepare our country for the 21st century" (Fast, 2014, p. 4) seeks to "maintain and enhance Canada's global position in higher education" (DFATDC, 2014, para. 3). Among other things, it "aims to increase the number, breadth and depth of active collaborations between Canadian and foreign postsecondary institutions and research centres, and to position Canada as a country of choice for both academic recruitment and partnerships" (DFATDC, 2014, p. 11).

Canada's International Education Strategy also places a high premium on enhancing Canada's competitiveness in a globalized knowledge-based economy. It enunciates that, "Deeper links between research institutes and the attraction of researchers will help strengthen Canada's innovation edge and competitiveness—keys to success in today's highly competitive, knowledge-based economy" (DFATDC, 2014, p. 11).

The federal government has also moved a step further to fund not only the *International Education Strategy*, but also the Mitacs Globalink[1] program and Edu-Canada[2], two major initiatives aimed at promoting Canada as a brand for international students. Further, recognizing internationalization as a "key driver of Canada's economy" (The Government of Canada, 2013, p. 87) and of "Canada's future prosperity" (Advisory Panel, 2012, p. viii), the government has closely aligned internationalization with Canada's diplomacy, trade and immigration objectives (McBride, 2015).

Federal level internationalization policies have also been accompanied by provincial and institutional strategies. For example, *Alberta's Internationalization Strategy 2013* (The Government of Alberta, 2013) identifies global engagement as "*the* answer" to the province's long term economic goals. At the same time, the internationalization of the post-secondary education system in the province is distinctively oriented toward "positioning Alberta as a global leader" (The Government of Alberta, 2014a, p. 1). In the same vein, internationalization also appears to be at the forefront of the strategic priorities of the University of Alberta, the largest in the province. In its official website, the University states its commitment to "continually strives to enhance international dimensions in its teaching, research, service, outreach and

---

[1] Established in 1999, Mitacs is a national, not-for-profit organization that has designed and delivered research and training programs in Canada. Its Globalink program offers funded research internships to senior undergraduate students. The purpose of Globalink research internships is to put Canadian universities on the map of top research destinations, and for international students to return to Canada for their graduate studies. (Mitacs, n.d.)

[2] Edu-Canada is "the marketing unit within the Department of Education and Foreign Affairs …to develop an official Canadian brand to boost educational marketing, IMAGINE: Education in/au Canada" (Desai-Trilokekar & Kizilbash, 2013, p. 1). The brand "aims to convince international students that the quality of an education in Canada will provide them with the tools they need to develop their full potential" (Imagine Education au /in Canada, n.d.)

administration" and see international engagement as "a key academic strategy to improving the quality of teaching, learning, and research … in turn enhancing the university's overall reputation and further improving its worldwide standing" (The University of Alberta, n.d.c., para. 1-2).

Overall, internationalization has come to be viewed as a "cross-cutting public policy priority" (McBride, 2015, para. 2), "a core element of Canadian universities' activities" (AUCC, 2014, p. 40), and "a significant feature of the Canadian educational landscape" (Beck, 2012, p. 133). Indeed, educational institutions all across Canada are now entrusted with the responsibility of achieving the goals set out in *Canada's International Education Strategy* (McBride, 2015). Already, more than 80% of all Canadian universities have identified internationalization as a top planning priority (AUCC, 2014). While it can be argued that even before these recent initiatives, internationalization had already become "'the norm' on Canadian campuses" (Birchard, 2007, para. 1) and had formed "an integral part of Canadian universities' institutional strategies" (AUCC, 2008, p. 5), recent moves by the federal and provincial governments suggest a renewed interest in internationalization. More importantly, these recent initiatives created an aura of internationalization imperative on Canadian campuses.

Yet despite a litany of new initiatives and policies on internationalization in Canada, little is known about the perspectives and experiences of faculty members who are engaged in strategic international research partnerships, a growing feature of Canadian universities' international engagement. How do they, particularly those who have had direct experiences in strategic international research partnerships chronicle their experiences? How do they understand internationalization? What are their accounts of the benefits of internationalization? How might their conceptions of internationalization coincide with and/or differ from "[t]he prevalent understanding of internationalization, widely used by Canadian universities and colleges" (Beck, 2012, p. 134)?[3] How do faculty members see globalization impacting their conceptions and motivations of internationalization as well as their professional practices especially in view of the claim

---

[3] This prevalent understanding of internationalization, according to Beck (2012), is one conceptualized by Jane Knight. Knight (2004) defined internationalization as a "the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education" (p .11).

that internationalization, in some contexts, is increasingly being driven by economic globalization (Welch, 2012, 2002), and, as a result, the distinction between globalization and internationalization is getting blurred (Brandenburg & de Wit, 2011)? Answers to these questions are needed in order to advance our understandings of internationalization and how, in particular, it plays out within the context of strategic international research partnerships. It is argued that without the perspectives of those who have had direct experience with internationalization in their own context, our understanding of internationalization will remain at best partial, decontextualized and reflecting only those perspectives that are expressed in the extant literature.

I should point out that there is a limited, albeit growing, volume of literature on internationalization in Canadian universities (Beck, 2012, 2009; Friesen, 2012; Kaznowska & Usher, 2011; Ilieva, Beck & Waterstone, 2014; Larkin, 2013; Larsen, 2016a, 2015; Larsen & Al-Haque, 2016; Shaw, 2014; Shultz, 2013; Trilokekar & Jones, 2007; Trilokekar & Kizilbash, 2013; Viczko, 2015, 2013; Weber, 2007). This domestic literature, as scant as it is, has not adequately explored how internationalization is understood and rationalized by faculty members who are actively engaged in strategic international partnerships in overseas locations. It is also unclear from much of this literature how internationally engaged faculty members see the implications of their international engagement on their professional practices in their home universities.

Overall, a dearth of research on faculty members' experiences in internationalization in Canada leaves us uninformed about what internationalization means in the specific local institutional context, what rationales are driving it, and the implications of these to faculty members' professional practices in their own universities.

Rationale for the Study

This study was an attempt to redress two known gaps in internationalization research globally and most notably in the Canadian context: (1) A general lack of research in internationalization within an institutional setting that has paid due attention to the peculiarities of the local context, and (2) a paucity of theoretically-informed research particularly on the perceptions of faculty members about their international/ overseas experience particularly as they pertain to the meaning and the rationales they hold for their international engagement. I will elaborate each in the following.

First, over the past two decades, studies on internationalization in Canada and beyond have sought to address several topics of interest. These included, inter alia, cross-border and transnational education (Altbach & Knight, 2007; de Wit, 2012; Knight, 2008b), double degree programs (Knight, 2011a), debates on the meaning and trajectory of internationalization (Beck, 2009; Knight, 2013; Teichler, 2004), the pros and cons of internationalization (Lambert & Usher, 2013; Knight, 2012, 2008b, 2007b), stakeholders' views on internationalization (Cho & Palmer, 2013; Green & Olson, 2003; Knight, 2007a), quality issues in internationalization (Knight 2008b; van Damme, 2001), and most recently how internationalization is affected by global tensions (Altbach & de Wit, 2015). Yet there has been a paucity of research, particularly in the Canadian context that has drawn particular attention to the intricacies of the local institutional context (Beck, 2013; Friesen, 2012). The result was that we continued to rely on self-help manuals that offered little more than decontextualized and normative understandings of internationalization that had little relation to reality on the ground. Thus, one rationale for present study was to gain a grounded understanding of internationalization by paying particular attention to the local context within which internationalization is enacted.

Second, despite the claim that "the internationalization of higher education has been studied in depth" (Knight, 2014a), there was generally little research on internationalization in Canadian campuses (Beck, 2012). In fact, according to Beck (2012), one of the "the key gaps in Canadian research on internationalization" was "the lack of understanding of the perspectives, practices, and experiences of the participants engaged in internationalization" (p. 136). She recommended for "an urgent need to investigate the complexity of internationalization if knowledge about internationalization is to be advanced" (p. 136). To date, there was almost no research in Canada that has investigated the experiences of faculty members engaged in overseas international activities. This was despite the recognition that they are the "key agents of [the] institutional internationalization process in Canadian higher education" (Friesen, 2012, p. 219). Of course, since Beck's (2012) writing, studies on internationalization in Canada have grown substantially. Yet, the call to understand the perspectives and experiences of participants who were engaged in internationalization had been particularly slow to

materialize. It was, therefore, partly to this clarion call that this dissertation responded. In so doing, this study could contribute to the better understanding of the meaning of and rationales of internationalization from the "key agents" of the international process as well as the implications of these on their professional practices in their own university.

Finally, although the extant literature points to the fact that internationalization was increasingly being used "to enhance national competitiveness in a global market place" (Hudzik, 2011, p. 13) and "has taken on an entrepreneurial and market-oriented dimension" (Beck, 2012, p. 135), thus leading to exploitative practices which prioritize profit maximization (Association of Canadian Deans of Education, 2014) and in some cases to "opportunistic entrepreneurialism" (Welch, 2012, p. 310), the empirical basis for such claims especially stemming from in-depth qualitative case studies was largely sparse. Indeed, a critical gap in in Canadian research on internationalization was a lack of theoretically-informed research that has taken insights from dominant theories in higher education (Beck, 2012; Larsen, 2016a). This had resulted in undertheorized understandings of internationalization that provided little guidance to policy and practice. Thus, for example, whether academics (re) produce the discourses of globalization and academic capitalism in their interpretations and practices of internationalization, and see the rationales for internationalization in predominantly economic terms, and/or collude with neoliberal agendas was an open question that needed in-depth exploration. This qualitative case study was, therefore, part of an attempt to respond to this lacuna by developing a better understanding of internationalization in an institutional setting using the theories of globalization and academic capitalism.

Purpose and Delimitations of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative study was to understand the meaning faculty members at the University of Alberta attribute to their international experiences and the rationales for their engagement in overseas international research partnerships as well as the implications of these on their professional practices.

Delimiting the study to understand the meaning of and rationales for internationalization was in keeping with the focus of much research in internationalization studies (Knight, 2008, 2004; de Wit, 2010; Jones & de Wit, 2012) and reflects the conviction that the focus of social inquiry or of any social action should

rest upon understanding the meaning and values that individuals attach to their own actions, a stance deeply embedded in interpretive practices (Crotty, 1998). More specifically, the objectives of this dissertation were to:

(1) understand the meaning of internationalization held by faculty members at the University of Alberta who have participated in strategic international research partnerships with overseas universities;

(2) explore the rationales underpinning their engagement in these research partnerships; and

(3) examine the particular ways in which faculty members' international experiences influenced their professional practices.

By exploring the meaning and rationales faculty members' hold for their engagement in international partnerships, I sought to gain a more nuanced understanding of internationalization as it played out in the context of strategic international research partnerships. In so doing, I also sought to delve deeper to find out whether the discourses of economic globalization and academic capitalism were permeating faculty members perceptions, rationales and practices of internationalization.

I realized that the concept of internationalization was far broader than just international partnerships or collaborations, and, as a result, it could not be simply reduced to such a singular conception here. Nonetheless, it could be argued that one of internationalization's key manifestation worldwide and more so in the Canadian higher education landscape had thus far been evident by way of establishing strategic partnerships with universities abroad. This was clearly manifest in AUCC's (2014) most recent survey. Besides international partnerships had formed an integral part of internationalization in Canadian universities for many years. From a global perspective, too, international institutional agreements/networks were amongst the top areas of current and expected growth (Knight, 2008b). It was also claimed that, "strategic partnerships in research, teaching, and transfer of knowledge, between universities and of universities with business and beyond national borders, will be the future for higher education in order to manage the challenges that globalization will place on it" (de Wit, 2002, p. 205). Indeed, one of the overriding purposes of *Canada's International Education Strategy* was

"to keep Canada at the forefront of maintaining, creating, and enhancing strategic institutional partnerships" (DFATDC, 2014, pp. 11-12).

Finally, since the purpose of the study was to explore the experiences and perceptions as recounted by faculty members at the University of Alberta within the context of the national/provincial imperatives placed on Canadian universities to enhance internationalization, it was considered appropriate to delimit the study to faculty members at this university.

Research Questions

In this study, I sought to answer the following central research question: How do faculty members who are engaged in strategic international research partnerships with overseas institutions chronicle their experiences of internationalization?

In an attempt to address this central research question, I posed the following three sub-questions:

(1) How do faculty members engaged in strategic international research partnerships understand internationalization?

(2) What are the rationales underpinning their engagement in strategic international research partnerships?

(3) In what ways do faculty members' international experiences influence their professional practices in their home universities?

Significance of the Study

This study was important for several reasons. First, despite the plethora of studies on internationalization, studies which had explored faculty members' understandings and interpretations of internationalization were conspicuously limited, much less how its conceptualization was shaped and influenced by global discourses and specific local conditions. This is unfortunate especially at a time when there is a global imperative to internationalize universities and when increased demands of accountability are placed on universities to produce globally aware graduates with intercultural and international skills. Seen in this light, a study of internationalization, especially from the perspectives of those who are actively engaged in the process, would be extremely beneficial as it provides a more nuanced understanding of its meaning within the context of international

partnerships. In so doing, this qualitative study could contribute to the extant literature by advancing our conceptualization of internationalization.

Second, while there was little effort generally to incorporate the perspectives of those with direct relevant experience in studies on internationalization (de Haan, 2014), the literature was also largely silent on how specifically internationalization actually operated within the context of strategic international research partnerships, how such partnerships were rationalized by faculty members, and how faculty members' experiences in these endeavors influenced their professional practices. Given Beck's (2012) recent assessment of gaps in internationalization studies in Canada, there could more likely be a clear void in all these areas in that context. Thus, another contribution of this study was to fill this lacuna in Canadian higher education by analyzing specifically how faculty members in one case study university—the University of Alberta— understood and rationalized their engagement in strategic international partnerships. In so doing, the results of this research could provide a grounded account of the intricate ways in which internationalization was being perceived and enacted within an institutional setting.

The significance of this study could also be seen from another perspective, one that is central to the field of internationalization of higher education. In response to a growing claim that internationalization was contributing to commercialization and commodification of knowledge, some known analysts had called for a "[s]erious reflection and debate…about the directions that internationalization is taking", especially "in terms of what values and purposes are driving internationalization" (Knight, 2013, p. 89). Yet, to date, scholarship on values and purposes of internationalization had largely omitted the voices of faculty members who were engaged in institutional partnerships, people who had experiential knowledge and who, by virtue of their unique experiences, could provide valuable insights on such important issues. By attempting to fill this gap, this study could add to the existing body of knowledge on internationalization by illuminating the particular ways in which economic globalization influenced internationalization and the professional practices of academics.

The results of this study could be used as a resource for policy makers and for teaching and research for students and academics interested in the internationalization of

higher education in Canada and beyond. It could also inform policy makers on the dynamics of internationalization within the context of international partnerships. Finally, this study has practical significance for the University of Alberta as it may provide relevant information for those units and individuals tasked with enhancing the internationalization efforts of the university.

Definition of Key Terms

Faculty members: Alternatively used with the term "academics", it refers to academic employees in the University with a teaching, research and service role.

International outlook: An indicator developed by Times Higher Education to rank universities by their outward looking characteristics. The indicator takes into account each institution's proportion of international staff, proportion of international students and proportion of research papers published with at least one co-author from another country.

Internationalization: In this study, internationalization is used to refer to the deliberate process of integrating the international, intercultural or global dimensions into the goals, functions and delivery of education as a means to improve the quality of education or to achieve the academic objectives of the institution or socio-cultural, economic, or political goals of the country/region (de Wit, 2015; Knight, 2015).

Professional practices: Faculty members' teaching and research roles in their own universities.

Rationales: The reasons for engaging in internationalization or international partnerships.

The Global North: As used in this study, it refers to a geographical division of countries in the northern hemisphere based on the Brandt Line[4] that are relatively richer and technologically more advanced compared to the Global South countries.

The Global South: As used in this study, it refers to a geographical division of countries in the southern hemisphere based on the Brandt Line (except Australia and New Zealand) that are relatively poor and technologically less advanced compared to the Global North countries.

---

[4] The Brandt Line is an imaginary representation of the North-South divide proposed by Willy Brandt in 1980. The line was based on a socio-economic division and divided countries into more economically developed countries to the North and less economically developed countries to the South (Independent Commission on International Development Issues, 1980).

Organization of the Study

This study is organized into seven chapters. Chapter I sets the background of the study linking it with the problem statement and the rationale which point to gaps into the existing literature, thereby setting the scene for the research questions. This chapter also includes the rationale for the study, the purpose of the study and its delimitation, the significance of the study and finally the definition of terms. Chapter II is concerned with a review of the related literature and the theoretical framework guiding the study. It discusses key concepts and themes related to the topic at hand including globalization, the knowledge-based economy and more particularly the meaning of and rationales for internationalization. Chapter III deals with the methodology including the choice of the research paradigm, the particular research design, the research site, and the ontological and epistemological underpinnings of the study. It also presents the researcher's positionality, the context, the participants, data sources, data analysis, ethical considerations, trustworthiness and limitation of the study. Chapter IV presents the analyses of data pertaining to the meaning of and rationales for internationalization. Chapter V is about data analysis as related to the impact of international engagement on faculty members' international engagement. Chapter VI is a discussion of major findings of the study. Finally, Chapter VII presents the key findings, conclusions, recommendations and implications of the study.

Summary

This chapter has shown how internationalization has become a key policy agenda in Canadian higher education in recent years as is evidenced in both the promulgation of internationalization policies at federal, provincial and institutional levels and in the establishment of a growing number of international partnerships between Canadian universities and overseas institutions. Yet, despite a growing number of studies in internationalization in Canada, there has been a paucity of research that has particularly investigated the experiences of academics who are involved in strategic international research partnerships. Thus, it was stated that the present study was conducted as part of an effort to fill this void in the Canadian higher education landscape by examining the meaning of internationalization from faculty members' perspectives, the rationales for their international engagement as well as the implications of these for their professional

practices in their university. To do so, the study was guided by a central research questions and three sub-questions. These were followed by the purpose and delimitation of the study. The chapter also stated the significance of this study for both theory and practice including informing policy making on internationalization at the University of Alberta.

Chapter II: Review of the Related Literature

Over the last few decades, the ecology of global higher education has undergone dramatic transformation as it responds to the combined pressures of globalization, the discourse of the knowledge based economy as well as to advances in information and communication technologies (ICTs). One of the net effects of this development is a resurgence of interest in the internationalization of higher education to such an extent that internationalization has become "an innate good in the discussion of higher education" (Shurbert, Jones & Desai-Trilokekar, 2009, p. 7) as well as "a core issue of concern to the higher education enterprise" (Rumbley Altbach & Reisberg 2012, p. 3).

I posit that any proper examination of the internationalization of higher education as it has evolved over the last couple of decades needs to be seen within the broader context of globalization. The reason is simple and straightforward. As Peter Scott (2000) has aptly put it, "the challenges facing higher education in the new millennium cannot be understood unless proper account is taken of the phenomenon of globalization" (p. 5). Larsen (2016b) has reiterated the same point when she argued that "it is impossible to understand internationalization processes without attending to the broader global transformations that now characterize our modern world" (p. 3). Globalization has "profoundly affected higher education" (Altbach, Reisberg & Rumbley, 2010, p. 7) and this, in turn, has implications for the international dimension of higher education (Knight, 2008b). Globalization and internationalization are indeed "interpenetrating, each creating conditions of possibility for the other" (Marginson, 2009, p. 20). "Internationalization is changing the world of higher education, and globalization is changing the world of internationalization" (Knight, 2004, p. 5).

I also maintain that a study of internationalization in Canadian universities needs to be viewed against the basic tenets of the discourse of the knowledge-based economy and (re)examine the nuances of this discourse in that specific context. As Jessop (2008b) has pointed out, the advent of the knowledge-based economy as "the hegemonic economic imaginary" (p. 28) has been particularly "influential in shaping policy paradigms, strategies, and policies in and across many different fields of social practice" (Jessop, 2008a, p. 2). To this, Spring (2008) adds: "the global discourse about the

knowledge economy has set the agenda for many national education policies" (p. 338). Nowhere are these remarks more evident than in the Canadian government's efforts in internationalization where, for example, a major federal government policy asserts that "international partnerships in research and innovation" are "vital to building prosperity in the new knowledge-driven economy" (DFATDC, 2014, p. 16). Indeed, as Trilokekar and Kizilbash (2013) noted, "Beginning in the early 1990s, the Canadian government focused on the growing importance of the new 'knowledge based economy' and the central role of higher education" (p. 3). The authors saw this development as resulting in the "marketing of higher education and training" by The Canadian government as this was found to be vital "for a country like Canada, which relied on exports for a third of its Gross National Product (GNP)" (p. 3).

Finally, I draw heavily on previous works of de Wit (2015; 2011; 2010; 2002) and Knight (2012, 2008a, 2008b, 2007, 2004) to discuss the meaning of and rationales for internationalization as well as the strategies and approaches of internationalization. It should be clear at the outset that I do not aim to be exhaustive in my treatment of the extant literature on internationalization in this chapter. Rather, I selectively highlight common themes, trends and debates on the internationalization of higher education as well as the nexus between globalization and internationalization.

Globalization

What is globalization? Although the image of globalization is often captured with apt expressions such as "time-space compression" (Harvey, 1990), "deterritorialization" (Scholte, 2000), "action at distance" (Giddens, 1990), and the "widening, deepening and speeding up of worldwide interconnectedness" (Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, & Perraton 1999, p. 2), it should be admitted that globalization is at bottom a highly contested concept. It has been variously described as slippery, multifaceted, contentious, and lacking any precise definition (Currie, DeAngelis, de Boer, Huisman, & Lacotte, 2003; Held, et al., 1999; Scholte, 2000; Tikly, 2001; Vaira, 2004). Admittedly, globalization is not a single and unitary concept, and up until today there exists no universally accepted definition of the term that satisfies every soul. Allen and Thompson (1997) conclude: "Those who lament the absence of an agreed, secure definition of globalization are likely to remain in a state of despondency" (p. 213).

Indeed, globalization is a multifaceted concept and a "far from monolithic discourse that is employed and called on to justify or denounce a wide range of changes in contemporary societies" (Dale & Robertson, 2002, p. 10). Perhaps one way of understanding globalization is to recognize its various elements or manifestations. In this respect, Marginson (1999) has spelled out six aspects of globalization: finance and trade; communications and information technologies; international movements of peoples; the formation of global societies (who share similar interests); linguistic, cultural and ideological convergence; and world systems of signs and images (e.g., CNN, Coke bottle, the market liberal paradigm). On top of these, Knight (2008b, p. 5) has identified the knowledge society, information and communication technologies, the market economy and trade liberalization as amongst those elements of globalization which have particular relevance to higher education.

In important respects, globalization has facilitated the creation of what Ohmae (1990) dubbed a "borderless world", or at least a "blurring of boundaries of space and time" (Enders, 2004, p. 366). This has allowed, according to Appadurai's (1996) for global cultural flows of people, finance, technologies, images, and ideas. Thus, another way of understanding globalization is to see it as "the flow of people culture, ideas, values, knowledge, technology, and economy across borders resulting in a more connected and interdependent world" (Knight, 2008b, p. 4).

One central debate in the globalization literature that has particular relevance to the present study relates to the question of the power of the nation-state vis-à-vis the market. Some have argued the demise of the nation-state in the face of globalization (e.g., Ohmae, 1995). Others, however, argued that although globalization has placed undue pressures on the capacity of nation-states to play key roles in the economy (such as controlling markets, promoting economic growth and maintain social inequality), the nation-state will continue to play an important role in the age of economic globalization. Thus, it is by no means proper to assume that globalization is an uncontrollable force (Henry, Lingard, Rivizi & Taylor, 1999). Thus, the argument goes: The triumph of the market over the state is simply naively assumed. Today, a pervasive view, yet by no means the only view, that is gaining ground in the globalization debate is that of a *transformationalist thesis* (Held, et al. 1999). It argues that globalization has led to the

reconstitution and reconfiguration of the role of the nation-sate. "This new role has been described as involving a 'new orthodoxy' aimed at making nations more competitive within the global economy" (Tikly, 2001, p. 162). In such a context, higher education is also "imagined by national policy makers as a primary instrument of the competition state in the global setting" (Marginson, 2009, p. 21). As Beerkens (2004) argues:

> The 'competition state' promotes international collaboration [among universities] as they become less tied to the national regulatory and financial context. International cooperation is enabled through increasing institutional autonomy which gives universities more margins to operate internationally. Universities are also motivated to operate in a more entrepreneurial way and gain more (though still marginal) opportunities for acquiring international sources of funding. (p. 3)

The result is that "the new world of higher education is characterized by competition for prestige, talent and resources on both national and global scales" (IAU, 2012, p. 3). Further, "National and international rankings are driving some universities to prioritize policies and practices that help them rise in the rankings" (p. 3).

Although it is widely admitted that globalization has impacted education in general and higher education in particular, it remains that both the nature and the specifics of this impact are not uniform across varying contexts. That is, globalization does not affect education systems and institutions of higher education in the same way. This is true not only for institutions located across various regions of the world, but also for those located in the same jurisdictions and locales. At the same time, while it is true that globalization has its own impact on education, such impact is not unidirectional. Education also shapes the globalization discourse. Indeed, according to Marginson (1999), education is a "primary medium of globalization, and an incubator of its agents" (p. 19).

Globalization and higher education. A voluminous literature has now accumulated which has analyzed the impact of globalization on higher education (e.g., Altbach, 2001; Altbach, Reisberg & Rumbley, 2010; Currie et al., 2003; Deem, 2001; Deem & Brehony, 2005; Henry, et al., 1999; King, 2004; Knight, 2008a,b; Marginson, 2009; Scott, 2000; Spring, 2009; Tikly, 2001; Vaira, 2004; Widavsky, 2010; Yang,

2003). Thus, I will make no attempt to replicate that work here. Suffice it here to mention the most salient ones. First, it is worth mentioning that the impact of globalization on higher education is often construed in terms of its effect in escalating "a borderless academic world" (Wildavsky, 2010, p. 5), thus leading to the import and export of educational services at the global level. Second, globalization has been seen as contributing to the emergence and spread of new educational delivery modes including internet and satellite-based forms, as well as in terms of the redefinition of the roles of national level education actors (Knight, 2008b; van der Wende, 2001). Regarding the last point, for example, one prominent trend has been the shift from direct supervision of institutions to a "steering at a distance" approach, thus providing universities with more autonomy in the conduct of their core functions. In fact, according to Vaira (2004), the "globalization discourse has affected higher education…in its every aspect: policy-making, governance, organization and academic work and identity" (p. 484). One notable development in this regard is the "growing requirement to … improve quality, effectiveness, efficiency and responsiveness in all the strategic higher education activities (didactic, research, curricula innovation, staff and budgeting)" (p. 490).

Third, globalization has given rise to wide-ranging outcomes that have repercussions on the higher education sector. According to Altbach and Knight (2007) these include:

> the integration of research, the use of English as the lingua franca for scientific communication, the growing international labor market for scholars and scientists, the growth of communications firms and of multinational and technology publishing, and the use of information technology (p. 291).

Finally, globalization, it is argued, has led to the increasing marketization or commercialization of education (Knight, 2008a; Welch, 2002). As globalization deepens, higher education has become a commodity to be traded in an open market like any other product. This has impacted both the mission and the strategic direction of universities in fundamental ways. In many countries universities are being pressurized to function more like business organizations, "more enterprising and competitive", thus "education becomes less part of social policy and more part of economic policy" (Currie et al., 2003,

p. 11). Such changes have "affected the institutions' funding and management concerning the types of research undertaken, student profiles, teaching loads, and collegial relations" (p. 11). According to Tudiver (1999),

> Operating universities like businesses changes their essence. Gearing to the market means redefining relevance. Social values that have shaped higher education are replaced by measures of financial viability. Research and teaching are assessed in narrow market terms. Profit becomes the guiding principle for deciding which services and products to offer…corporations draw faculty into a search for sales rather than truth, favouring projects with strong market potential over theoretical or basic research. Inherent value of the work is less important than its potential to generate revenue. (p. 168)

In the context of globalization, Vaira (2004) argues that, "higher education is witnessing a process of deep institutional change that involves the deinstitutionalization of its rooted policy and values frameworks and the parallel institutionalization of new ones" (p. 485). For example, as Henry et al. (1999, p. 91) explain, increased commercialization means that the economic and individual concerns override social and cultural concerns. They write, "The most obvious impact of the new global policy environment on the purposes of education is the dominance of instrumentalism to the detriment of other and broader purposes of education" (p. 91). Thus, for example, education for democracy, critical consciousness, and global citizenship remain at the margins. Instead, "Education in both industrialized and `developing' countries is increasingly focused towards economic and vocational goals with the aim of producing skilled workers to assist countries to compete in the globalized economy. Education is increasingly being commodified and transformed into a *service"* (p. 91).

Globalization and internationalization. Although the terms globalization and internationalization are sometimes used interchangeably (de Wit, 2002), they do not convey the same meaning or involve identical set of processes. Indeed, globalization and internationalization are closely related (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Welch, 2002), or "clearly linked" (Green & Olson, 2003, p. 3). Yet, one clear difference between the two, according to de Wit (2002), is that while globalization "ignores the existence of nations and their differences and looks for more similarities than for differences", internationalization recognizes "difference as a starting point for [national and

institutional] linkages" (p. 226). Such a distinction is also evident in Teichler's (2004) use of the two terms where he sees "globalization" as a process which involves the obfuscating of national boundaries and connoting competition. Teichler (2004) argues:

> 'Internationalization', the growing border-crossing activities between national systems of higher education is losing ground to 'globalization', increasing border- crossing activities of blurred national systems which is often employed to depict world-wide trends and growing global competition. (p. 5)

A similar interpretation is also found in Marginson (1999): "Globalization refers to the formation of world systems, as distinct from internationalization which presupposes nations as the essential unit" (p. 19).

Altbach and Knight (2007) draw an important distinction between globalization and internationalization. "Globalization", they write "is the context of economic and academic trends that are part of the reality of the 21st century". However, "internationalization" refers to "the policies and practices undertaken by academic systems and institutions—and even individuals—to cope with the global academic environment" (p. 290). Yet, the distinction between the two concepts is understood differently by other writers. For Currie et al. (2003), for example, "globalization represents *neoliberal*, market-oriented forces enabling a borderless world and internationalization represents arrangements between nation-sates primarily cultivating greater tolerance and exchange of ideas" (p. 11). This latter distinction between globalization and internationalization is also evident in the works of Welch (2002, 2012) where he sees globalization as an extension of global capitalism while internationalization, increasingly driven as it is by the forces of global capital, connotes "cultural exchange based on values of reciprocity and mutuality" (Welch, 2012, p. 310). Indeed, the term "neo-liberal globalization" (Rhoades, Torres, & Brewster, 2005) has been coined to refer to a variant of globalization that privileges unbridled competition, free markets, privatization, deregulation.

It is worth noting that the relationship between globalization and internationalization is:

dialectical but not dualistic… [and that] this dialectic is not carved in stone. It varies historically. International processes and global processes sometimes substitute each other and sometimes feed each other; and at different times one or another set of practices grows in importance relative to the other" (Marginson, 2009, pp. 20-21).

Marginson (2009) observes that globalization and internationalization are "*two different dimensions of cross border human action*, dimensions that have different geo-spatial dynamics and different implications for transformation" (p. 19, emphasis in original). He draws an important distinction between the two:

> Internationalization means the thickening of relationships conducted between nations (inter-national relations) where national institutions and practices are affected at the margins but essentially remain intact. Globalization means the enhancement of the worldwide or pan-European spheres of action. It has potentially transformative effects within nations as well as remaking the common environment in which they relate to each other. (Marginson, 2009, p. 19)

It is a widely held view among many scholars that higher education internationalization is a response to globalization (Altbach, Reisberg & Rumbley, 2010; Beerkens, 2004; de Wit, 2011; Knight, 2008b; Rumbley, 2015; Stromquist, 2007; van der Wende, 1997b; Zha, 2003). More specifically, internationalization is regarded as "both a reaction and a companion trend to globalization", and "the toolkit of responses available (primarily at institutional and national levels) to address the many and diverse opportunities and imperatives presented by the overwhelming forces of globalization" (Rumbley, Altbach & Reisberg, 2012, p. 4). Globalization is in turn considered a "catalyst" (Knight, 1997 cited in de Wit, 2002, p. 143), and "the most important contextual factor shaping the internationalization of higher education" (IAU, 2012, p. 1).

Globalization has made it possible for the free movement of students and faculty across borders and the sharing of policies and practices between countries (Henard, Diamond, & Roservere, 2012). Thus, as Altbach, Reisberg and Rumbley (2010) maintain, internationalizing higher education is necessary in order "to keep pace with both economic and academic globalization" (p. 31). The authors' own conception of internationalization itself points to this reality. They define internationalization as "the

variety of policies and programs that universities and governments implement *to respond* to globalization" (emphasis added, p. 7). They go on to write: "Internationalization…can be seen as a strategy for societies and institutions to respond to the many demands placed upon them by globalization and as a way for higher education to prepare individuals for engagement in a globalized world" (p. 24).

As globalization continues to deepen economic and socio- cultural ties between countries and increasingly making them interdependent, its impact on internationalization is becoming even more evident. One clear consequence of this is that we find "at the core of postsecondary institutions' missions, institutions are preparing "global-ready" graduates in the 21st century who will be able to address global challenges and live in an increasingly interconnected society" (Deardoff & Jones, 2012, p. 283). Further, student and academics mobility as well as the mobility of academic programs has become part of the reality of the 21st century higher education. Universities are also increasingly engaging themselves in what is often referred to as "internationalization at home" (Nilsson, 2003) by integrating intercultural and international dimensions into their core activities in an explicit effort to develop the intercultural and international competencies of students who do not cross borders. "The mainstreaming of internationalization assumes a more integral process- based approach, aimed at a better quality of higher education and competencies of staff and students" (de Wit, 2012, p. 5). For these reasons, an increasing number of universities are also including "service to a community that extends beyond local and national boundaries and aiming to produce 'global citizens' with 'global competencies'" (Altbach, Reisberg & Rumbley, 2010, p. 27). Indeed, in an increasingly interconnected world, the preparation of students as "global citizens" for the "who also possess intercultural and global competencies is high on the agenda in many countries around the globe (Altbach, Reisberg & Rumbley, 2010; Deardoff & Jones, 2012; Ruby, 2014).

The Knowledge-based Economy

As "a powerful economic imaginary in the last 20 years or so" (Jessop, 2008a, p. 2), the discourse of the knowledge-based economy has had far reaching consequences on the changing landscape of higher education. At the core of this discourse lies the underlying assumption that knowledge is increasingly becoming a key engine of

economic growth. The argument, simply put, states that industrialized countries are fast moving from an economy based on natural resources and physical inputs to one based on knowledge (Powell & Snellman, 2004). Proponents argue that higher education is increasingly being reconstructed as central to the construction of knowledge societies and in the development of a knowledge-based economy. The term knowledge-based economy refers to "production and services based on knowledge-intensive activities that contribute to an accelerated pace of technical and scientific advance, as well as rapid obsolescence" (Powell & Snellman, 2004, p. 199). According to OECD's major publication entitled *The Knowledge-Based Economy (*OECD, 1996), the term "knowledge societies" refers to "economies which are directly based on production, distribution, and use of knowledge and information" (p. 7). The discourse of the knowledge-based economy has been an influential force in inspiring many industrialized countries to invest highly in the production of graduates with high-level skills. In the words of Powell & Snellman (2004), "The key component of knowledge economy is a greater reliance on intellectual capabilities than on physical inputs or natural resources" (p. 199). For example, the University of Alberta (2015) states that,

> Within a global knowledge economy characterized by intense competition, advanced education and research remain essential to ensuring Alberta's people are skilled and adaptable, our economy is robust and diversified, and our culture and quality of life is vibrant and prosperous. (p. 27)

The discourse of knowledge-based economy is firmly entrenched within much of the current thinking of powerful global players such as the World Bank, OECD and UNESCO. For example, an influential report of the World Bank entitled *Construction of Knowledge Societies: New Challenges for Tertiary Education* (World Bank 2002) asserts:

> Knowledge accumulation and application have become major factors in economic development and are increasingly at the core of a country's competitive advantage in the global economy…the role of tertiary education in the construction of knowledge economies…is more influential than ever. Indeed, tertiary education is central to the creation of the intellectual capacity on which knowledge production and utilization depend. (p. xvii)

The role of higher education in the production, dissemination/diffusion, and storage of knowledge as well as for the construction of knowledge societies has been foregrounded by successive reports of the World Bank (World Bank, 2002, 2000, 1994), OECD (2004) and more recently by UNESCO (2010). Driven as it is by these powerful international bodies which appear to be increasingly assuming a functionalist view of higher education, the knowledge-based economy has been widely appropriated in many countries and regions of the world. For example, at the very core of Europe's agenda on global competition, is fundamentally "to enhance the performance of the European knowledge economy as a whole" (van der Wende, 2007, p. 12). This is manifest, among other things, in the increasing cross-border mobility of students within the region and enticing more students from other regions.

The knowledge based economy has also contributed notably to the drive for increased engagement in higher education internationalization. For example, according to the UK's *Vision 2020* (Böhm et al., 2004), "International education is at the center of the UK's *knowledge economy* and the nation's long-term wealth and prosperity". International education is further represented as capable of providing "the UK with a dynamic, high-skill and sustainable *export industry* that has far-reaching national implications" (p. 67, emphasis added). Relatedly, we also find this discourse deeply entrenched within Canadian international strategies and as well as in institutional strategic plans. As recently as 2014, for example, writing in his inaugural message addressed to readers of the *International Education Strategy*, the Honourable Ed Fast, Canada's Minister of International Trade, stated that we live "[i]n a highly competitive, knowledge-based global economy, [where] ideas and innovation go hand in hand with job creation and economic growth." That is why, he argues, "[i]nternational education is critical to Canada's success… [and that is why also] international education is at the very heart of [Canada's] current and future prosperity" (DFATDC, 2014, p. 4). Besides, the *International Education Strategy* (DFATDC, 2014), itself a land mark policy on internationalization, is subtitled "harnessing our knowledge advantage to drive innovation and prosperity". The increasing reconstruction of internationalization as a means for attaining national competitiveness agendas has never been more evident.

In a knowledge-driven economy, Canada needs to educate highly qualified and skilled people who can then take their place among the best and the brightest in the world. The internationalization of Canada's education and research institutions through international partnerships and exchange of talent is thus of substantial importance to supporting Canada's science and technology (S&T) and innovation agendas. (Advisory Panel, 2012, p. viii)

One obvious effect of the discourse of knowledge-based economy on higher education thus becomes one of engendering a restructuring of the higher education system to raise a country's competitive edge in the world economy. In this context, effective participation in an increasingly competitive and interconnected knowledge based economy has been recast as a central endeavor required for economic success.

As Stromquist (2013) observed, "the knowledge society has catapulted the value of advanced skills and knowledge into highly remunerated jobs" (p. 229). That is the reason why an OECD's major report titled *Tertiary Education for the Knowledge Society* (Santiago, Tremblay, Basri & Arnal, 2008) stresses that "economic development and improving innovative capacity requires a well-trained and skilled workforce" (p. 91). Acknowledgement of this fact has resulted in several responses as outlined below.

On the one hand, there has been a veritable boom in the global social demand for higher education as is reflected in the explosive growth in the number of students pursuing tertiary education. For example, according to the OECD's Education *at A Glance* report on tertiary education (OECD, 2009) 51.7 million new tertiary students walked into tertiary institutions in the space of just seven years (from 2000 to 2007). And in 2009 there were 170 million tertiary students worldwide (British Council, 2012). This figure represents an increase of 40.7% over the 2000 figure reported by UNESCO (2009). Massification, which, according to Altbach (2013), is "an 'iron law' of the twenty-first-century higher education" (p. xv) has swept across nations. A UNESCO Science Report (Hollanders & Soete, 2010), for example had found that India was committed to establish 30 new universities in a bid to increase student enrollment from less than 15 million to 21 million by 2012. Yet changes in global higher education enrollments symbolize just the tip of the iceberg in the overall transformations that took place in tertiary education. As Neave (2000) writes, this wave of mass higher education enrollment in effect produced, especially from roughly the mid-1980s onwards, "fundamental revisions to the

relationship between government, society and the university…[as well as] massive internal reforms to governance, management and to academic productivity"(p. 10).

In addition, there has been a proliferation of academic exchanges and collaborative scholarship between countries as is demonstrated by the increasing mobility of students and scholars, growing interinstitutional partnerships, and franchising and twinning arrangements between institutions. New forms of internationalization known sometimes as "transnational education" has also emerged as programs and institutions move across borders (such as the opening of branch campuses). Also, higher education institutions increasingly engage in campus-based international activities. Writing almost a decade and half ago, two well-known scholars in the field of higher education observed:

> Perhaps at no time since the establishment of the universities in the medieval period has higher education been so international in scope. Internationalism is a key part of the future, and higher education is a central element in the knowledge-based global economy. (Altbach & Teichler 2001, p. 24)

Yet developments since then are even more pronounced. Prompted in some cases by government policies (as in the case of Europe, for example) as well as by student demand for prestigious degrees, there has been an explosive growth in the number of student crossing borders. A recent release from UNESCO Institute of Statistics (n.d.) has found at least 4 million students traveling abroad for study in the year 2012, demonstrating a remarkable rise in student mobility compared to the 2 million registered in 2000. By some estimates, the number of international students will rise to 8 million by 2020 (Altbach, Reisberg & Rumbley, 2010). On a similar note, international branch campuses have also proliferated rising from just 24 in 2002 to 279 until 2015 (Knight, 2014b; Cross-Border Education Research Team, 2015). Overall, these developments suggest internationalization's growing prominence as a policy imperative in recent times. As Jones and de Wit (2014) note:

> Global competition for talent, growing complexity in cross-border activity, branch campuses, and the creation of global professionals and citizens are now high on the agenda, not only of international educators but also of university presidents, associations of universities, politicians, and other key players in higher education around the world. (p. 28)

At the same time, the importance of internationalization sits squarely in the mainstream public discourse on higher education reform. An OECD publication, *Approaches to Internationalization and their Implications for Strategic Management and Institutional Practice. A Guide for Higher Education Institutions* (Henard, Diamond, & Roservere, 2012, p. 9), posits that internationalization enables higher education institutions to: (a) increase national and international visibility; (b) leverage institutional strengths through strategic partnerships; (c) enlarge the academic community within which to benchmark their activities; (d) mobilize internal intellectual resources; (e) add important, contemporary learning outcomes to student experience; and, finally, (f) develop stronger research groups.

Internationalization

Rising from its peripheral position in the early 1980s, as being largely "perceived as merely an interesting and appealing component of an institution's profile" (Rumbley Altbach & Reisberg, 2012, p. 3), internationalization has become "a legitimate area of policy, practice, and research in higher education" (Knight, 2011b, p. 14).

A closer look into the recent literature points to a host of terminologies that have been used to describe both its growing importance and its prevalence in global higher education. Accordingly, internationalization has been variously described as "a mantra" (Tadaki, 2013), "a present must" (Danielscu & Perez-Danielscu, 2014), an "institutional imperative"(Hudzik, 2011), "a key issue" (Leask & Beelen, 2009), "a mainstream notion" (Jones & de Wit, 2012), "an important policy and research agenda" (Daquila, 2013), "a prevalent goal of contemporary higher education institutions" (Childress, 2009, p. 290), a "catchword of the times" (Yang, 2002), "an increasingly important trend" (Childress, 2010), "an established feature of global higher education" (Singh, Schapper & Jack, 2014), and "the norm" for higher education around the globe (Jones & Killick, 2013, p. 166).

Notwithstanding its growing popularity, however, internationalization still remains "amorphous" (Chan & Dimmock, 2008), "ambiguous and unclear" (Gao, 2015, p. 196; Stier, 2004), "increasingly contentious" (Green & Whitsed, 2012, p. 150), "a much debated and diversely interpreted" concept (Leask & Bridge, 2013, p. 79), and "a more

confused and misunderstood concept" (Knight, 2011b, p. 14). Indeed, de Haan (2014) has stated that internationalization has become "a buzz word and container concept" encompassing "everything that relates international", therefore "losing its meaning" (de Haan, 2014, p. 241).

One of the foremost authorities in the field of higher education internationalization has written: "there is a great deal of confusion about what it means" (Knight, 2004, p. 5). For Yang (2002), this confusion occurs because analysts have employed different perspectives when examining university internationalization. Writing as early as 1994, when the concept was still in its embryonic stage, Jane Knight warned that internationalization should not be employed as a "catch-phrase for everything and anything international" (p. 3). Or else, it will be "diminished and becomes a camouflage for generalized and ambiguous reflection" (p. 3). Almost two decades later, however, she lamentably notes that "the term is becoming a catchphrase to describe anything and everything remotely linked to the worldwide, intercultural, global, or international dimensions of higher education; thus, it is at risk of losing its meaning and direction" (Knight, 2012, p. 41). Why has the concept of internationalization become so difficult to pin down? According to Knight (2004), "Given the myriad of factors that are affecting internationalization both within and external to the education sector plus the accelerated pace of change, it is no wonder that *internationalization* is being used in a variety of ways and for different purposes." (p. 9).

Internationalization as a driver of change in higher education. One of the most important realities of the 21st century higher education is that it is driven, at least in part, by internationalization. "Whereas at the beginning of the 21st century, international orientations, characteristics, and programmatic offerings of a college or university may have been perceived as merely an interesting and appealing component of an institution's profile, today internationalization is a core issue of concern to the higher education enterprise" (Rumbley, Altbach and Reisberg, 2012, p. 3). Internationalization has become a global imperative, as is evident, for example, in the title of a recent book by Philip G. Altbach (2013)—*The Internationalization Imperative in Higher Education*. Internationalization "stands out clearly as a strategic objective essential to the relevance, dynamism, and sustainability of the world's 21st-century institutions and systems of

higher education" (Rumbley, Altbach & Reisberg, 2012, p. 4). According to IAU (2014), internationalization is "perhaps the most important agent of change in higher education". Rumbley, Altbach and Reisberg (2012) referred to it as "one of the most powerful and pervasive forces at work within higher education around the world during the last two decades". Taylor (2004) reiterates the same point when he writes that internationalization is "one of the most significant drivers of change facing the modern university" (p. 168).

Internationalization has indeed transformed the world of higher education for good or bad (Knight, 2013). It has improved access to higher education in some countries and created a "niche market" in others (Altbach & Knight, 2007, p. 304). Internationalization has also been presented "as a strategy for enhanced quality or visibility" (Rumbley, 2015, p. 16). In the words of Rumbley, Altbach & Reisberg (2012), "internationalization has emerged as a compelling agent of change in its own right, serving as a potent catalyst for new models for the organization, delivery, and even the stated mission of the higher education enterprise in many different contexts across the globe" (p. 4). Internationalization has clearly infiltrated the very fabric of the 21st century higher education to such an extent that "[w]ith remarkably few exceptions, no corner of the globe or institutional type has proven itself immune to the call to "internationalize" in some fashion "(p. 3).

Defining internationalization. "Internationalization of universities is far from a clearly defined and understood concept" (Bartell, 2003, p. 45). Internationalization is not easily defined, partly because it is no longer what it used to be (Marmolejo, 2011), or perhaps due to differences in how internationalization has historically emerged in different countries and regions (Callan, 1998). Different universities understand internationalization differently. For example, writing in the context of the US, Miller-Idriss and Worden (2010) write that although "virtually all American universities have embraced internationalization … how internationalization is defined and understood is a matter of some debate" (p. 393). Context plays an important role regarding how internationalization is perceived (Knight, 2015). For example, Yang (2002) has identified different understanding of internationalization in the Western and developing societies (Yang, 2002). He wrote: "In less-developed countries, internationalization has been assigned more ideological meanings" (p. 88). Other authors arguing from a critical

tradition have labeled internationalization as a discourse driven by an "ideology" (Stier, 2010, 2004), and as an "eduscape"; that is, involving the transfer of Western models of education and pedagogy to other parts of the world (Beck, 2012).

> The reality, then, is that internationalization conveys a variety of understandings, interpretations and applications, anywhere from a minimalist, instrumental and static view, such as securing external funding for study abroad programs, through international exchange of students, conducting research internationally, to a view of internationalization as a complex, all-encompassing and policy-driven process, integral to and permeating the life, culture, curriculum and instructional as well as research activities of the university and its members. (Bartell, 2003, p. 46)

To date, no single universally accepted definition of internationalization exists. While developing a clear definition of "internationalization" has been considered beneficial for several reasons such as to clarify the confusion and misunderstanding surrounding its meaning and to have sound parameters for assessment, there is still confusion and complexity in defining it (Knight, 2008a). There is no "overall consensus" about the meaning of internationalization (Welch, 2002; Yang, 2002). As Callan (1998) has put it succinctly, "At the heart of any serious discussion of internationalization lies a conundrum… Despite many attempts to formulate a 'tight' definition the core idea remains conceptually elusive" (Callan, 1998, p. 44). To this Yang (2002) adds: "There is no simple, unique or all-encompassing definition of internationalization…While there has been much talk about internationalization in many aspects of modern society, rarely do we have an exact definition of what is actually meant" (pp. 81-82).

In spite of what has been said up to this point, however, in recent years, a "broadly accepted" (Jones & de Wit, 2012), "well-known" (Yang, 2002, p. 84), "most frequently" employed (Yemini, 2014, p. 66) and "widely used" (Leask & Bridge, 2013, p.79; de Wit, 2012, p. 7) definition of internationalization has emerged. This definition, offered by Knight (2003), a long-standing figure in the field, sees internationalization as "the process of integrating an international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education" (p. 2).

At least four important aspects of the above definition are worth elaborating. First, the use of "national", "sector" and "institutional" levels is intended to convey the broad

scope of the definition. Second, the definition recognizes internationalization as a process, as an ongoing effort rather than a one-shot activity. Third, the word "integration" suggests that "internationalization does not arrive naturally in…universities…but needs to be [actively and deliberately] introduced" (de Wit, 2012, p. 7). Fourth, the definition, employing the terms "international", "intercultural" and "global" as a triad, emphasizes not only about relationships between or among countries (international) but also aspects of cultural diversity (intercultural) as well as a sense of worldwide scope (global) (Knight, 2012).

It is important to note, however, that internationalization is an evolving concept (IAU, 2012). Quite recently, de Haan (2014) has examined several definitions of internationalization from the literature and has discerned three noteworthy developments in the evolution of term:

(a) *A shift from an activity-focused to a strategy-focused perspective*. This means that as internationalization grew in scope and complexity, a shift has also taken place toward viewing internationalization as a process requiring strategic management rather than merely seeing it in terms of a set of activities.

(b) *A broadening from the individual institutional level to the sector/national/ regional level*. This suggest a shift from institutional-based definition of internationalization to an all-embracing one including, institutional, sectoral and national levels, and

(c) *A development from fragmented studies from diversified perspectives to a synthetic view of internationalization*. This last point indicates that there is an emerging trend in the definitions of internationalization in education becoming more similar.

Having said this, it is important to also point out a very recent and updated definition of internationalization offered by de Wit (2015). He defined internationalization as:

the *intentional* process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions and delivery of post-secondary education, *in order to enhance the quality of education and research for all students and staff* and to make a meaningful contribution to society (p. 24, emphasis added)

According to de Wit (2015), the need for a revised definition of internationalization is deemed important because it "reflects increased awareness that internationalization of higher education must become more inclusive and less elitist", and that "mobility must become an integral part of the internationalized curriculum that ensures internationalization for all" (p. 23). The revised definition also "re-emphasises that internationalization is not a goal in itself, but a means to enhance quality" and that it "should not focus solely on economic rationales" (p. 23).

Key manifestations of internationalization. Internationalization has "dramatically changed itself" over the years (Knight, 2013, p. 84). It has been defined, understood and interpreted differently (Knight, 1994; 1997; 2003; 2004, Yang, 2002, de Wit, 2002, 2011). "Some people see internationalization as a *state* of things, others as a *process* and some see it as a *doctrine*" (Stier, 2004, p. 84). Others describe it in terms of activities, processes, competencies and organizational culture (Knight, 1995). As Knight (2004) explains, for some internationalization connotes academic (i.e., students and teachers) mobility across boarders as well as closer international linkages and partnerships between and among institutions in terms of joint/double degree programs and/or joint research. For others, it means cross-border education exchanges such as opening branch campuses or franchises in other countries. For still others, it involves the infusion of international, intercultural or global dimensions and non-Western content into the curriculum and the teaching learning process. Similarly, internationalization has been associated with "specific initiatives such as branch campuses, cross-border collaborative arrangements, programs for international students, establishing English-medium programs and degrees" (Altbach & Knight, 2007, p. 290).

In an effort to provide a useful framework for understanding its scope and complexity, Rumbley, Altbach and Reisberg (2012, p. 6) have compiled a list of the key facets of internationalization. These include: (1) The increasing number of internationally mobile students and scholars, moving to and from ever more diverse locations; (2) the rapid growth in cross-border educational provision; (3) the push to achieve world-class status; (4) the interest in producing globally competent graduates capable of understanding and functioning in a complex and interconnected world; (5) the increasing prevalence of the English language for teaching and research; (6) the significant emphasis

on cooperative networking among higher education institutions and national higher education systems; (7) the overt efforts by individual institutions and national higher education systems to compete internationally; and (8) the dramatic increase in the commercialization of international education, particularly in terms of the growing opportunities available to for-profit enterprises.

A similar list of aspects of internationalization has also been offered by Harman (2005, pp. 120-121). It included; (1) The international movement of students between countries; (2) the international movement of academic staff and researchers; internationalization of higher education curricula in order to achieve better understandings about other people and cultures, and competence in foreign languages; (3) international links between nation states through open learning programs and new technologies;(4) bilateral links between governments and higher education institutions in different countries for collaboration in research, curriculum development, student and staff exchange, and other international activities; multinational collaboration such as via international organizations or through consortia such as Universtas Global; and (5) export education where education services are offered on a commercial basis in other countries, with students studying either in their home country or in the country of their provider.

Yet, internationalization involves much more than any compiled list of its manifestations. Of course, in their own admission, the authors stated that the above is not an exhaustive list of the various manifestations of internationalization. Identifying the various manifestations of internationalization, albeit useful, only serves to reduce internationalization as a compendium of activities. Indeed, doing so is also to succumb to the activity based approach of internationalization.

Myths and misconceptions about internationalization. A lack of consensus on the meaning of internationalization has given rise to several myths and misconceptions about internationalization. Indeed, misunderstandings about internationalization are so widespread that two of the leading authorities in the field, i.e., Knight (2011b, pp.14-15) and de Wit (2012, pp. 5-8), have gone to the extent of identifying the most prevalent ones. According to Knight (2011b, pp.14-15) five predominant myths about internationalization have come to be evident which "reflect very common and misleading assumptions" (p. 14). The first myth views "foreign students as international agents",

32

and rests on the mistaken assumption that "more foreign students on campus will produce more internationalized international culture" (p. 14). A second myth is associated with seeing "international reputation as a proxy for quality". It is based on an incorrect assumption that "the more international a university is—in terms of students, faculty, and curriculum, research, and network memberships—the better its reputation" (p. 14). A third myth equates internationalization with *international institution agreements*. It is based on the misleading assumption that "the greater the number of international agreements or network memberships a university has the more prestigious and attractive it is to other institutions and students" (p. 15). The fourth myth is concerned with securing *international accreditation*. It is wrongly assumed that "the more international accreditation stars an institution has, the more internationalized it is and ergo the better it is" (p. 15). The final myth has to do with *global branding*. This myth rests on "the incorrect assumption that the purpose of a university's internationalization efforts is to improve global brand or standing..[or that] an international marketing scheme is the equivalent of an internationalization plan" (p. 15).

de Wit (2012, pp. 5-8) has similarly identified nine "fairly common" misconceptions about internationalization, two of which (numbers 4 and 7) are related to Knight's two myths (myths 1 and 3). The first misconception he identifies is related to equating internationalization with teaching and learning in the English language, resulting, in turn, according to de Wit (2012), in "a decreasing focus on other foreign languages; in an insufficient focus on the quality of the English spoken by students and teachers for whom English is not their native language; and thus, leading to a decline in the quality of education". (p. 5). A second misconception views internationalization as equivalent to studying abroad. de Wit (2012) counters that "mobility is merely an instrument for promoting internationalization and not a goal in itself" (p. 6). A third misconception treats internationalization as synonymous with "providing training based on international content or connotation" (p. 6) such as European studies, international business, etc. de wit (2012) considers such a view as "too simplistic and instrumental an argument to declare regional studies as synonymous with internationalization" (p. 6). Related to Knight's first myth, the fourth misconception is related to linking internationalization with having many international students in the lecture room. The fifth

misconception is concerned with the other side of the coin. That is, the assumption that the presence of few international students in a classroom still guarantees success. The disproportionate balance between international and domestic students in a class has its own downsides. de Wit (2012) observes,

> a negative effect on the internationalization of mainstream, non- English-language programmes. Local students with certain, whether or not motivated, international interests preferably enroll in the international programmes – which means the interest of mainstream education in the local language dwindles. Also, in these programmes the presence of a small number of international students creates tensions. Should the courses be taught in English if there are only one or two international students in the lecture room? How can the integration of international students be realized in such distorted proportions? (pp. 6-7)

A sixth misconception has to do with the assumption that "students *normally* acquire intercultural and international competencies if they study or serve their internship abroad or take part in an international class" (p. 7 emphasis added). It is rather questionable that students will acquire these competencies easily and readily in such experiences. According to de Wit (2012), "reality is more complicated…After all, students can completely seclude themselves from sharing experiences with other students and other sections of the population in the countries they visit" (p. 7). The seventh misconception is related to Knight's third myth and is based on the assumption that the more partnerships an institution has, the more successful it becomes. A counter argument advanced against this view states: "The majority of partnerships remain bilateral, and in several institutions and schools the number far exceeds the number of students and teachers being exchanged" (p. 7). An eighth misconception is related to the "general opinion" identified at universities and researchers that a university has "a truly international characteristic, and thus there is no need to stimulate and guide internationalization" (p. 7). de Wit's counter argument goes: "Internationalization does not arrive naturally in general universities and universities of applied sciences, but needs to be introduced." (p. 7). A final misconception sees internationalization as a precise goal of universities. de Wit (2015) holds that internationalization cannot be reduced to "a goal in itself but a means to contribute to the enhancement of the quality of higher education"

(p. 16). He argues that, "If internationalization is regarded as a specific goal, then it remains ad hoc and marginal" (de Wit, 2012, p. 7). In his view, internationalization should be seen as "process to introduce intercultural, international, and global dimensions in higher education; to improve the goals, functions, and delivery of higher education; and thus to upgrade the quality of education and research" (p. 7).

It is important to note at this point that the myths and misconceptions about internationalization in effect point to two main problems regarding the conception of internationalization: (1) a confusion of means and ends of internationalization "whereby internationalization is regarded as synonymous with a specific programmatic or organizational strategy to promote internationalization", and (2) a shift in thinking toward "a predominantly activity- oriented or even instrumental approach toward internationalization" (de Wit, 2012, p. 5).

Rationales for internationalization. The question of why to internationalize universities has been a recurrent theme that runs through the internationalization literature. Writing in the 1999 issue of *International Higher Education*, de Wit inquired, "Why are institutions of higher education, national governments, international bodies, and (increasingly) the private sector—banks, industry, and foundations—now so actively involved in international educational activities?" He hastened to add: "There is no single answer to this question" (p. 2). His answer still rings true to this date.

Why concern about rationales for internationalization? This is because, in the words of Knight (2008a), rationales are:

> key to understanding all aspects of the international dimension of higher education…At a more fundamental level, rationales reflect the core values that a higher education system holds regarding the contributions that international, intercultural, and global elements make to the role of higher education in society. (p. 192)

According to Knight (2008a),

> One of the more complicated but critical aspects of understanding internationalization is the diversity of rationales that drive institutions to internationalize and that guide countries to give more importance to and invest more deeply in the international dimension of higher education. These

motivations are often not explicit and are gradually changing to reflect the international competitive environment of the knowledge society and the role of higher education in the knowledge industry." (p. 36)

Admittedly, while one finds a multitude of rationales driving the internationalization agenda of universities across different cultures, it is impossible to compile universally agreed rationales for internationalization. Numerous rationales inform the internationalization activities of universities across diverse contexts with no consensus about them. One can argue, however, that since de Wit's (1999) writing, a lot has changed in the landscape of higher education with implication on internationalization and the rationales driving it. It is therefore appropriate to take stock.

Much previous research indicates that universities engage in internationalization for a variety of reasons. Some do it largely for economic reasons; others for enhancing the student experience, still others for improving their international standing in international rankings (Jones, 2013). Indeed, as the conceptualization of internationalization has changed in the course of time, so have the rationales underpinning it. Thus, as IAU (2012) has found out, the rationales for internationalization have continued to evolve, "ranging from educating global citizens, building capacity for research, to generating income from international student tuition fees and the quest to enhance institutional prestige." (IAU, 2012, p. 2).

While the rationales driving internationalization have surely evolved over the years, it is also fitting to examine the factors that account for the divergence among the rationales. This is dealt with in the following section.

Accounting for the divergence among rationales for internationalization.
Although it can be generally stated that the rationales driving internationalization vary by institution, government department, stakeholder and country (Knight, 2004), I consider it more revealing to spell out the bases for these differences. Thus, for one, differences in rationales for internationalization imply differences in interests among stakeholders (de Wit, 2000, Green & Olson, 2003, Knight, 2004). Disparate rationales may also suggest differences in institutional/national priorities as well as differences in contextual factors between nations and regions (IAU, 2014; Yang, 2002). At other times, differences also point to the changing dynamics of the concept itself (de Wit, 2011), to its complexity, and

to the substantial contribution internationalization itself is making (Knight, 2004). As well, "different rationales imply different means and ends to internationalization" (de Wit, 2002, p. 223). The literature further points to differences in rationales over time. That is, traditional rationales are giving way to new emerging rationales. de Wit (1999) has noted, "Since World War II, the political rationale has been the dominant one in initiatives to internationalize higher education... [However], with the end of the Cold War, the emphasis has changed from the political to the economic" (p. 2). de Wit (2000, p. 12) concludes, (a) There is a strong overlap in rationales within different stakeholder groups, the main differences being in the hierarchy of priorities; (b) in general, stakeholders do not have one exclusive rationale but a combination of rationales for internationalization; (c) rationales may vary both between and within stakeholder groups; (d) priorities in rationales may change over time and according to country and region, and (e) rationales are in general more implicit than explicit motives for internationalization.

   Taxonomies of rationales for internationalization. One could also discern in the extant literature several classifications of the underlying drives for internationalization. Traditional/existing rationales are distinguished from contemporary/emerging rationales (Hudzik, 2011; Knight, 2004; 2008b). Hudzik (2011, p. 16), for example, writes that although internationalization has contributed to the "enrichment of ideas" of the wanderer scholar in medieval times, contemporary rationales for internationalization differ markedly from traditional motives. For him, among contemporary rationales for internationalization include, (a) expanding cross-cultural knowledge and understanding given the increased frequency and necessity of cross-cultural contacts and relations; (b) strengthening a higher education institution's stature and value added in teaching and research in a global system of higher education; (c) enhancing national and global security; (d) improving labor force and local economic competitiveness in a global marketplace; and (e) enhancing knowledge, skills, attributes, and careers for graduates to be effective citizens and workforce members.

   Another important distinction has also been drawn between "old" forms of internationalization (i.e., those driven by academic and sociocultural rationales) and "new" forms of internationalization (i.e., those motivated by political and economic rationales) (Stensaker, Frolich, Gornitzka & Maassen, 2008, p. 4). In this classification,

some countries notably the US, Australia, New Zealand and the UK are at the forefront of the 'new' internationalization while others are located in the 'old' internationalization. This does not suggest however that "old" and "new" forms of internationalization are mutually exclusive. In fact, As Welch (2012) observed in the case of Australia, for example, the two forms of internationalization can and do exist although one tends to prevail over the other at a certain historical point in time. He wrote, thus:

> The Janus face of internationalization of Australian higher education holds some lessons for other countries: one side faces in the direction of opportunistic entrepreneurialism [emphasizing economic rationales], the other towards genuine cultural exchange based on values of reciprocity and mutuality [sociocultural rationales]. It is that latter face which has largely been obscured by Australia's opportunistic approach to internationalization. (Welch, 2012, p. 310)

Another way of classifying rationales is by level. Accordingly, institutional rationales for internationalization (such as income generation) are distinct from those articulated by governments at the national level; for example, nation building (Knight, 2008a).

Finally, rationales for internationalization are also differentiated between those principally aimed at "cooperation" and those directed toward "competition" (Huisman & van der Wende, 2004; Luijten-Lub, Van der Wende & Huisman, 2005), with the latter goal becoming increasingly dominant in several industrially advanced countries.

Rationales for internationalization from international surveys. International surveys serve as important sources for examining the rationales for internationalization from diverse national contexts. There have been until this date three international surveys conducted by IAU on internationalization (IAU, 2003, 2005, 2009 (the report of which is released in 2010)) which examined the rationales for internationalization from respondents (mainly heads of institutions) located in many countries around the world. Although all these surveys have found the predominance of academic rationales over economic rationales as driving forces for internationalization, the results of the 2005 and 2009 surveys are particularly more revealing. First, both surveys found, as the top most rationale, the preparation of intercultural competent students for a more international and

globalized world. Yet, strengthening research and knowledge capacity, which was ranked in second place in 2005 dropped to fourth place in 2009. This is an astonishing finding especially when seen in light of the emergence of the knowledge society and economy (Knight, 2012). What's more, in both surveys, "creating and enhancing the institution's profile" ranked in third place. This suggests that institutions are attaching more importance to an international brand "which relies more on a smart and successful marketing campaign than on integrating an international, global, and intercultural dimension into the teaching learning process, research, and service to community/society" (Knight, 2012, p. 33).

There is still an important finding from the IAU surveys of 2005 and 2009. As Knight (2012) explains:

> Of interest is that diversifying sources of income remains the least important rationale across both surveys. This finding raises eyebrows and speculation, given the reliance of some universities in several countries on revenue from international student recruitment and cross-border education. But this dependence on international student fees applies only to higher education institutions in 8 or 10 countries (i.e., Australia, United Kingdom, and New Zealand) and not to the majority of institutions in the 95 countries that responded to the survey in 2005 and 115 countries in 2009. It is a potent reminder that economic rationales are the top driver in only a handful of countries around the world, although the impact of these countries is significant as they are the most active and aggressive in terms of international education. (p. 33)

Rationales for internationalization are contextually and culturally sensitive and often seek to address domestic concerns as well. For example, Green & Olson (2003, pp. 11-18), writing in the context of the United States, have identified, inter alia, national security and foreign policy as important goals of internationalization by a diverse group of stakeholders. On the other hand, Hudzik (2011) writing within the same context, offers a broad range of rationales for internationalization, the ultimate purpose being "better connection of institutions to a changing local and global environment and providing more relevant service to society and clientele under these changing realities" (p. 8).

A conceptual framework for rationales for internationalization. An often-cited conceptual framework for analyzing rationales for internationalization is one that has been proposed by Knight (2004, 2008a). As shown in Table 1, Knight (2008a) grouped

the rationales into four based on their perceived benefits of internationalization for the social/cultural, political, academic, and economic life of nations. Social/cultural rationales have included the need for preservation or promotion of national cultural identity, improved intercultural understanding, citizenship development, and social and community development. Political rationales have emphasized on the use of internationalization as an instrument for foreign policy, national security, technical assistance, peace and mutual understanding, national identity, and regional identity. Economic rationales involved the desire for economic growth and competitiveness, labor market, and financial incentives.

Finally, academic rationales have included the need to integrate international dimension to research and teaching, extension of academic horizon, institution building, profile and status, enhancement of quality, and international academic standards. Knight (2008a) has further put forward what she called "emerging rationales" for internationalization at both the national and institutional levels.

At the national level, these include human resource development, strategic alliances, income generation/commercial trade, nation building/institution building, social/cultural development and mutual understanding. Those at the institutional level have included international branding and profile, quality enhancement/international standards, income generation, student and staff development, strategic alliances, knowledge production (Knight, 2008a, p. 18).

Rationales for internationalization in Canadian universities. An examination of the rationales driving the involvement of Canadian universities in internationalization is deemed a necessary part of the present endeavor for two reasons. For one, it provides insights as to the most prominent rationales (academic, social, economic, cultural) driving internationalization. Second, it provides information how these rationales are similar to or different from other contexts.

To begin with, there has not been a shortage of studies which have examined the rationales underpinning the international efforts of Canadian universities. In the last two decades alone, there have been four national surveys which were conducted in 1995, 2000, 2006 and 2014. One of these (Knight, 1995) examined the rationales for internationalization from some 58 AUCC member higher education institutions in Canada. The

respondents, who at the time were heads of institutions and administrators (presidents, vice-presidents' international liaison officers and such others as dean or registrar), were asked to identify the three important reasons for internationalization.

Table 1. Rationales Driving Internationalization

Existing Rationales	Emerging Rationales
Social/Cultural National cultural identity Intercultural understanding Citizenship development Social and community development	**National level** Human resources development Strategic alliances Income generation/commercial trade Nation building/institution building Social/ cultural development and mutual understanding
Political Foreign policy National security Technical assistance Peace and mutual understanding National identity Regional identity	**Institutional level** International branding and profile Quality enhancement/international standards Income generation Student and staff development Strategic alliances Knowledge production
Economic Economic growth and competitiveness Labour market Financial incentives	
Academic Extension of academic horizon Institution building Profile and status Enhancement of quality	

Source: Knight, 2008a, p. 25

Ninety-five percent of survey participants ranked, as the first most important reason for internationalization, "prepare graduates and scholars who are internationally knowledgeable and internationally competent". This was followed by 65% of the

participants ranking "address through scholarship, the increasingly interdependent nature of the world (environmentally, culturally, economically and socially)" as the second most important reason. Although, a single third important reason did not emerge from the survey, three other rationales, however, coalesced together at third level of importance: "address national and international issues through research" (identified by 26% of survey participants), "acknowledge ethnic and cultural diversity of Canada" (25%), "knowledge systems should be more international" (25%).

AUCC has also conducted three more surveys on internationalization in 2000, 2006 and 2014 with a similar group of respondents. In all these surveys preparing internationally and interculturally competent graduates was the top ranked rationale for internationalization. This is followed by building strategic alliances (research and scholarship) with institutions abroad. It is important to note that the top ranked rationales in all these Canadian surveys, i.e., academic rationales, correspond with those found in IAU worldwide surveys. However, these findings need to be interpreted with caution since, at times, rationales are "more implicit than explicit…and…more rhetoric than reality" (Knight, 2000, p. 79).

It is interesting to note also that "global profile" and "revenue generation" are identified as increasingly important rationales by a significant number of respondents in the 2014 survey. This may suggest the influence of global competition, international rankings and economic factors in university campuses.

Benefits and risks of internationalization. A number of potential benefits and risks are associated with the internationalization of higher education. With regard to benefits, two points are worth noting. On one hand, there is a close correspondence between those explicit rationales often advanced in the literature and the assumed benefits of internationalization. On the other hand, it should be acknowledged that the benefits of "true" internationalization (Bols, 2013) or "genuine" internationalization (Welch, 2002) are well-known and difficult to dispute.

Of the many benefits adduced to internationalization include international/global literacy (Agnew & van Balkow, 2009; Bartell, 2003; Yemini, 2012), producing global citizens or world-conscious graduates and citizenry (Hudzik, 2011; Ruby, 2014); intercultural competence (Deardorff, 2006; Deardorff & Jones, 2012); cultural awareness

and developing mutual understanding (Gregersen-Hermans, 2014); providing the most relevant education to students (Henard, Diamond & Roseveare, 2012), advancement of human knowledge (Yang, 2002); cross-cultural awareness and multiculturalism (OECD, 2004), providing more relevant service to society and clientele (Hudzik, 2011), the opportunity to promote research relationships across borders and the breaking of national myopia (Schapper & Mayson, 2004).

With regard to the benefits that accrue to students, a recent report by three higher education scholars (Altbach, Reiseberg & Rumbley, 2010) concludes, "while it is difficult to assess personal, professional, and academic outcomes in any systematic or large scale way, a preponderance of anecdotal evidence suggests that the benefits of international study for most students are quite positive—enjoyable, meaningful, and often life changing" (p. 101).

Additionally, "internationalization aims to educate students as global citizens, including attributes of openness to and understanding of other worldviews, empathy for people with different backgrounds and experience to oneself, the capacity to value diversity, and respect for indigenous peoples and knowledge" (CBIE, 2014, para 4). It is further argued that international/global literacy is "critical to youngsters' future cultural, technological, economic and political health" (Yemini, 2012, p. 69). Surely, internationalization affords important benefits for countries and academic institutions. As Yang (2002) states, "Academic study needs an international approach to avoid parochialism in scholarship and research and to stimulate critical thinking and enquiry about the complexity of issues and interests that bear on the relations among nations, regions and interest groups" (p. 86).

On the other hand, IAU (2012, pp. 2-3) has compiled its own list of what it called "most worthy" and "enduring academic benefits of internationalization": These include: (1) improved quality of teaching and learning as well as research; (2) deeper engagement with national, regional, and global issues and stakeholders; (3) better preparation of students as national and global citizens and as productive members of the workforce; (4) access for students to programs that are unavailable or scarce in their home countries; (5) enhanced opportunities for faculty improvement and, through mobility, decreased risk of academic 'inbreeding'; (6) possibility to participate in international networks to conduct

research on pressing issues at home and abroad and benefit from the expertise and perspectives of researchers from many parts of the world; (7) opportunity to situate institutional performance within the context of international good practice; and (8) improved institutional policy-making, governance, student services, outreach, and quality assurance through sharing of experiences across national borders.

While the benefits of internationalization stated above are less controversial for many, serious concerns are expressed about its risks. Many accounts of the risks of internationalization point to commodification and commercialization, unequal sharing of the benefits of internationalization, the dominance of western epistemological approach and/or (neo)colonization, loss of cultural identity, foreign 'degree mills' and /or low quality providers, brain drain, homogenization of curriculum, growing elitism in access to international education opportunities, and overuse of English as a medium of instruction (ACDE, 2014; IAU, 2005; 2014; Knight, 2008a, 2012).

One potential risk of internationalization in the Canadian context is related to the perception that it is can be used as an instrument to intensify competition among universities for status and global ranking as well as a means of supporting the local economy through high-paying international students. This calls for an urgent need to take an ethical approach to internationalization by emphasizing fundamental academic goals and values through mutual collaboration and networking.

Approaches to Internationalization

Across varying contexts, education systems and higher education institutions employ various approaches to address the process of internationalization. The diversity in approaches is due mainly to the particular challenges and opportunities institutions face relating to the international dimension of higher education (Knight, 2008a). An examination of approaches to internationalization used by institutions and systems of education offers valuable insights. That is, it helps "to analyze whether the dominant approach being used is consistent and complementary to the rationales and values driving he efforts to internationalize" (Knight, 2008a, p. 33). At the most basic level, four approaches to internationalization can be identified: activity, rationale, competency, and process (de Wit, 2002). A description of each of these approaches is offered in Table 2.

Table 2. Approaches to Internationalization

National-or-sector level Approaches	Institutional Level Approaches
Activity: Internationalization is described in terms of activities such as study abroad, curriculum and academic programs, institutional linkages and networks, development projects, and branch campuses.	**Programs:** Internationalization of higher education is seen in terms of providing funded programs that facilitate institutions and individuals to have opportunities to engage in international activities such as mobility, research, and linkages.
Outcomes: Internationalization is presented in the form of desired outcomes such as student competencies, increased profile, more international agreements, and partners or projects	**Rationales:** Internationalization of higher education is presented in terms of why it is important that a national higher education sector become more international. Rationales vary enormously and can handle human resources development, strategic alliances, commercial trade, nation building, and social/cultural development
Rationales: Internationalization is described with respect to the primary motivations or rationales driving it. This can include academic standards, income generation, cultural diversity, and student and staff development.	**Ad hoc:** Internationalization of higher education is treated as an ad hoc or reactive response to the many new opportunities that are being presented for international delivery, mobility, and cooperation in postsecondary education
Process: Internationalization is considered to be a process where an international dimension is integrated into teaching, learning, and service functions of the institution.	**Policy:** Internationalization of higher education is described in terms of policies that address or emphasize the importance of the international or intercultural dimension in postsecondary education. Policies can be from a variety of sectors, for example, education, foreign affairs, science and technology, culture, or trade.
At home: Internationalization is interpreted to be the creation of a culture or climate on campus that promotes and supports international/intercultural understanding and focuses on campus-based activities.	**Strategic:** Internationalization of higher education is considered to be a key element of a national strategy to achieve a country's goals and priorities both domestically and internationally
Abroad (cross-border): Internationalization is seen as the cross-border delivery of education to other countries through a variety of delivery modes (face to face, distance, e-learning) and through different administrative arrangements (franchises, twinning, branch campuses, etc).	

Source: Knight (2004), pp. 19-20.

According to de Wit (2002, pp. 116-118), the activity approach to internationalization defines internationalization in terms of activities including academic

and extracurricular activities such as curriculum development, academic (student and faculty) exchanges, and joint research activities.

The second approach, the rationale approach, describes internationalization in terms of its purposes and intended outcomes such as those covered in the preceding section of this chapter. A third approach, the competency approach, views internationalization from the standpoint of enhancing the knowledge, skills and altitudes of students and faculty such as raising global/international literacy.

The fourth approach, the process approach, is one that is most widely accepted. It defines internationalization as a process which seeks to integrate an international dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution.

A more elaborate framework for analyzing approaches to internationalization has been offered by Knight (2008a). She categorizes approaches into two—national or sector level approaches, and institutional level approaches. At the national or sector levels, she identified five generic approaches to internationalization (programs, rationales, ad hoc, policies, and strategic) that could be used to implement a policy or strategy for internationalization. Similarly, she identifies six approaches at the institutional level (activity, outcomes, rationales, process, ethos, abroad/cross border). There are two points worth considering before closing this section. First, these approaches to internationalization are not mutually exclusive. There is a great deal of overlap among the various approaches. Second, the fact that there are various approaches to internationalization suggests that there is no one best way to internationalize (Knight, 2008a).

Internationalization Strategies, Programs and Policies

One way of examining the internationalization within an institutional setting is to see it from the point of view of the actual plans (policies, programs, and strategies) and operations that take place both at the national and institutional levels. There are a range of international strategies, programs and policies employed by institutions at both these levels. These are portrayed in Table 3. Before going further, however, it is fitting to delineate the meaning of these terms as used here. According to Knight (2008a), "strategies" are used to "reflect the most concrete level and include the academic and organizational initiatives at the institutional level" and imply the "notion of a more

planned, integrated and strategic approach" (p. 33). Programs, on the other hand, represent "a more comprehensive approach to internationalization" and finally, "policies set out the overall framework" (p. 33).

At the institutional/provider level, an institution can devise a number of *academic strategies* for internationalization. Knight (2008a, p. 34) has outlined many of these on several crucial areas. These include *academic programs* (e.g., student exchange programs, foreign language study, etc.); *research and scholarly collaboration* (e.g., joint research projects, international conferences, etc.); *external relations*, both domestic and crossborder (e.g., community based partnerships with NGO groups, branch campuses); and *extra-curricular strategies* (e.g., student clubs and associations).

Table 3. Internationalization Policy and Programs at Three Levels

Level	*Policy*	*Programs*
National	Education and other national-level policies relating to international dimension of higher education i.e., cultural, scientific, immigration, trade, employment policies	National or sub-regional programs which promote or facilitate the international dimension of postsecondary education. Can be provided by different government departments or nongovernment organizations. May be oriented to different international aspects, i.e., academic mobility programs, international research initiatives, student recruitment programs, etc.
Sector	Policies related to the purpose, functions, funding, and regulation of higher education	Programs offered by and for the education sector specifically. Can be provided by any level of government or by public or private organizations
Institutional	Policies that address specific aspects of internationalization and/or policies that integrate the international dimension into the primary mission and functions of the institution and sustain it	Programs such as those identified in academic programs (e.g., student exchange programs, foreign language study

Source: Knight (2008a), p. 35

Other than academic strategies, institutions need to have *organizational strategies* on four important areas. These, according to Knight (2008a, p. 34) include *governance* (e.g., expressed commitment by senior leaders), *operations* (e.g., appropriate organizational structures); *services* (e.g., student housing, library, etc.); and *human*

resources (e.g., recruitment and selection procedures that recognize international expertise).

Knight (2008a) further writes that while "strategies and a strategic approach are at the core of the success and sustainability of internationalization at the institutional level…it is necessary to broaden the concept of organizational strategies to the national sector by introducing the terms 'policies' and 'programs'" (p. 35). The reason for this broadening of scope, she argues, is that the national/sector level is now part of the definition and conceptual framework of internationalization.

The Changing Face of Internationalization

It is often said that internationalization, driven mainly by academic and socio-cultural rationales, has long been an enduring feature of universities since the start of medieval European universities (de Wit, 1999; Yang, 2002). However, recent scholarship on internationalization suggest that in many industrialized countries internationalization is increasingly being driven by commercial interests (Altbach, Reisberg & Rumbley, 2010; IAU, 2014; Knight, 2013; Welch, 2002). Of course, in an age of budget cuts and dwindling internal revenues, it is no wonder that economic reasons have increasingly come to dominate the drives for internationalization in many Western universities. Writing of an emerging global trend in the internationalization of higher education a decade and half ago, van der Wende (2001) wrote, "Whereas political, cultural and academic rationales have driven internationalization over the last decades, now, increasingly economic rationales play a role" (p. 250). A decade later, de Wit (2011) has similarly commented, "At the present time, the economic rationales are considered to be more dominant than the other three, and in connection to these, academic rationales such as strategic alliances, status and profile are also becoming more dominant" (p. 245). It is important to note that with the coming into prominence of the discourse of the knowledge-based economy, "education is increasingly treated as an engine of national and international competitiveness" (Welch, 2012), and in such a context internationalization "is increasingly being shaped by the forces of global capital, or economic globalization" (p. 310). Writing of current trends, Stromquist (2013) has observed that nowadays "internationalization assumes, generally, a search for students as well as business and academic partnership with China, India, and the oil-rich countries"

(p. 236). Thus, internationalization for cooperation, once an important goal, may have lost its flavor. According to Gregersen-Hermans (2014)

> the underlying values [of internationalization] have shifted from contributing to 'a better, more peaceful world'; to recruiting and attracting talents in the context of the knowledge society; and from 'creating global citizens' to increased opportunities for employability and 'obtaining knowledge useful of the internationalized professions of the post-industrial era'. (p. 8)

Welch (2002) concludes, a "worldwide tidal wave of globomania threatens to engulf moves toward genuine internationalization of universities" (p. 471). In a recent interview, Egron-Polak, Secretary-General of the IAU, has encapsulated the core problem behind internationalization more bluntly: "if internationalization stops being about revenue, it stops" (Merrill, 2012, p. 173). Writing of the trend in the US, Altbach (2013) echoes a similar concern: "few American colleges or universities have traditionally seen international activities in primarily commercial terms. … most institutions have viewed global engagement in educational terms—when they have thought about it at all. [Yet] *this is changing*" (p. 13 emphasis added). In the same country, Green and Olson (2003) have remarked, "Given the dominance of market forces and competition in the United States, it is no surprise that governments, businesses, and institutions value the economic benefits of internationalization" (p. 13).

This global trend toward commodification, competition and ranking is well summarized in a recent report by IAU. Thus,

> At many institutions, internationalization is now part of a strategy to enhance prestige, global competitiveness and revenue. As higher education has in some respects become a global 'industry', so has internationalization of higher education become, in some quarters, a competition in which commercial and other interests sometimes overshadow higher education's fundamental academic mission and values (p. 3).

IAU (2012) has in fact warned that, "Competition is in danger of displacing collaboration as the foundation for internationalization. (IAU, 2012, p. 3)

In some industrialized countries notably in the US, Australia, and the UK, higher education is slowly changing into an export industry, with commercialization and stiff

competition for international students on the rise. For the UK, for example, according to UK Vision 2020 (Bohm et al., 2004), internationalization has been reduced to "an *economic sector* that is extremely attractive to the UK: it is knowledge intensive, highly value-added and offers long terms benefits" (p. 3, emphasis added).

In Australia, Welch (2012) has traced developments in that country's engagement with internationalization particularly as it pertains to international students. He observes a clear change of rationales for international engagement. He writes that whereas previously rationales for international student flows to Australia "were largely based on notions of international goodwill, aid and development, as well as considerations of national status", this was later replaced by "a 'market' discourse" (p. 303). Thus, internationalization "based on education or social good" has been replaced by "a logic of economics" (p. 304).

Further, a study of internationalization in 12 universities and colleges in 5 Scandinavian countries (Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Iceland and Norway) has found out "a tendency towards convergence in policy making on the economic dimensions of internationalization" and "a stronger focus on the expected financial benefits of international students" (Stensaker, Frolitch, Gornitzka & Maassen, 2008, p. 3).

Internationalization in Canada is also pursuing a similar path as Trilokekar (2010) observes: "Internationalization at Canadian universities… [was] embedded in a traditional Canadian ethos and soft power policy of anti-imperialism and a need for a just and equitable world order, best reflected in the Pearsonian foreign policy tradition… *However, this is now history*. "(p. 144, emphasis added). Along the same line, Metcalfe (2010) observes a clear shift to "the realm of academic capitalism" in Canada, as is evident, for example, in "decreased…proportional share of local public (provincial) funding on higher education, and ...increased reliance upon private sources of income namely through tuition, the sales of goods and services, and industrial partnership" (p. 509). Perhaps with more budget cuts in sight due to fluctuating oil prices and economic exigencies, Canadian post-secondary institutions will more likely emphasize the economic benefits of internationalization in the years to come at the expense of the academic and socio-cultural benefits.

That said, it is important to note that the nature and direction of internationalization has also been impacted by powerful global actors. Writing in the European context, Kehm (2003) argues that,

> we clearly note an internationalization of higher education policy and politics. Next to political actors on the national level and a larger autonomy of the institutional level, we see new actors, in particular international and supranational organizations like the European Union, the OECD, the World Bank and UNESCO, trying to influence reform processes in and steering of higher education by promoting their own definitions of the functions and goals of higher education and by providing a variety of incentives. (p. 111)

As a global player with significant power, OECD, in particular, exercises governance by information (Porter & Webb, 2008) by actively disseminating information that supports its own privileged positions. OECD functions as an "important site for the construction, standardization and dissemination of transnational policy ideas" (Mahon & McBride, 2009, p. 83). For example, in a report produced to serve as a guide for the internationalization of higher education institutions, OECD (Henard, Diamond, Roseveare, 2012) articulates four reasons as to why internationalization should matter for governments. That is, to (a) develop national university systems with a broader, global framework; (b) produce a skilled workforce with global awareness and multicultural competencies; (c) use public higher education funds to promote participation in the global economy; (d) benefit from trade in education services.

As seen above, OECD's construction of education/internationalization as "trade" and "the use of public funds to promote participation in the global economy" point to hegemonic global economic discourses that shape higher education internationalization.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework developed in this section is a compendium of three lines of thought. The first one of these comes from an ever-growing body of literature on higher education internationalization (de Wit, 2012, 2010; Knight, 2012, 2008a, 2004). At the heart of this scholarly literature are the meaning, rationales, approaches and strategies/programs/policies of internationalization. A detailed discussion of these is provided in the preceding sections this chapter. It is only important at this juncture to

state the two concepts within this framework that have much relevance to the present study; that is, the meaning of and rationales for internationalization. Within the aforementioned framework, internationalization is understood to mean "the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education" (Knight, 2004, p. 11). Rationales for internationalization are broadly divided into four areas: socio/cultural (e.g., intercultural understanding), political (e.g., foreign policy), economic (e.g., economic growth and competitiveness), and academic (e.g. enhancement of quality). Although both the meaning and rationales identified in this framework are meant to be used as analytical tools to examine conceptions of and drives for internationalization at national and institutional levels as well, they are used here as analytical devices to explore faculty members' perspectives and motivations of internationalization.

Two other theoretical orientations also form part of the theoretical framework developed here. The first of these is globalization theory. Globalization is a highly contested and multifaceted concept comprising political, economic, social and cultural dimensions. It is variously understood and interpreted. For Lingard (2009), globalization's key manifestation for the last thirty years has been "*neoliberal globalization*" (p. 18, emphasis added). Indeed, one view of globalization relegates it to an "economic discourse which actively promulgates a market ideology, and results from policies of neo-liberal governmentality" (Vidovich, Yang, & Currie, 2007, p. 90). According to Monkman and Baird (2002), "neoliberalism is globalization's ideology" (p. 502). Similarly, scholars arguing from a critical tradition argue that globalization connotes market ideology, increased performativity, the mercantilization of educational services, corporate control and/or privatization which are all associated with the ideology of neoliberalism (Ball, 2012; Currie, Deangelis, de Boer, Huisman, & Lacotte 2003; Giroux, 2004).

Not everyone agrees with such assessments of course. Globalization is also used in an ideologically neutral sense, to refer to cross border flows of ideas, people, technology and finance (Knight, 2008a), or just "the enhancement of the worldwide…spheres of action" (Marginson, 2009, p. 19).

It should be admitted that there is no interest here to reduce globalization to an economic discourse. At the same time, however, it is important to note that much of the criticism labelled on internationalization in recent times has to do with its association with economic globalization (Beck, 2012; Branderburg & de Wit, 2011; IAU, 2014; Knight, 2008b; Stromquist, 2007; Welch, 2002, 2010). Increasingly, internationalization is closely associated with commercialization and commodification of education services. As Altbach (2001) has noted, "Higher education commercialization has…reached the global marketplace…[and] [w]ith the growing commercialization of higher education, the values of the marketplace have intruded onto the campus." (pp. 2, 3). With the introduction of global university rankings and the General Agreement on Trade in Services which sees education as a tradable service, competition for rankings and status become increasingly fierce among universities. As a result, "Current thinking sees international higher education as a commodity to be freely traded and sees higher education as a private good, not a public responsibility" (Altbach & Knight, 2007, p. 291).

Canadian universities have not remained unaffected by the winds of change brought about by globalization. For example, an analysis of the effect of globalization on the Canadian higher education policy has shown "the pervasive influence of economic globalization and the continuing shift to a more utilitarian and market-oriented ideological outlook" (Kirby, 2008, p. 1). More specifically, it is argued that internationalization in Canada "has taken on an entrepreneurial and market-oriented dimension" (Beck, 2012, p. 135).

This study also draws on academic capitalism theory (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Rhoades & Slaughter, 2004; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004) as a conceptual lens through which to examine the activities of faculty members engaged in international partnerships. According to Rhoades and Slaughter (2004) academic capitalism refers to "the involvement of colleges and faculty in market-like behaviors" (p. 37). Related to one of globalization's outcomes (i.e., the marketization of higher education) and the ascendancy of the neoliberal and neo-conservative agendas, academic capitalism serves to explain the behavior of universities, faculty members and administrators as they engage in market or market-like behaviours. According to Rhoades and Slaughter (2004) faculty members and

academic managers could be complicit in the pursuit of academic capitalism such as for example by taking their academic units into entrepreneurial directions, or by prioritizing revenue generation over the core educational activities of the academy. They go on to write:

> Some adjustments in academic programming to encompass the challenges of a shifting global economy obviously make sense. What makes less sense is to substantially restrict the academy to meeting short-term economic priorities—and what makes still less sense is to reduce the other significant roles that higher education has to play. These include providing access to the economy for a broader proportion of the population; preparing citizens for a democracy in a new, high-tech, global world; and addressing a range of social problems and issues that attend the shift to a knowledge-based economy. (p. 38)

There is close affinity between what Rhoades and Slaughter (2004) described in the above quote and the current trajectory of internationalization in many Western countries. Knight (2013) observes that "capacity building through international cooperation is being replaced by status building initiatives to gain world class recognition and higher rankings" (p. 84). She goes on to write: "Institutions must ask how an increased emphasis in the 'buying and selling' of education across borders will affect the nature and priority given to academic, social and cultural purposes of non-profit international educational activities" (p. 87).

In their treatise *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy*, Slaughter and Rhoades (2004, pp. 76-77) argued how higher education which used to be seen largely as "an academic public good knowledge regime" with its Mertonian norms (such as organized skepticism) has shifted to "an academic capitalist knowledge regime" with a new set of values such as profit making, knowledge privatization and organized commitment to the knowledge economy. "The theory of academic capitalism focuses on networks…that link institutions as well as faculty…to the new economy" (p. 15). The "new economy" promotes "privatization, commercialization, deregulation and reregulation" (p. 21). Academic capitalism is aligned with neoliberalism. According to Slaughter and Rhodes (2004) academic capitalism takes many forms such as maximizing external revenue generation, engaging in entrepreneurial activity, preparing students for the new economy, rigorous competition among universities and colleges to market their

institution to high-ability students, and "colleges and universities work[ing] their "brand" which is associated with prestige related to the research and scholarship of the faculty" (p. 303).

In a recent article entitled *Revisiting Academic Capitalism in Canada: No Longer the Exception* (published in *The Journal of Higher Education*), Metcalfe (2010) has shown how "Canada has moved swiftly into the realm of academic capitalism" (p. 503). Indeed, according to Metcalfe, "Canadian higher education is…firmly entrenched in academic capitalism" (p. 507) as is evidenced, for example in the commercialization of research.

As regards with the relationship between internationalization and academic capitalism, it could be envisaged that faculty members who are engaged in international partnerships may embrace the marketization discourse and may even be engaged in market like behaviors in a number of ways such as, for example, collaborating with the "international marketing campaign" (Knight, 2013) of their universities or academic units through a promotion and branding exercise or even speaking favorably of their universities image or image building, advertising university programs, assisting in the recruitment of more international students to their universities, searching for new markets, and more.

This does not mean that such practices are necessarily wrong. Given, as stated before, the financial difficulties many public universities find themselves in, such entrepreneurial behaviours are understandable. Yet at the same time they inevitably raise crucial questions about the values of internationalization and whether it is currently being used merely as a means for revenue generation rather than for the improvement of the quality of teaching, learning and research.

Globalization and academic capitalism theories therefore inform the present study in the sense that they frame analysis as well as provide valuable aid in making sense of data at a later stage of this study. In using these theories, I am particularly interested in examining the extent to which faculty members identify themselves with, or embrace or even utilize the language of economic globalization while sharing their international experiences.

Summary

This chapter reviewed previous research as it related to internationalization, globalization, and the knowledge based economy. Internationalization is "the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education" (Knight, 2004, p. 11). The review had shown that while internationalization and globalization were at times presented as overlapping, more often than not, internationalization was viewed as a response to globalization. Globalization was understood both from a neutral ideological perspective to mean the transfer of information, ideas, people and capital across societies at an unprecedented pace, and the intensification of capitalism with neoliberalism as its core ideology, hence the term "neo-liberal globalization" (Rhoads, Torres, & Brewster, 2005).

One impact of globalization to higher education was the intrusion of market values into the day-to-day conduct of the academic functions of universities as was broadly argued in critical scholarly research on higher education and most notably in the "academic capitalism" literature. Academic capitalism saw such growing entrepreneurialism within universities as a strategy university deploy "to achieve prestige and position in the knowledge economy" (Kauppinen, Coco, Choi, & Brajkovic, 2016, p. 35).

Thus, while internationalization was also sustained by academic and socio-cultural rationales, the reviewed literature suggested that it was also driven by economic rationales. In Canada, for example, internationalization was linked to growing entrepreneurialism and drawing fee-paying international students. National provincial, and institutional policies on internationalization also drew from the discourse of knowledge based economy which emphasized "the importance of knowledge in creating economic growth and global competitiveness" (Marginson & van der Wende, 2006, p. 8). Academic capitalism was in fact seen as a product of the shift from an industrial to a knowledge-based economy (Rhodes & Slaughter, 2004, p. 38). Finally, this chapter also included a theoretical framework that guided the study and was informed by globalization and academic capitalism.

Chapter III: Methodology

The Naturalistic Paradigm

This research was informed by the "naturalistic paradigm" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) or as was later came to be known as *constructivism* (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, 1998; Lincoln, & Guba, 2000; Lincoln, Lynham & Guba, 2011). As an "eclectic" (Schwandt, 1998) paradigm, the naturalistic paradigm seeks to achieve "understanding and reconstruction of the constructions that people (including the inquirer) initially hold, aiming toward consensus but still open to new interpretations as information and sophistication improve" (Guba & Lincoln, 1998, p. 211). Underpinning the naturalistic paradigm are a set of assumptions that are particularly pertinent to this study: (1) what is real is a construction in the minds of individuals; (2) there are multiple, often conflicting, constructions and all (at least potentially) are meaningful; (3) the question of which or whether constructions are true is socio-historically relative; and (4) truth is a matter of the best-informed and most sophisticated constructions on which there is consensus at a given time (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, pp. 105-117; Lincoln & Guba, 2000, pp. 163-188; Lincoln, Lynham & Guba, 2011; Schwandt, 1998, pp. 243-244). The assumptions of the naturalistic paradigm undergird many of the qualitative research designs including the case study design chosen for this study.

A Qualitative Case Study Design

By employing a qualitative case study design for the present study, I aimed to gain an in-depth understanding (Merriam, 1985) of internationalization "ideographically"; that is, "in terms of the particulars of the case" (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p. 42), and from an "emic" perspective (Stake, 2010); that is; emerging from the participants rather than from my perspective as a researcher or what "writers express in the literature" (Creswell, 2008, p. 186). The two terms, "qualitative" and "case study", are worth elaborating further.

Qualitative. Because this study is first and foremost *qualitative* research, a few words about qualitative research in general and its "special characteristics" (Stake, 2010) are in order. Qualitative research is a broad umbrella term which can take many forms

(Merriam, 2009). Yet it is generally defined as "a means for exploring and understanding the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem" (Creswell, 2014, p. 246). A central goal of qualitative research approach is that of gaining a deeper understanding of the phenomenon of interest (Creswell, 2014; Merriam, 2009; Schwandt, 2000; Stake, 2010).

Qualitative research has several characteristics which makes it particularly fitting for the purpose intended in this study. First, as a form of inquiry, qualitative research is well suited for studies which aim to better capture the meanings, perspectives and subjective views of the participants as closely as possible (Patton, 2002). Second, at the core of qualitative research tradition lies the need to *understand* the world from the stand point of the participants. In other words, the search for participants' own *meaning* of the phenomenon is a defining characteristic of qualitative inquiry (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007; Clandinin, 2012; Creswell, 2008; Lincoln & Guba, 2000; Loseke, 2013; Merriam, 2009; Miles & Humberman, 1994; Stake, 2010; van Mannen, 2006). As Denzin and Lincoln (1994) point out, qualitative researchers "make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them" (p. 2). Third, qualitative research involves inductive data analysis. That is, instead of trying to deductively test their own hypothesis as in positivist research, qualitative researchers "build their patterns, categories and themes from the bottom up by organizing the data inductively into increasingly more abstract units of information" (Creswell, 2014, p. 186). A fourth important characteristic of qualitative research relates to the importance it attaches to context. Bogdan and Biklen (2007) write, "human behavior is significantly influenced by the setting in which it occurs" (p. 5).

A fifth characteristic of qualitative research has to do with sampling. Qualitative research rests on the logic and power of *purposeful sampling* (Patton, 2015), as contrasted with statistical probability sampling in which case the purpose is generalization rather than a deeper understanding of the phenomenon under investigation. Finally, in qualitative research, the researcher becomes "*the primary instrument for data collection and analysis*" (Merriam, 2009, p. 15, emphasis in original), which at least from a positive lens means that the researcher can "check with respondents the accuracy of interpretation and explore unusual or unanticipated responses" (p. 15).

Case study. While there are several ways of defining a case study, for the present purpose, case study is defined as "a study of a bounded system, emphasizing the unity and wholeness of that system, but confining the attention to those aspects that are relevant to the research problem at the time" (Stake, 1988, p. 258). According to Yin (2014), the conduct of a good case study, among other things, entails "understanding the comparative advantage of case study research" (p. 2). A case study design is particularly appropriate for the present study for a number of reasons. First, consistent with the objectives of the present study, a case study research aims to increase understanding of the phenomenon of interest (Merriam, 2009). Second, unlike other research methods, case studies aim "for an understanding of the particular case in its idiosyncrasy [and] in its complexity" (Stake, 1988, p. 256). Third, a case study is well suited for studies, such as this one, where the purpose is understanding and exploration (Merriam, 2009; Yin, 1994). Fourth, "case studies provide an in-depth look into phenomena that might easily be missed when using [other methods]" (Stromquist, 2007, p. 85). Fifth, "a case study investigates a contemporary phenomenon (the 'case') in its real-world context, especially when the boundaries between the phenomenon and context may not be clearly evident" (Yin, 2014, p. 2). I proposed to study a contemporary phenomenon (internationalization), asking "how" questions, and had little control over what transpires in the process of internationalization. Fourth, a case study is, by definition, a study of a bounded system (Creswell, 2007; Merriam, 2009; Stake, 1988). For the present purpose, the case study university, the University of Alberta, was selected for several reasons as outlined in the subsequent section.

Ontological and Epistemological Underpinnings

This study was underpinned by a set of ontological and epistemological assumptions as outlined below.

Ontology. The present inquiry was grounded on "relativist ontology" (Crotty, 1998; Lincoln & Guba, 2000), the idea that reality is locally and culturally constructed. According to this ontological position, reality is not considered stable and singular but dynamic and multiple and therefore there are multiple understandings and meanings of a phenomenon (Guba & Lincoln, 1994; Merriam, 2002; Stake, 2010). It is often a researcher's ontological position that dictates the use of a qualitative and a quantitative

approach. As Merriam (2009) explains, "One of the assumptions underlying qualitative research is that realty is holistic, multidimensional, and ever-changing; it is not a single, fixed, objective phenomenon waiting to be discovered, observed, and measured as in quantitative research" (p. 213). Qualitative researchers recognize the multiplicity or plurality of meaning. However, it is not only the multiplicity of meaning that is at the heart of the qualitative research but the how of its constructions as well. In the words of Merriam (2009), "A central characteristic of qualitative research is that individuals construct reality in interaction with their social worlds" (p. 22). As I entered this research to learn faculty members' construction of reality of the phenomenon of internationalization, I assumed that internationalization was a socially constructed phenomenon, and not a single, identifiable and apprehendable reality as proposed by positivism (Guba & Lincoln, 1998; Lincoln, Lynham & Guba, 2011).

Epistemology. The epistemology underpinning the present study was constructionism. According to Crotty (1998), "Constructionism is the epistemology claimed in most qualitative approaches…[and it holds that] all knowledge, and therefore *all meaningful reality as such, is contingent upon human practices, being constructed in and out of interaction between human beings and their world, and developed and transmitted within an essentially social context"* (pp. 16, 42, emphasis in original). This suggests that meaning is not something imposed on reality or one that is out there to be discovered; instead it is constructed. To quote Crotty (1998) again, "Meaning does not inhere in the object, merely waiting for someone to come upon it…Meanings are constructed by human beings as they engage with the world they are interpreting…we do not create meaning…. We construct meaning. We have something to work with. What we have to work with is the world and objects in the world" (pp. 42, 43, 44).

Social constructionism is based on the viewpoint that people come to know what they know by interpreting and *constructing* reality "interpersonally and intersubjectively… interacting in a network of relationships" (Patton, 2015, p. 123). Knowledge for the constructionist is a matter of social construction. Knowledge is what we can make sense of reality as we engage with the world around us. Reality, so constructed, is not therefore fixed and singular, but ever-changing and multiple. Because people's constructions differ on account of their world views, backgrounds and frames of

reference, one will end up having varying constructions or interpretations of the same phenomenon. This is true no matter how similar the context within which the participants may find themselves. As Patton (2015) argues, "two people can live in the same empirical world, even though one's world is haunted by demons, the other's by subatomic particles" (p. 122). Such a position has important implications for the present study. This might suggest, for example, that faculty members working in the same institution and under similar set of circumstances could end up having divergent perspectives and understandings of internationalization. They could make sense of the world in different ways and each of these interpretations could be as important as any other.

It is important to note that constructionism does not deny the existence of objective reality as such. Instead, constructionist epistemology is compatible with realist ontology. "Social constructionism is at once realist and relativist", writes Crotty (1998, p. 63). "Constructionist philosophy is based on the thesis of *ontological relativity* which holds that all tenable statements about existence depend on a world view and no world view is uniquely determined by empirical or sense data about the world" (Patton, 2015, p. 122). This is a central perspective that has important implications for the present study. Thus, when I entered this study attempting to understand and explore the internationalization experiences of faculty members by employing a constructionist epistemology, I did so in proper acknowledgement of the fact that my participants will have different understandings of the same phenomenon based on their unique experiences and circumstances. My aim in this research was not to generalize findings to a larger population of individuals who shared similar characteristics but rather to offer deep insights into the participants' experiences (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Nor was it my intent to get at the *essence* of the phenomenon under investigation by some kind of phenomenological reduction, as would, for example, a phenomenologist doing a similar study might wish to accomplish, but instead to explore the multiple realities (or "multiple voices") as they were socially, historically and culturally constructed by research participants as they engaged with the phenomenon. In other words, employing a constructionist mindset, I worked "to make sense of (or interpret) the meanings… [faculty members] have about … [internationalization]" (Creswell, 2003, p. 9). The task

for the constructionist is to "seek to capture diverse understandings and multiple realities about people's definitions and experiences of the situation. A singular or universal explanation would not be sought. In this way, constructionist qualitative inquiry honors the idea of multiple realities" (Patton, 2015, p. 123, emphasis in original).

Researcher Positionality

I approached this study from the standpoint of a student and an academic with more than a decade of teaching and administration experience in higher education. Although much of that experience had been in a developing country context (Ethiopia), my experience had been uniquely shaped, among other things, by having attended my graduate education in three different continents (Africa, Europe and North America). It was my conviction that internationalization was a desirable goal for universities in our contemporary times. I believed that not only was internationalization an effective tool for promoting the ideals of good quality education and effectively dealing with the perils of parochialism, but as we continue to live in a more globalized world, internationalization becomes a means for advancing our common values as citizens of this world, therefore drawing us together ever before. As such, I considered internationalization a force for good. On the other hand, I realized that internationalization, as it manifests itself in the form of competition among universities for international students, global league tables, institutional branding and the commercialization of research, was somehow troubling. I did agree with the sentiment expressed by Knight (2013) that, "The discourse and practice of internationalization needs to be re-oriented to values—especially academic values" (p. 90). Also, higher education, I submitted, should be "a profound instrument of social power, one that can project values independent of state and corporate demands and offer its students and community members a space for their own cultivation" (Rana, 2016, para.12).

I was also concerned as an academic about the shift that was taking place in the internationalization of higher education; that is, the shift from cooperation to competition; from pursuing scholarship to intensifying commercialization; and from one aimed at enhancing teaching and research quality to one of entrepreneurship and from one of becoming a force for cultural pluralism in the campus to one of promoting academic capitalism. As an academic, I always believed that I and my fellow colleagues were

engaged in a moral and ethical profession where our passion for investing our effort and energy in our work originated principally from our intrinsic desire to transform the lives our students rather than from our yearning for self-aggrandizement.

I, therefore, entered into this study critically examining and acknowledging my values as they were shaped by my prior training as well as my teaching and administration experience in a higher education setting. Acknowledging these values also meant that my analysis and interpretation of data could, in a way, be shaped by those experiences and convictions. However, I attempted earnestly not to allow my personal convictions to influence data collection and analysis. I particularly endeavoured to hold back my own personal views on internationalization during interviews. I also kept my emotions in check as participants expressed views that are contrary to my opinions so as not to hinder them from openly expressing their views.

The Research Site

The University of Alberta is a large, public, research-intensive university in Alberta, Canada, which in recent years has made internationalization an institutional priority (more about this in a later section). It is a research-intensive university with a demonstrated commitment to internationalization, particularly in the form of forging bilateral strategic international research partnerships with some select "priority countries." This is linked to a broader provincial effort to access new international markets and "champion global liberalized trade" (The Government of Alberta, 2010) as well as to "strengthen Alberta's profile" (The Government of Alberta, 2014b). This indicates that it is a particularly appropriate site in which to explore the "situated meaning" (Stake, 2006) of internationalization as well as the values driving it in the context of strategic partnerships.

In order to gain new insights into the internationalization phenomena in context (Gay, Mills & Airasian, 2009) and to "maximize what we can learn" from the case (Stake, 1995, p. 4), the following institutional and contextual factors were considered particularly salient. First, the university is the only Canadian university which, until the time of this writing, is a member of the World Universities Network, a global network of research-intensive universities whose objective, inter alia, is to further collaborations in research and address issues of global significance, thus demonstrating the university's

63

commitment not only to research but also to collaborations that extend beyond one's national borders. Allied with this is the university's membership in U-15, Canada's 15 research intensive universities.

Second, as the largest university in the province of Alberta, the university is uniquely positioned at the intersections of bilateral economic relations between Alberta, Canada's energy province with the second largest proven reserves of oil in the world (Giesy, Anderson, & Wiseman, 2010), and other partner nations which saw the province as a reliable trading partner in view of both their ever growing demand for natural oil and gas as well as in their quest to find a new market for their high-tech products required by Alberta's energy sector. Because such economic relations between Alberta and other countries often find expression in research collaborations between universities in the respective countries (such is the case from which participants for this study are drawn), it means that the case is important to gain nuanced understandings of internationalization in a particular real-world political and economic context.

The Context: National, provincial, institutional

The national context. Although Canada is a federal state consisting of ten provinces and three territories, Canadian higher education exhibits some features that are unlike its counterparts in other countries. For example, constitutionally, education is the responsibility of the provincial governments and there is no central or federal organ with the duty to establish broad frameworks or policies for higher education. While a Council of Ministers of Education exists, and is made up of Ministers and Deputy Ministers of Education from all provinces and territories, as a body it has no statutory powers but acts as a forum in which issues are shared and linkages formed on a voluntary basis. In the absence of any national governing body in education, internationalization initiatives in Canada have remained for long "a piecemeal combination of various federal and provincial departmental initiatives" (Trilokekar & Jones, 2007, p. 13). Yet, as noted in the first chapter, several recent federal government initiatives, in which provincial bodies may elect to participate voluntarily, have shone a spotlight on internationalization, suggesting an internationalization imperative throughout the country. Internationalization has now become a key national strategy linked primarily to enhancing Canada's competitiveness in the global economy. Indeed, as was stated by Ed Fast, former

Canadian Minister of International Trade, *Canada's International Education Strategy* was in effect a reflection of "a commitment to 'brand' Canada to maximum effect" (DFATDC, 2014, p.4). This sentiment has apparently been endorsed by higher education institutions all across the country.

Internationalization in Canada is conceived as a response to globalization. Although the relationship between globalization and Canada's response to it is a broad and complex one that cannot be fully explored in this study, at least two observations seem to be germane. One is that the global context is often recast by Canadian national policy makers as characterized by fierce economic competition among nation states (Fast, 2013; DFATDC, 2014). As a result, enhancing Canada's competitive edge has become a major focus of higher education. The message for Canadian universities is straightforward. If they have to remain faithful to the government's plans they need to demonstrate how they are competing with their peers on a global scale. Illieva, Beck and Waterstone (2014) pointed out, "Internationalisation has become a key institutional strategy for Canadian universities… seeking to brand and position themselves in a competitive market" (p. 877). The second point is related to the first observation. International education has been identified by national policy makers as a priority sector in which the matter of Canada's competitive edge is embedded (DFATDC, 2014, 2013). This means that universities should be committed to engaging in internationalization collaborative projects in order to assist in attaining government's efforts to enhance Canada's competitiveness.

Thus, part of understanding internationalization in Canadian higher education requires an examination of the culture of competitiveness embedded within the government's strategy of dealing with the global economy. As stated by the Hon. Stockwell Day, Canada's Minister of International Trade and Minister for the Asia-Pacific Gateway

> In the face of rising international competition and profound difficulties in the global economy, Canada's future prosperity hinges on how well we collectively harness our competitive advantages to maintain our place as one of the world's great trading nations and most successful economies. (The Government of Canada, 2009, p. 1)

Indeed, Day's message also reverberates in statements from more recent governments. The Honourable Ed Fast, former Canada's Minister of International Trade has also stated in his message in the *Global Markets Action Plan* (The Government of Canada, 2013a) that,

> we are pursuing deeper trade and investment ties with many of the largest, most dynamic and fastest-growing markets in the world in order to enhance Canada's competitive edge in a global economy that is fiercely competitive. The rapidly changing global economic landscape requires Canada to remain nimble and agile. I believe that, to stay competitive, we must keep challenging ourselves. (p. 4)

Thus, what can we make of Canadian government's commitment to internationalization? An understanding of the government of Canada's education strategy relating to higher education can be summed up succinctly. It is a commitment targeted to "making the grade in a highly competitive global environment" (DFATDC, 2014, p. 5).

The provincial context. Internationalization is also a key commitment of the Government of Alberta. Worthy of note, for example, is the government's commitment to establish 13 international offices in 9 countries worldwide as an explicit effort to strengthen Alberta's international profile. The province's international plan has several objectives: (1) to diversify markets to expand the global economy, (2) to build Alberta's reputation as a global citizen, and (3) to prepare Albertan's for success in the global community. One key approach that government has adopted is to "build effective partnerships and networks and increase collaboration with Alberta's stakeholders" (The Government of Alberta, 2014b, p. 2). Internationalization, it is argued, is particularly important for "developing graduates with the international and intercultural competencies to live and work effectively within this complex and interdependent world" (The Government of Alberta, n.d., para. 2).

One overarching aim for the provincial international effort is to "[e]quip Albertans with the tools and global mindset to *compete* in the *global market place*" (The Government of Alberta, 2014b, p. 2, emphasis added). "In today's competitive global economy securing access to emerging markets is becoming increasingly important" (The Government of Alberta, 2014b p. 7). "The Government of Alberta is committed to increasing Alberta's

international profile and access to market" (The Government of Alberta, 2014b p. 8). Within this broad provincial context, higher education has been accorded a unique role to play; that is, "positioning Alberta as a global leader" (The Government of Alberta, 2014a, para. 1). The government states that:

> One focus area for the Ministry is to ensure that Albertans are well prepared to participate and compete successfully in the global marketplace. International education abroad experiences are a powerful way for Albertans to acquire international competencies, to integrate them into their academic and professional development and to excel in our increasingly complex and interconnected world. (The Government of Alberta, 2014a, Para. 2)

Overall, the government's international strategy identifies the world as a marketplace where one has to compete to survive and thrive. This was vividly expressed by former premier Alison Redford (2011-2014) in her opening message to *Alberta's International Strategy 2013* where she said, "Job one for our government is reaching international markets, to get the fairest price possible for our products, resources and services" (The Government of Alberta, 2013, p. 4). In line with the priorities of the Federal government there was also the desire to equip Albertans with "the skills, knowledge and abilities to function effectively within the global context" (The Government of Alberta, 2014a, Para. 1).

The Institutional context. Founded in 1908, the University of Alberta is one of Canada's largest research-intensive universities. The university offers approximately 200 undergraduate and 500 graduate programs in 18 faculties and 5 campuses. As shown in Table 4, in 2015-2016, the university had a student population of 37, 830 at the undergraduate and graduate levels (The University of Alberta, n.d.e.). Drawn from 143 countries, international students comprised 21.1 % of the total enrolment (17% of the undergraduate enrolment, and 39% at the graduate level). International student admissions in the university increased drastically by 27% from year 2016 to 2017 (Chiose, 2017).

In the 2015-2016 academic year, there were 1649 faculty and 392 research academic staff in the university. According to a recent report, international faculty accounted for more than 60% of the new hires bringing the total percentage of international professors to approximately 40% of the current total (Brown, 2017).

Table 4. Students by Home Destination (2015-2016)

	Alberta	Elsewhere in Canada	International	% of international
Undergraduate	22649	2789	5188	17
Graduate	3085	1324	2795	39
Total	25734	4113	7983	21

Source: The University of Alberta, n.d.e.

Over the past number of years, internationalization has been at the forefront of the University of Alberta's strategic priorities, reflecting both provincial and national imperatives. Among the crucial objectives set out by the university's key strategic planning documents *Dare to Deliver (2011-2015)*, *For the Public Good* (2016) as well as the 2015 and the 2016 *Comprehensive Institutional Plans* include "global engagement", "enhancing our presence in the world", and increasing the "diversity" of students and faculty. As a result, forging key strategic partnerships with overseas governments and institutions have underpinned a key part of the University's strategy. The University of Alberta boasts of having about 695 active international agreements (D. Scott, personal communication, May 1, 2016) with institutions and governments around the world.

The University of Alberta stood as the 31st most international university in the world in 2017, as ranked by the new Times Higher Education "international outlook[5]" indicator, a measure of the world's most international (or outward-looking[6]) universities. The same rankings placed the university as the third most international university in Canada, surpassed only by the University of British Columbia and McGill.

As is made explicit in *For the Public Good* (The University of Alberta, 2016b), at the core of the institution's objective lies, its desire to foster targeted and strategic

---

[5] an indicator developed by Times Higher Education to rank universities by their outward looking characteristics. The indicator takes into account "each institution's proportion of international staff, proportion of international students and proportion of research papers published with at least one co-author from another country" (Bothwell, 2016, para. 4)

[6] Those universities that are "typically focused on attracting the best students and scholars from around the world, launching partnerships with overseas institutions and businesses, incentivizing cross-border research collaborations and educating their students to become 'global citizens'" (Bothwell, 2017, para 3).

"international collaborations, partnerships, and MOUs at the institutional, faculty, department, unit, and individual levels" (p. 25).

Further the University is increasingly drawing international students as part of "addressing Canada's and Alberta's globalization objectives" (The University of Alberta, 2014, p. 34). A key point to note is how the university's commitment to internationalization reflects the broader changes in the Canadian landscape. As is made manifest in one important institutional document, "The University sees its own internationalization agenda as part of the broader efforts to internationalize postsecondary education and research within the Province of Alberta and Canada" (University of Alberta, 2010, p. 6).

As an institution intent on becoming "one of the world's great international universities" (The University of Alberta, n.d.a.), the University of Alberta is actively engaged in an explicit effort to enhance its overall reputation and worldwide standing. "Strategically, the University of Alberta has placed priority on building partnerships with top-tier institutions in five countries: Germany, China, Brazil, India, and (regions within) the United States" (The University of Alberta, 2015, p. 51). At the same time, the university is committed to "[d]evelop [the] global competency in [its] graduates through access to short-and long-term outbound international experiences" (The University of Alberta, 2016b, p. 14).

Partnerships have become the main manifestations of faculty members' involvement in internationalization at the University of Alberta. The University states that, "Enhanced international connections enable more members of the University to engage with international scholarly networks, co-publish with international colleagues, and gain access for their publications to globally ranked top journals" (The University of Alberta, 2010, p. 7). Indeed, as is made explicit in *For the Public Good* (2016) one strategic objective of the university is to "maintain and pursue partnerships across the global academy to expand research and funding opportunities for our researchers and thus increase their capacity for success" (p. 20).

From the perspective of the decision makers of the University of Alberta, partnerships are seen as avenues through which the university aims to discover, disseminate, and apply new knowledge. Further, international engagement is justified as

"a key academic strategy to improving the quality of teaching, learning, and research". In specific terms the University of Alberta sees international engagement as important for supporting its commitment to research relating to environmental sustainability and stewardship. In keeping with this thrust the university has outlined a number of fundamental principles that underpin its internationalization aspirations in these areas. These include development of global mindedness and reciprocity, and emphasizing the mutual beneficial learning experiences including intercultural awareness and openness to different perspectives available to both faculty members and students (The University of Alberta, 2016b).

From the perspective of the decision makers of the University of Alberta, partnerships are seen as avenues through which the university aims to discover, disseminate, and apply new knowledge. Besides, international engagement is justified as a key academic strategy to improve the quality of teaching, learning, and research. Further, the university sees international engagement as important for supporting existing efforts devoted to environmental sustainability and stewardship. Along the same line, the university has outlined some fundamental principles that underpin its internationalization plans. Worthy of mention include global mindedness and reciprocity, and mutual beneficial learning experiences including intercultural awareness and openness to different perspectives (The University of Alberta, 2016b).

However, the internationalization imperative at the University of Alberta has never been more prominent than in its commitment to forge two key strategic partnerships with two priority countries (i.e., Bolvania and Moktovar, both pseudonyms) that were selected to play an important role in the provinces' strategic interest of energy and environment. The two strategic international research partnerships that are the focus of this study are with universities in Bolvania and Moktovar.

It is worth mentioning again the University of Alberta's "priority country approach" to international engagement. The idea behind this strategic initiative is to pull together and concentrate the university's international efforts and resources on some "select number of key partner countries and with a few priority partner institutions within those countries" (University of Alberta International, p. 1). Thus, the university has identified 18 countries, ranked from Tier 1 to 3 (from 1st priority to 3rd priority countries)

70

with which the university aspires to build long term strategic alliances. Tier 1 countries, for example include 6 countries (2 from Global North and 4 from Global South).

Participants

Research participants were selected from lists of all faculty members engaged in the two strategic international research partnerships with universities in Bolvania and Moktovar. For the purpose of this study, strategic international research partnerships were defined as those formal and bi-lateral research partnerships that are designed by central university administration in partnership with local government for the purpose of promoting both the local government's socio-economic ties with "priority countries" as well as stimulating the internationalization efforts of the university. Two such partnerships were selected primarily because they fit the definition above and that they represent two distinct areas of university's engagement in two geographical zones, i.e., one with a Northern partner and another with a Southern partner country. Both partnerships were part of a broader institutional initiative aimed at forging long-standing strategic partnerships with two priority countries in key areas of provincial interest—energy and environment. The two partner countries, Bolvania (a Global North partner) and Moktovar (a Global South Partner), have been identified by the University of Alberta as Tier I (first priority) countries, countries with which it aspires to engage in research on the afore mentioned areas.

Because of the particular area of research (energy and environment), nearly all those academics who participated in the two partnerships were from two disciplinary groups; that is, technologies and pure sciences (Bechler &Towler 2001). Only one participant was from another disciplinary background, i.e. applied social science. The common participant inclusion criteria in this study included participation in a strategic international research partnership in the position of an academic researcher. However, in an attempt to obtain as much variation as possible in the sample and to gain diversity of perspectives, I employed "maximum variation sampling" (Patton, 1990). With this in mind, I selected participants from different academic departments within the technologies and pure sciences groupings. I also purposely selected the only two women in both partnerships and the only participant from applied social sciences discipline.

To enhance variation within the sample, I further selected some participants based on their team leadership roles in the partnerships. My rationale was that those exercising leadership had more direct involvement in the decisions and discussions made within the framework of partnerships. Finally I selected a couple of the participants based on referrals from other participants for having more information about the partnerships.

Table 5. Participants' Profiles

Name (Pseudonym)	Gender	Academic Rank	Discipline	Partnership
Brian Wilson	Male	Professor	Technologies	N/N and N/S
Charles Fraser	Male	Professor	Pure sciences	N/N
Chester Brown	Male	Professor	Technologies	N/N and N/S
Derrick Smith	Male	Professor	Technologies	N/N
Dustin Shultz	Male	Associate Professor	Technologies	N/S
Eddie Chambers	Male	Associate Professor	Technologies	N/S
Frasor Golden	Male	Professor	Pure sciences	N/N
Fred Jones	Male	Associate Professor	Technologies	N/N
Jeremy Davies	Male	Professor	Applied social sciences	N/S
Jessica Meme	Female	Professor	Technologies	N/S
Liam Webb	Male	Associate Professor	Pure sciences	N/N
Linda Franklin	Female	Professor	Pure sciences	N/N
Morgan Dakin	Male	Professor	Pure sciences	N/N
Peter Andrews	Male	Professor	Pure sciences	N/N
Tony Briggs	Male	Associate professor	Pure sciences	N/S
William Evans	Male	Associate professor	Pure sciences	N/N

The nature of participants' involvement in the two partnerships deserve explanation. First, they were part of a broader institutional initiative aimed at forging long-standing strategic partnerships with two priority countries in key areas of provincial

interest—energy and environment. Second, their involvement in these partnerships was structured within a framework of Memorandum of Understandings (MoUs) signed between the University of Alberta and the two overseas partners. Third, the participants in these partnerships received funding for their research. As well, they were actively engaged in their research partnerships within the last five years. A more detailed description of the participants' profile is provided in Appendix A.

Data Sources

Qualitative case study researchers rely heavily on multiple sources of qualitative data. Indeed, multiple methods of data collection is the hallmark of case study research (Merriam, 1998). There were three data sources for this study: Individual, in-depth semi-structured interviews, documentary sources and reflective journal.

Interview. In order to access the perspective of the participants (Patton, 1980), I employed semi-structured interviews. After the protocols of this research were approved by the University's Research Ethics Office (REO), an invitation to participate in the study, which contained a copy of the information letter (see Appendix B), was sent to the participants through campus mail followed by email. Thus, out of the 33 academics I invited to participate in my study, 16 expressed willingness to take part in the study. These included 9 academics from the Bolvania (North/North) partnership, 5 from the Moktovar (North/South) partnership, and 2 who participated from both partnerships. Of the 16 participants, 2 were female and 14 were male; 7 were from technologies, 8 were from pure sciences and 1 was from applied social sciences (Becher & Trowler, 2001); 4 had leadership roles within the two partnerships; 10 were professors while 6 were associate professors.

Then, after the participants signed on the consent form (Appendix C), I began conducting face-to-face semi-structured interviews with the participants. I was interested in how participants make sense of their international experience (Creswell, 2014; Patton, 2002) and how they "interpret the world around them" (Merriam, 2009, p. 88). As Seidman (2013) noted, "At the root of in-depth interviewing is an interest in understanding the lived experience of other people and the meaning they make of that experience" (p. 9). Thus, I sought to understand the meaning that participants ascribed to internationalization within the context of the strategic research partnership they were

involved with, the rationales underpinning their international engagement, as well as the perceived impact of their international engagement on their professional practices in the University of Alberta. While bearing in mind the research questions and the purpose of this study, I began asking participants broad and open-ended question about their international experience (see Appendix D): "Tell me about the Bolvania/Moktovar international research partnership that you are involved in". Then in order to probe deeply about the meaning of internationalization from their perspectives, I asked participants: What does internationalization mean to you in the context of your international engagement? What are your personal rationales for your participation in the Bolvania/ Moktovar partnership? In what ways did your international engagement in this partnership influence your teaching and research roles in your university? As the interviews continued, I asked specific questions such as: How did you come to be involved in the partnership in the first place? Although I employed standard probes throughout the interviews, to ensure that all participants were asked similar questions, I also used specific probes as each interview proceeded.

Follow-up interviews were arranged with nine participants (7 from the Bolvania group and 2 from the Moktovar group) until a point of data saturation in order to probe deeply on themes and categories of data that emerged from an earlier analysis. Altogether, 25 interviews were conducted with the participants. On average, the initial interviews took 1 hour while the follow up interviews took 45 minutes. Interviews were audio-taped and later transcribed verbatim.

As part of a member check procedure, I gave participants both a copy of their interview transcripts after each interview as well as a summary of my interpretation in order for them to review the accuracy of the transcripts and of my interpretation before I analyzed them. Of the 16 participants, only two made slight changes to the transcripts while no changes were made to my interpretations by the participants. After data analysis, I also discussed the findings of my study with some participants with an eye to check whether my findings are plausible.

Participants were assigned pseudonyms to protect their identity and were categorized as North/North (N/N) and North/South (N/S) depending on the location of

their overseas engagement (See Table 5). However, participants were informed that, given the nature of the study, they could not be guaranteed anonymity.

Documents. "Sensitivity to context is central in qualitative inquiry and analysis" (Patton, 2015, p. 9). In order to gain a deeper understanding of the university's internationalization policies and the broader context within which the university functions as well as to see whether participants' narratives aligned with the university's plan for internationalization, I examined different documentary data and selected those that were credible and relevant to my purpose. These included: (1) strategic plans and seminal documents including Memorandum of Understandings for the two partnerships, *Alberta's international strategy 2013. Building markets* (The Government of Alberta, 2013)*, Dare to Deliver Academic Plan (2011-2015)* (The University of Alberta, n.d.a.)*, and Comprehensive Institutional Plans 2014, 2015, 2016* (The University of Alberta, 2016a, 2015, 2014)*,* and *For the Public Good* (The University of Alberta, 2016b) as well as (2) information collected from the University website, the personal websites of participants and the Bolvania partnership website. These included news reports, events, president's messages, milestones achieved and success stories about the university's internationalization efforts.

Reflective journal/memos. I also kept a reflective journal throughout the duration of this study. I used a reflective journal to document my learning, to keep record of my biases as well as my evolving reflections on the phenomenon of interest.

Data Analysis

To analyze the data, I followed conventional qualitative data analysis techniques suggested by several authors (Gay, Mills & Airasian 2009; Litchman 2013; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Strauss & Corbin, 1998; Merriam, 2009; Creswell, 2014; Saldana, 2013). As an initial step, I strove to get a general sense of the data by reading the verbatim transcripts and listening to the audio files several times (Creswell, 2014). In the second phase, I proceeded iteratively and inductively by dissecting each interview transcript categorically with descriptive codes and categories (Litchman, 2013). In order to "honour [participants'] voices, and to ground analysis from their perspectives" (Saldana, 2013), I also employed In Vivo codes. "In Vivo codes use the direct language of the participants as codes rather than the researcher-generated words and phrases"

(Saldana, 2013, p. 61). In the third phase, I categorized initially coded data under major categories. Throughout the data analysis, I also carried Merriam's (2009) admonition that "the practical goal of data analysis is to find answers to…[one's] research questions" (p. 176). Thus, I kept a copy of my research question and the purpose of my study on a separate sheet as I continue to code data (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003). Further, as Gay, Mills & Airasian's (2009) proposed, I asked key questions as an important analytical strategy. I posed questions such as "What are the meanings of internationalization held by this participant?', "How did his/her meaning of internationalization relate or differ from those offered by other participants?", "What part of their narratives are particularly relevant to this study, especially in light of the research questions posed?"'. I also used the same procedures separately for coding the documentary data and my reflective memos (Saldana, 2013). Finally, working inductively and coding and recoding, categorizing and recategorizing across transcripts (Saldana, 2013), I allowed themes to emerge from the data (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Ethical Considerations

Ethical issues have become increasingly salient in qualitative research. Miles and Huberman (1994) have long advised that, "Any qualitative researcher who is not asleep ponders moral and ethical questions" (p. 288). Thus, in order to safe guard participants from any potential harm as result of their participation in this study, I employed several strategies. First, participants were informed that their participation was voluntary, and that they could withdraw from the study at any time. Interviews were conducted only after written permission to proceed with this study was obtained from the participants themselves. Third, although the nature of this study means that participants cannot be guaranteed anonymity, they were nevertheless informed that their participation in this study will remain confidential by the use of pseudonyms. Finally, this research received approval from the University of Alberta Research Ethics Board for its adherence to the ethical standards of conducting research with human participants.

Trustworthiness

A key issue in qualitative research has to do with ensuring its trustworthiness (also called internal validity or credibility). Although scholars identifed many ways by which qualitative researchers could enhance the trustworthiness of their findings, I employed the

four criteria of *creditability*, *transferability*, *dependability* and *confirmability* as proposed by Guba (1981) and Lincoln and Guba (1985, 1986) to apply rigour in studies conducted within the naturalistic inquiry paradigm. Thus, to achieve *credibility* I employed "member checks" which, according to Guba (1981), is "the single most important action" that lies at "the heart of the credibility criterion" (p. 85). I used member checks both during the study by asking participants immediately after each interview whether my interpretations of their interview were accurate and after the completion of the study. That is, I allowed the participants in this study to be actively involved to check the accuracy of their interview transcripts and my interpretations as well as my emerging findings. Second, I used prolonged engagement and observation by maintaining lengthy and intensive contact with the phenomena in the field in order to identify the most noticeable elements of the situation and in-depth understanding of the phenomenon. This meant that although interviews took place between the years 2016-2017, I collected various forms of documentary data on internationalization in the period between 2015-2017. This long-term engagement has allowed me to gain important insights about the university's internationalization plans and activities, thus enhancing the validity of my findings.

Third, I also cross-checked data using different documentary and web sources. Fourth, I have also deliberately endeavored to seek rival explanations to find evidence that contradicts my interpretations. I did this by constantly thinking and trying other ways of organizing the data. Finally, I used peer debriefing during the study by sharing my insights and emerging findings with my supervisor, two faculty members and a couple of doctoral students in the department of Educational Policy Studies while documenting my learning in my journal.

To achieve *transferability*, I provided enough description of the context of the study. According to Guba (1981), inquiry in the naturalistic paradigm can be affected by situational uniqueness. Thus, to enable other researchers to judge the transferability of the findings of this study, I collected thick descriptive data from several data sources and developed a narrative about the context. To achieve both *dependability and confirmability*, I provided enough background about the study and identified the research problem including detailed description of the study methodology, sources of data,

sampling strategy, and data analysis techniques. Finally, as part of clarifying my bias as a researcher and where I was coming from, I clarified my worldviews and positionality at the outset of the study.

Limitations

This study had several limitations. First, although I originally invited 33 academics to participate in my study only 16 were willing to take part in the study. One limitation of this study was, therefore, the small number of academics involved in the study. This might suggest that only those who have positive stories to tell had participated in this study thus preventing us from a more balanced perspective on important issues raised in this study. Second, in spite of my efforts to increase the credibility of this study, I recognized that my values as researcher and my individual experience in higher education might influence the data and interpretations that were derived from the study.

Third, as with other case study research, the results of this study were not generalizable to a large population of academics in the university. However, this study had provided a nuanced meaning of internationalization as well as the values driving it within the context of institutionally-mandated strategic international research partnerships. Finally, while I offered important conclusions in this study on the meaning and rationales of internationalization as well as the perceived impact of internationalization on participants' professional practices, these results were based largely on the perspectives of participants who participated in two partnerships in the university. This calls for the need to conduct further studies on how internationalization plays out in faculty-based collaborations as well as those based on individual faculty members' own initiatives.

Summary

This chapter dealt with the methodology employed in this study. It began by outlining the underlying assumptions of the naturalistic paradigm that are particularly pertinent to this study. This was followed by a discussion of the qualitative case study design chosen for the study and how this design is particularly appropriate to achieve the purpose of this study. I have also stated the ontological and epistemological underpinning of the study. As well, I have made my positionality clear. A good section of the chapter was also devoted to a discussion of the broader context within which the present study is

situated including national provincial and institutional contexts. Subsequent sections of the chapter then dealt with the selection of the participants, the research site, and the sources of data. Finally, the chapter dealt with ethical issues, trustworthiness and limitations of the study.

CHAPTER IV:

The Meanings of and Rationales for Internationalization

I begin this section by bringing to the fore the ways in which participating faculty members made sense of internationalization within their context and how they rationalized their involvement in the partnerships. The research questions upon which the analysis in this section was grounded were: 'How do faculty members at the University of Alberta who have been engaged in strategic international research partnerships with overseas universities understand internationalization?', and "What are the rationales underpinning their engagement in the partnerships?". The analysis yielded several themes that highlighted the multiple realities participants have had of internationalization.

Internationalization as a Cross-border Activity/Exchange of Experiences

A dominant view among many participants was the idea that internationalization was mainly a series of cross-border exchanges of experiences between people. These involved student exchanges, collaboration with overseas partners through joint research projects, international student recruitment and student/faculty travel. Across interviews, participants employed descriptors such as "exposure", "openness", "connections", "travel", "collaboration", and "international conferences" to make sense of internationalization as a cross-border sharing of experiences. Yet four key categories stood out as representing the essence of participants' notions of internationalization as a cross-border exchange of experiences. These are exposure, student-exchanges, collaboration, and communication/connection.

Exposure. A common interpretation of internationalization to many participants was that it was an exposure to an overseas location in which they and their students experienced a new culture, new conditions and a new system of doing things. For example, when asked about his conception of internationalization, one participant said, "for me it means ... as a natural scientist, as a soil scientist, it means being exposed to conditions, natural conditions in another part of the world" (William, N/N). William spoke of how his exposure to Bolvania "help[ed] [him]better understand [his]science and its application to various environmental problems".

Likewise, Brian, a participant with the Bolvania and Moktovar partnership described internationalization as "more of exposure" to research carried out in other contexts. For Peter (N/N), internationalization meant "to get out and do things in the rest of the world".

Not only was internationalization presented as an exposure /experience beyond one's borders, but for certain professions, this exposure was considered an indispensable part of one's job, without which academic work is rendered unthinkable. As one participant explained,

> Well for earth science, you have to work overseas. I studied plate tectonics which is a lot of questions about volcanoes and earthquakes, and you really can't answer those questions completely by just saying you are going to restrict yourself to the geographical area of Canada. We have earthquakes in Canada. They are very rare but we can understand the same process that can cause a bigger earthquake in Canada by working in other places…I would say working internationally is a huge part of what I do because science is truly global. We have to look at different parts of the planet to understand a phenomenon… so for me working internationally is a huge part of what I do. I don't think I could do [academic work] if I wasn't working internationally. (Morgan N/N)

At times, international exposure becomes a matter of necessity when partners with similar expertise are not found in the home university. For example, Dustin (N/S) said,

> To my knowledge, I don't know who within Canada I need to work with. [The lab[oratory] I have is a unique lab in Canada. There were two labs in the US…two in Europe, [and]one in Japan. To do [collaborative] research, I naturally have to go international. It is that simple.

Dustin noted how internationalization, as an exposure to an overseas location, was a "big, flashy, regular friend" for him. As vital as internationalization was to his field, he pointed out that he could do nothing without it as "the job itself has evolved to a stage where it involves international components at multiple levels and angles". Dustin's sentiment was also echoed by another participant who described internationalization as a crucial part of his professional pursuits. He said, "for me, it [internationalization] is part of breathing; it's natural" (Derrick, N/N).

Student exchanges/Study abroad experiences. Student exchanges was an element that nearly all participants saw as an integral part of internationalization. This was seen as being of immense benefit to students. Some participants expressed pride in the sheer number of international students they have managed to attract into their research programs. One participant told me, "Over the last five years… I've had…20 Bolvanian students visit here… there are about four here right now. There were six or seven earlier in here. Prior to that I had four or five" (Frasor, N/N). Some participants commented that international experiences would provide their students with valuable opportunities to develop cross-cultural competencies which many employers see as important, thereby facilitating students' successful transition to gainful employment after graduation. Because of the value placed on student exchanges, some participants indicated that they actively search for ways and means of providing overseas experiences for their students as part of their training. According to one participant, providing an overseas experience for his students "is probably far more valuable than some of the more abstract mathematical courses they might take. They are actually seeing how life is on the rest of the planet. (Morgan, N/N)

The underlying value of student exchanges has been located within the globalization discourse of a "shrinking world" and "a flat world" in which cultural competence is constructed as a sine quo non for successful engagement in a multicultural world. Many participants believed that in our increasingly global world, many of their students will not end up working within the borders of Canada. Students are expected to be more culturally aware, globally engaged, and requiring important skills that will help them function successfully in different contexts.

Indeed, the fact that study abroad experiences are particularly important for students' overall learning experiences was a dominant theme running across the University of Alberta's internationalization agenda. As former president of the University, Indira Samaraksera put it,

> Students immersed in another culture, in another part of the world where there is
> a different set of challenges, come back with a much more complete experience.
> It helps them to develop entrepreneurial spirit, a cultural understanding, empathy,
> a sense of gratitude for what they have. It also helps them to develop a sense of

obligation, because if they want to preserve the quality of democracy we have, then they're going to have to work at it. From a very personal point of view, I think that is critical. (cited in Cook, 2015, para. 6)

It was also a view clearly endorsed by the university's successive *Comprehensive Institutional Plans* (The University of Alberta, 2014, 2015, 2016a). For example, both the 2014 *Comprehensive Institutional Plan (p. 48*) and 2015 *Comprehensive Institutional Plan* (p. 61) indicate study abroad experiences as ways to "meet employer expectations in Canada and abroad". Both plans explicitly state that "graduates need the knowledge, skills, and understanding to function effectively in a global marketplace". The plans also indicate that "students [themselves]expect their university education to prepare them well for international opportunities". Overall, it remains that study abroad experiences are seen as mechanisms by which students are equipped "with the necessary knowledge and skills to be successful in an increasingly global environment" (The University of Alberta, 2016a, p. 75).

Collaboration. Throughout the interviews, internationalization was also made evident in the language of "collaboration" which, according to many participants, entails a pooling of resources, reciprocity and mutualism between the parties that are partnering. One participant stated: "Internationalization means to me that I don't work in isolation. It means that I am internationalizing my work to incorporate the views and values and the actual efforts of other people in other countries" (Linda, N/N). Another participant noted how internationalization was basically a collaboration "with partners from other countries on topics of common interest" (Jeremy, N/S). Jeremy argued that the interaction and collaboration between the partners, working together toward a common goal, was capable of producing an effect that was greater than the sum of their individual efforts. Another participant (Liam, N/N) held a similar view. He talked about how "finding people with common interest to work together to solve problems" was at the heart of internationalization.

Still another participant pointed out that for him internationalization meant "developing a collaboration" (Chester, N/N, N/S) with partner institutions located overseas. According to him, international partnerships had to be made after a serious and

careful assessment of the areas of strengths of the partner with an eye to gain returns that were meaningful and worth the effort.

One point that was clearly apparent during interviews was how collaboration was interpreted to mean partnerships between the University of Alberta and institutions of the same or higher stature. Several participants from the Moktovar partnership spoke about the value of partnering with a top-tier university in Moktar. This, as they saw it, was important as a way of maximizing their own knowledge and skills. The idea of collaboration as "cooperation" with an institution of a lower status never came up throughout the interviews. Instead, a pervasive view was how international partnerships were to be used as a strategy to enhance the university's competitive advantage.

Connections/communication. Internationalization was also described and understood in terms of open and unconstrained communication and connection across borders. For instance, one participant, (Eddie N/S), asserted that in his particular field international conferences were ideal forums wherein professors and students from many countries would come together, exchange ideas, and get to know each other's work. Thus, this meant that "we are not building a dome and doing our own thing. We are opening it up to the world" (Linda, N/N).

Terms in the discourse of globalization such as a "borderless world", and a "flat world" are also invoked to describe internationalization as an activity involving global connections and transnational communication. This view is well captured by one participant who spoke about how, subsequent to the coming of the internet and modern air travel, "the world truly became flat" (Derrick, N/N). He noted that national borders have now become "virtual". He talked about how "people no longer have countries or institution as a border now" as communication technologies and high-speed air travel revolutionized the manner in which we interact and communicate in a globalized world.

Internationalization as Learning

Another way in which faculty members made sense of internationalization is through the concept of learning. All participants acknowledged that learning in the globalized age is a process where partners located in different parts of the world collaborate and learn from each other's expertise. Throughout the interviews many

participants spoke of internationalization as a "two-way street", involving "complementarity" and "knowledge-sharing" where partners become both sources and recipients at the same time as they engage in an up-front and authentic collaboration. A more in-depth analysis revealed three interrelated concepts/categories subsumed under participant's view of internationalization as learning, i.e., knowledge-sharing, increased intercultural understanding and development of community/trust.

Knowledge-sharing. Many participants deemed knowledge-sharing as an essential element of internationalization. The idea of "knowledge-sharing" was an important one for participants as it was aligned to notions of reciprocity and mutuality between partners as they engage in research whose benefits accrue to both parties. "Knowledge-sharing" is defined in the literature as a process "through which knowledge is channeled between a source and a recipient" (Cummings, 2003, p. 6). It has as its purpose "to transfer source knowledge successfully to a recipient" (p. 7). It has been suggested that,

> In most knowledge-sharing situations, reciprocal knowledge exchanges, rather than one-way knowledge transfers, are either sought or occur. Nonetheless, even in reciprocal exchanges, each party is at times either a source or a recipient with respect to what they are sending or receiving. (p. 7)

A key point is how *all* participants involved in both the North/North and North/South partnership witnessed reciprocity and complementarity in their engagements. All participants vehemently asserted that there was not a one-way flow of knowledge and practices from North to South. Neither partner, in their views, had been a sole source nor a mere recipient but acted in both roles at the same time. The views of two participants in the Bolvania and Moktovar partnerships sums it all up: "They help us. We help them…We are learning from each other" (Jessica, N/S), and "We learned from Bolvanians and the Bolvanians learned from us" (Linda, N/N).

One important observation was how knowledge-sharing was at the core of the participants psyche as was evident in their narratives of the benefits of their international engagement. Most participants talked about their international experiences with great interest, of how invaluable their experiences had been in boosting their scientific

knowledge and its application. One participant who was engaged in the University of Albeta-Moktovar research partnership stated that he cherished his collaboration with professors from the partners' overseas university. He recognized that the partnership was between two countries at different stages of economic and social development. He talked about how Moktovar was at a relatively low level of development compared to Canada in many respects. Yet, he contended that this disparity was getting fuzzier due to the narrowing of the digital divide. He stated that the university in Moktovar where his partners are from was one of the best in the global league table, particularly in his field. As a result, he found it professionally enlightening to be engaged in a partnership of this sort. He stated, "For sure, we are better in one area, for example, in the management side of things, but they could be doing better in the knowledge of the field. We have some things they don't have. They have some things we don't have. Internationalization is not a one-way street nowadays" (Eddie, N/S).

This notion of internationalization as knowledge-sharing and involving reciprocal learning was also emphasized by another participant (Brian, N/N, N/S) who saw learning as a critical component of internationalization in both the North-North and North-South research partnerships at the university. He indicated that learning new ways of doing things from international partners is predominantly what internationalization was all about. He saw knowledge-sharing as "the gist" of internationalization.

Another participant held a similar view. He argued that there was a great deal of reciprocity and mutuality in the exchanges with his partners. The net result for everybody was an increase in learning. Internationalization, he believed, was "an exchange of ideas, an exchange of personnel and an exchange of expertise between multiple different universities situated in different countries" (Fred, N/N).

Intercultural understanding. The view of internationalization as learning is also embedded in the opportunities it provides for enhancing intercultural understanding. Some participants noted how the need for intercultural understanding becomes more important as we continue to live in a world of increasing diversity. They saw internationalization as indispensable for promoting understanding and tolerance among people. For example, speaking about his perspectives on internationalization, one participant emphasized how "getting to know people" from diverse cultural

backgrounds is important as a way of "addressing some issues that are scary for society" such as cultural conflicts. He brought to the fore issues of empathy, openness, and respect for others' cultures and world view, important dimensions of learning in a globalizing age. He saw internationalization as a process of "growing through interaction with people from other cultural backgrounds". He noted that learning could take place as we become more "open", "appreciative" and "being respectful" of others' opinions and cultural backgrounds.

Frasor went on to argue that a good deal of learning took place from such kinds of interactions which were based on respect and understanding. He said, when one "gets down to the technical aspects of it, everybody brings something different to the table. You can learn from everybody." He noted that this did not necessarily mean that one should agree with everybody's opinion. Rather, it meant that everybody's position should be well respected. He talked about how, for example, "People may have different religious backgrounds and religious beliefs that you may not agree with but you should respect them". He provided an example of his experience in which he highlighted how attending to cultural and religious diversity with due respect was particularly important as we go on living our daily lives in a multicultural society. He told me how he always behaved respectfully toward one of his post-doctoral students who prayed every day in the middle of the day. He said, "I would never, never in a million years dream of saying, 'Sorry, you can't go with that time of day because we have to have a meeting'". He spoke about how we all had our own "different beliefs and feelings" and "we don't necessarily agree with each other". Yet, he argued, it was high time that we became tolerant and respectful of diversity amongst us. As he saw it, "that's the way we all win".

The idea of internationalization as learning also finds expressions through its benefits not only to participating professors but to students as well. As Frasor pointed out, when students were more exposed to a different learning environment than they are used to, they learn not only new skills and knowledge but the new experience itself provides them with an ample opportunity to critically reflect on their own attitudes toward learning. He told me how "cultural issues" and differences in the "learning structure" or "the research structure" across countries was different and how

"that introduces a lot of challenges" to students and to professors as well. He shared me the story of one of his international graduate whom he supervised. She told him how it took her three years to figure out the differences in the academic culture between her home university and the University of Alberta. She told him, in his role as her PhD supervisor, how she was expecting him to direct her every step in the writing of her PhD research on a daily basis until she discovered that she was actually expected to work independently much of her time. On his part, he told her how things were different in his university. He told her, "A PhD adviser will give you an idea or a broad project and then it's your job in Canada to push that forward." (Frasor, N/N). Frasor emphasized how meaningful and invaluable this experience had been to his student to learn to work independently and to develop higher order thinking skills. He stated that although this could be a painful experience for her given her background, she ultimately benefitted. In his thinking, such learning "puts a lot of responsibility on her". She had been taught to think "independently" and her "critical thinking" skills developed.

Frasor then summarized what all this internationalization experience meant to him and his student. Both learned and grew as one shaped the other. He stated, "she's grown intellectually and professionally, and I've grown. I now understand that way of thinking. Again, I don't necessarily agree with it but at the same time I understand where it's coming from" (Frasor, N/N).

Collaborative learning/Community. Internationalization was also spoken of as the coming together of people working harmoniously and in concert to achieve a common goal through collaborative learning. In this view, internationalization was not simply portrayed as a collective effort invested in the production of scientific knowledge or a mere knowledge-sharing endeavour but was also seen as an opportunity to build a global community of people engaged in a planned effort to fight the most serious problems plaguing contemporary society. One participant, for example, indicated that the "common goal" he and his partners from Bolvania are working towards was ultimately "for the benefit of humanity". He noted how the results of his and his partners' research will benefit not only the province of Alberta but "the whole mining community in the world". Another participant agreed how it

was important "to see the planet as one big community where we build, learn and teach each other" (Linda, N/N). She pointed out that the partnerships was a way of learning from each other and conquering big problems together through collective effort.

Participants saw themselves actively engaged in a collaborative intellectual effort to learn from one another's resources and skills. As such, this type of learning was contrasted with individual learning. Some participants indicated that they and their institutions had limitations in resources and expertise that were met by the partners and vice versa.

Central to the view of collaborative learning was the concept of "community" in which partners freely communicate and learn in an ethic of openness and utmost honesty. As one participant commented about his research partnership, he had this to say,

> All of us are working together on something…it's the building of community, pushing things forward. We're not afraid of telling each other you're full of it. If someone makes a mistake or is wrong, we're perfectly comfortable with each other and we'll just tell each other, that's the beauty of it. It's fun. (Frasor, N/N)

Extension of academic horizons. Some participants mentioned that international engagement helps broaden their experiences and perspectives on a wide array of issues that are pertinent to their academic pursuits. Some pointed out that international engagement had benefits that far outweighed its costs as it provided them high-quality academic experience and gave their students' opportunities for developing learning new skills.

For example, when asked pointed questions about the rationales that informed his involvement in international research partnerships, one participant pointed to his academic goals. Internationalization, he stated, "help[s] me better understand my science and its application to various problems, environmental problems, agricultural problems things like that" (William, N/N). He talked about how he was driven by a "professional, personal interest" into the Bolvania partnership. He explained, "It [the partnership] is in my research area. So, I was interested in participating … I was attracted to it because of research interest and it allowed me to recruit graduate

students and produce scientific publications and stuff …it facilitated my research…programme". Liam (N/N) stated that, "You get a lot of experience, you get a lot of knowledge and a lot of exposure". He pointed out that involvement in the partnership provided an opportunity of "increasing the breadth of my knowledge, my training, [and] my experience".

Likewise, Fred (N/N) cited extension of his academic horizons as a rationale. He explained that, "Bolvania is very, very advanced in research and capabilities. So, collaborating with very advanced researchers is a good way to expand [my academic] horizons… it expands my knowledge in different ways" (Fred, N/N). Another participant, Charles (N/N), acknowledges that Bolvania is very well known for its "capacities and capabilities". Particularly important for him was, however, how the Bolvanian researchers were dealing with similar environmental problems as those faced by researchers in Alberta. "So, we can learn from their experiences…. This is one of the reasons why we wanted to work with Bolvania".

Engaging in an international partnership also becomes a means of capacity building, benchmarking and expanding one's learning. Linda (N/N) noted, for example, how in Bolvania she "learned some of the techniques that they [her partners] employed in doing their research". She said,

> I found that they were using some sophisticated methods that I had not used, for example. Some of the monitoring that they were doing was with drone technology and I wasn't doing anything like that. It was an eye opener for me to say, "Oh, wow, I didn't think that people were that advanced in doing their field monitoring in this way"

One participant (Brian, N/N, N/S) pointed out that he became interested in the Bolvania and Moktovar partnerships when he found out about the "kind of research they are doing". He spoke about how he was in a position where he could no longer advance his research significantly if he did not expand his network of contacts and learn from "other jurisdictions". He said that the lack of people with similar research interests at the University of Alberta "was one of the key drivers that…got [him] involved in the [Bolvania and Moktovar] partnerships". He told me, "There was no

body in the University of Alberta working in the area of research [that I am interested in]".

Some participants pointed to the academic benefits of the "networks" they had managed to maintain with oversees colleagues. For example, Dustin (N/S) noted that going international was important for him in search of colleagues with expertise in his specific area of research. He talked about how for people "working in science and engineering, internationalization was "a natural way of life". It had become an integral "part of the job". He spoke about how as a professor at a university it was important for him to "focus on a relatively narrow area within a discipline". The problem, though, as he described it, became "when I look around I find… only a limited number of people working in this [narrow]area.". Naturally, therefore, "if I want to find some people to [discuss my research with], [I] go to international conferences… [There] I find my true colleagues … I can find a better match…with respect to complementary expertise and common interests".

Another participant's (Charles, N/N) rationales for internationalization pointed to academic rationales. Charles stated that the two partners brought together their accumulated knowledge in order to find solutions to their common environmental challenges. He talked about how the two partnering countries had "commonalities" in the "biggest issues" they were facing in their respective locales, i.e., pollutants that cause environmental damage. He pointed out that the project he was working on was part of a concerted scientific effort "to deal with pollutants" including "hydrocarbon pollution" in the two countries. The results brought scientific solutions to the problems the two partners faced. Charles' rationale points to how internationalization is increasingly adapting itself to meet new global challenges in areas such as environmental pollution that require more collaboration between partners.

It was also interesting to note how the search for interdisciplinary knowledge was cited as a rationale for international engagement. For example, speaking of his rationales for his international engagement, Dustin talked about how research "is increasingly becoming interdisciplinary" necessitating one to work, at times, with "someone whose expertise is in a different discipline…to solve a problem". For Dustin, disciplinary knowledge puts a limit on what one can do to "to figure out a solution" to a scientific

problem. Dustin pointed out that one did not necessarily need to "go international" to find people with a different disciplinary background. However, he argued that when one goes international, one has "more options" to "find people with common interest to work together to solve a problem".

Similarly, Jeremy (N/S) indicated how through "working across disciplines" he envisaged developing his understanding of how "different elements" of a problem interact. As a person interested in pollution abatement technologies, he pointed how, by working with people with different disciplinary backgrounds, they could be in a better position to "design better [social] policies". For Jeremy, approaching a scientific problem with a singular disciplinary orientation could, at times, lead to a "very incomplete view" of problems which would subsequently lead to a "very wrong policy". In fact, for Jeremy, the only participant from applied sciences, the benefits of internationalization could also be seen not only from the point of view of the design of better social policies but also for better identification of problems as well. In his thinking, the more interdisciplinary the composition of faculty members in international partnerships, the better they would be in a position to identify the right problems to be tackled.

Internationalization as Branding and Reputation Building

When participants were asked about their perspectives of internationalization, many noted that internationalization, particularly as it manifested within the context of the two partnerships, was principally a promotion and branding exercise. In such a context, branding was considered important for enhancing reputation, visibility and ranking, as well as revenue generation by attracting students from across the globe.

Further analysis has shown that two categories are evident in the view of internationalization as branding and reputation building: (1) Institutional branding and reputation building, and (2) enhancement of personal reputation/profile.

Institutional branding and reputation building. Branding the university has been part and parcel of the internationalization agenda of the University of Alberta as a review of key institutional documents on internationalization have demonstrated. For example, one of the key strategies of the University of Alberta's Moktovar strategy is to "raise the University of Alberta's institutional profile in Moktovar" (Huang, 2016, p. 16).

For some participants, to brand the University of Alberta to an international level was one of the most salient purposes of the two partnerships. For example, Chester who was a member of both the North-North and North-South teams, spoke about "profile building" as an important objective of internationalization at the University of Alberta.

It is striking to note how participants in a North/North and North/South partnerships both tended to see branding and profile building as an important part of their international engagement. For example, William, a participant in North/North partnership acknowledged that the research partnership was aimed at branding the university. As he saw it, the partnership was "part of the branding agenda of the University of Alberta…getting the University's name outside Canada".

Tony, a participant who talked passionately about his extensive relations with Moktovar professors, held that internationalization had a lot to do with institutional branding. He noted that in the University of Alberta's context, internationalization "is for key universities around the world to know what we do at the University of Alberta, [our] excellence, and particular areas where we 're really excellent". He continued saying that from the perspective of the University of Alberta, "it [internationalization] is getting our name there". It is, in his view, about "people around the world, key partners knowing where we are".

Another participant echoed the same sentiment. As he put it, the objective of internationalization was "ultimately…to brand [the] university, [to]let the world know what we are capable of doing, [including] the infrastructure available, [the] kind of courses we offer, all those aspects" (Brian, N/N, N/S). He continued stating how the university's effort at branding itself ultimately contributed to the provincial economy by drawing more international students to Alberta. He noted that the key purpose of both partnerships was "branding" and "to develop interest among other people to come in and study here in the University of Alberta".

Dustin(N/S) indicated that the Moktovar partnership in which he participated was part of the drive "to raise the University of Alberta's international profile" and, in so doing, to make the university more visible than it was on the international scene. He talked how "the world is becoming a smaller place" and how a global tide of fierce

93

competition for "talent" among universities was surging. He reinforced the view of other participants that there was nothing wrong with competition and marketing in higher education. He argued, "branding was part of the game" that the University of Alberta had to play best to attract the top talent from around the world. He saw "branding" as important for the university to stay on course in a highly competitive global context. Another participant understood internationalization as an element of competition for status by drawing the best minds to the university. He stated, "Internationalization in my view is about attracting the best talent from an international arena…bringing in the brightest students and faculty from across the world and it is ultimately making our institution the best university to go to" (Eddie, N/S).

Although Eddie believed that internationalization could be employed as a means to facilitate intercultural understanding, he told me that this was not the main rationale for internationalization initiatives at the University of Alberta. As he saw it, internationalization at the university was driven more by "reputation" than just "cultural exchanges".

Speaking of branding, participants also spoke of how increasing the visibility of the institution was important to enhance students' employment opportunities outside their province and beyond. As for Fred (N/N), for example, branding the university "increases…[the] global impact of [the university] … [as well as its] ranking…[and] visibility", which ultimately translates into expanding students' employment opportunities. According to Fred, it was important "for the University of Alberta to start having more international visibility because this will help students to get better jobs in the future". He argued that, "If the university does not have international visibility, students will not get any jobs. They cannot all live in Edmonton".

Enhancement of personal reputation/profile. For some faculty members, internationalization for personal branding and international recognition is an important ideal to be pursued. For example, one participant stated that engaging in international research partnerships afforded him an opportunity to promote his stature as well as publicizing the kind of research he did. He stated, "Research is more of … publicizing the type of research that I do…. That definitely is what is attractive to me.

And that helps in improving my stature as a researcher" (Brian, N/N, N/S). For Brian, to be part of the the Bolvania and Moktovar partnerships was a life-long dream come true. He pointed out that he really liked the idea of being "regarded as one of the international authorities" in his field. He spoke about how he became more conscious about promoting his "international stature" the more he became a "senior" member of the university. He stated how he became more passionate about "serving on different kinds of panels around the globe, and being part of an international collaboration with different countries". He acknowledged that the two partnerships helped him to enhance his international profile "quite a lot".

Tony, a participant in the Moktovar partnership noted that his international engagement had paid dividends in terms of enhancing his personal reputation due, in part, to his connection with a well-known and respected academic in the partner country. He explained how his international engagement in Moktovar had been of great interest to him and how it had contributed to his visibility in that country:

> My network is so extensive now in Moktovar. I know people everywhere and I just started with this one guy…and from there it just exploded. I met all these people and I came back to Canada and they invited me back for something …and I'm just constantly expanding my network there... So it's been really excellent professionally like just purely from a career advancement point of view. (Tony, N/S)

As many participants acknowledged, what was particularly important about the two international research collaborations was that they expanded their professional networks in many ways. They indicated that connections, relationships, and "who you know' really mattered, enhancing their networks even more. These all contributed to profile building for faculty members. As Tony indicated, his "collaborator in Moktovar [a renowned scientist globally]…that one person can spread the word about [his] research in his network in Moktovar…not only just Moktovar but around the world by inviting me to give lectures at various conferences that he is organizing". Tony noted that although internationalization has many features such as student exchanges, "the bottom line is internationalization is just spreading your brand around the world whether it's your personal brand or university brand ... I think that's it".

What was particularly noteworthy was how some participants saw the partnerships as opportunities for publishing academic papers in high impact journals with their partners, which also enhanced their professional reputations. For example, Jessica (N/S) emphasised how her name "spreads out" when "publishing a paper everyone knows". The following interview excerpt was also illustrative of how publishing in high-impact journals was part of the drive for internationalization.

> **Interviewer**: In your opinion, what are the outcomes of this research partnership so far?
> **Jeremy**: We have published multiple, very important, high-impact papers.
> **Interviewer**: Were these jointly published with your partners?
> **Jeremy**: Jointly, yes. High impact, very high impact.
> **Interviewer**: Is publishing in high impact journals one purpose of your international engagement?
> **Jeremy**: Yes
> **Interviewer**: How does publishing in high impact journals contribute to your professional growth?
> **Jeremy**: It helps your professional career because your paper is appreciated by a very broad community, you get very high citations, and your research is adopted by a lot of people.

Many participants acknowledged that they have an inherent desire to grow professionally and it was in their best interest to be part of a partnership which paid dividends in terms of academic excellence. Worthy of note was how all participants in the Moktovar partnership expressed their high regard for Zokundu University which was considered the MIT of Moktovar. It was, for all participants, a university known for its high-quality programs and for the competence of its professors. Many participants believed that it was professionally enlightening to partner with professors from Zokundu University as it provided an opportunity that improved their own profile and status. For example, one participant indicated,

> If you're looking at universities... Zokundu is ranked above the University of Alberta. If you look at the personal level, my collaborator in fact is better known than I am. This guy is a true world leader, like top ten probably top 20 chemist in the world. I am not top twenty yet…So, while the research that we're doing is equal, I think, his status is higher than my status, worldwide.

Narratives of international ranking and status also permeated participants' rationales for involvement in internationalization. This was most strongly felt by faculty members partnering with Zokundu University in Moktovar. It was indeed deeply satisfying for one participant (Eddie, N/S) to be part of this partnership. He talked about how this partnership was vital for enhancing not only his status as an academic but also for raising the profile and status of the University of Alberta. He noted,

> The rationale for our engagement is straightforward. The status of the university that we are partnering with is so important for us. The University of Alberta is well positioned to become a major international university and it is in the university's best interest to make such kind of global connections with the best universities in the world. We are collaborating with one of the best universities in the globe. …When you play basketball, it gives you some kind of psychological satisfaction to play with best players. The same is true here…working with the best professors in your field means a lot.

When I probed further asking Eddie what he meant by "a lot" when partnering with the best professors, he replied: "It [this partnership] has a huge impact on my work. It brings about prestige and reputation to the work I do".

Eddie's words reverberated with those of Lorne Babiuk, the University of Alberta Vice-president (Research), who, while commenting on the signing of the partnership between the University of Alberta and Zokundu University, said,

> The Moktovarians are very conscious of and know where the universities are in the hierarchy. And they aren't necessarily enamoured by a long history of reputation, which may be dwindling…They're interested in where you are today. They see the University of Alberta rising very rapidly in overall international reputation. And clearly Alberta is an energy province, the engine of a Canadian energy environment. The University of Alberta has leadership in energy, from extraction to welding technologies to water usage; the entire spectrum is being done here. The Moktovarians are status conscious as well, so they want to make sure they work with the best. (The University of Alberta, 2012, para. 8)

Babiuk's statement about the University's rise in international reputation underscores how ranking and reputation have increasingly become key factors in attracting partners.

In a similar fashion, Britta Baron, the University of Alberta Vice-Provost and Associate Vice-president (International), stated how important profile and status were in a world of higher education characterized by fierce competition: "Being seen as an international institution is important for rank, which in turn is important for reputation" (The University of Alberta, n.d.d., para. 11). She adds, "it is reputation that is critical for building intellectual capital" (para. 11). Her words reflect a growing global trend for status competition across universities. Universities around the world "are undertaking serious efforts to create an international reputation and name brand for their own institution or for a network/consortium to place them in a more desirable position for competitive advantage" (Knight, 2004, p. 21). Indeed, at the heart of the University of Alberta's plan for international engagement is the view that "international engagement enhances the reputation of the University" (The University of Alberta, 2010, p. 3).

Brian, a participant in the Bolvania and Moktovar partnerships held that the partnerships were particularly aimed at the University's "name branding" as well. Reflecting on his experience, he stated how the partnerships had contributed to the attainment of the university's international plans. He pointed out how "in Bolvania now, people [have come to] know …the University of Alberta, where it is, what kind of expertise [we] have". He pointed out how "very few people" outside the borders of Canada knew about the university when he came to join his department in the year 2000. He reasoned that the US rather than Canada "was predominantly the destination" for the best students in his native country. He talked about how things had drastically changed since then as "large number of students" had joined the University of Alberta from all corners of the world including those from his native country. He attributed this change to the deliberate effort of the university to brand itself which, he believed, was a worthwhile decision. He stated that "internationalization helps in …branding and then…[we] can attract … large number of people and better talent from around the world".

Another participant (William, N/N) stated how being "associated with a prestigious institute like the Fenanzax (Pseudonym) institute [in Bolvania]" was critical for "the branding of the University of Alberta as a research university".

Internationalization as empty rhetoric. Several participants saw the university's involvement in internationalization as nothing more than an empty rhetoric and, in

reality, not a new venture at all. Instead, they viewed internationalization as an integral part of university life, one that was already deeply ingrained in the day-to-day practices of the university. Thus, they saw the move to internationalize the university as a rather hollow endeavour. "The university is", according to Dustin (N/S), "already internationalized". He indicated how internationalization had been "a natural part of" university life for centuries although it was even more pronounced today.

Jeremy (N/S) pointed out that the name "university" had originated from the word "universe", implying the fact that universities had always engaged with the "universal", by which he meant the "global", as well as the international.

Another participant echoes the same sentiment as Justin and Jeremy in stating that internationalization has never been novel. Indeed, what is now called internationalization is, for this participant, just a repackaging of the "same old stuff", activities he and his professional colleagues were accustomed to do for long. He explained,

> Internationalization for me, yes, it's a buzz word …But for me, it's just, "Oh, well. Okay". We've always done things internationally. The journals are international …Even journals that have a country's name associated with it, like, The Canadian Journal for Chemical Engineering does not publish just Canadian papers, and it doesn't make use of just Canadian reviewers, it's international. Or the Journal of the American Chemical Society, well, it's not just America. Even the membership of these societies, it's international.
>
> The whole concept of internationalization for me, is almost something passé. Yes, of course we do. We have been doing it and so, somebody called it a name [laughs] What's the big deal? That's my opinion at least… It's just a name that people call something that already existed… Research is international; it has been for a very long time. It will continue to be so. Yes, I can use the term. But, it has always been like this. (Derrick, N/N)

What is important to note here is how the participants saw internationalization as something that naturally takes place as part of carrying out their formal roles in the university, rather than as one that should be deliberately introduced. These views of the participants are evocative of some of the recent criticisms of internationalization. For example, Larsen's (2016a) pointed out how "[i]t is problematic to assume that the intercultural, international or global are "out there" beyond the university and

needs to be brought in, "infused or integrated into the teaching, research, and service functions of HEIs [higher education institutions]" (p. 4)

Internationalization for Financial Incentives

My interviews with some participants also indicated that as competition for research funding became increasingly fierce, they are, too, drawn by financial incentives to engage in the partnership that is not specifically in their area of interest and expertise. As one participant expressed, "money makes the world go around as far as these projects are concerned" (Frasor, N/N). He explained how the desire for research funding was a key factor for some people to get interested in the Bolvania partnership. His view was echoed by Linda (N/N) who argued that funding was a big incentive for members of her group to join the research partnership. She explained, "Well for some of them, for example, by getting the money, they could support another graduate student".

Referring to financial factors, one participant (Peter, N/N) stated that although "it is a hard thing" to find out the real reasons why people might be interested in some of these projects, "you're always going to get a percentage of the population of researchers who are in it for the wrong reasons". He talked about how there were some people "who will do the same thing over, and over, and over again" and send their grant applications to many places "to get money". Thus, Peter argued, "separating those at the beginning is often not easy because it does not appear that somebody should be interested [in the money as such]". According to Peter, no matter how hard one tries, one is "always going to end up with some people who, no matter what granting agency, are just going to take the money and run". This seemed to be the case for some faculty members involved in the Bolvania partnership. Morgan (N/N) indicated that in his view "a lot of people wanted to be involved in the project because it is easy money…here was a grant where basically you are guaranteed to get the money".

Indeed, according to Peter (N/N), "some of the PIs (principal investigators) and some of the (theme) leaders were there [in the partnerships] because it was easy money". Another participant lamented, "most people spend most of their time researching topics that are not interesting enough [for them]" merely because they were attracted to the partnership by "big money". However, Derrick (N/N) indicated that his comments should be seen from the proper perspective. For some, he said,

although the money was still appealing, they were primarily caught by a sense of duty. He explained,

> When senior people in the university come to me and say, "Well, we need you to do certain things". I think it would be wrong of me to say, "Oh, well go and sod off. I'm an academic, and I'm free, and I don't feel like doing it". It doesn't work this way.… The university still pays my salary and therefore, as an employee I have a certain duty to the university. (Derrick, N/N)

For some participants, funding appeared as an *opportunity* to be exploited in order to achieve their academic goals without which it would be difficult, if not impossible, to accomplish them. This was particularly so for those involved in the research partnership with Bolvania in which, according to many participants (and supported by the official documents), 20 million Canadian dollars was set aside for international research partnerships in energy and environment research.

William (N/N) underscored how the appeal of both the available research funding and the "flexibility" associated with it was important for him to recruit and support his three graduate students He stated,

> It was a good grant in the sense that it was quite well funded …and it was quite flexible in terms of the way you could spend the money within the different budget categories, compared to a lot of other grants. So, it was an attractive opportunity for a professor... I supported three graduate students with this funding and I also participated in …a supervisory committee of another PhD student through this funding.

Frasor (N/N) emphasized how attractive the funding was to advance his research program and to enhance his international profile. Describing his rationale for his involvement in the Bolvania partnership, he said,

> I have to be honest that some of it was there's research funding to push this forward.…When someone asks you to be involved in a way that you could actually grow your research program, grow your international profile and provide you with the way of supporting an aspect of your research that otherwise may not have been there, you're going to jump on it. It's an opportunity. (Frasor, N/N)

This was pointed out as being an instance of how funding bodies exert an influence over faculty members' research interests. Derrick (N/N) stated, "Research goes in the directions that the money dictates. And so, if there's money for specific things, then you adapt. Because the alternative is just, you don't do any [research]." He seemed to be highly critical of how governments were increasingly using funding as a device to channel research to their own agendas. He called this channeling a form of "brain prostitution". He explained,

> I mean, it costs me a lot of money to do my research. Just running my group costs me, yes, about $50,000 to $150,000 a month. That's a fair bit of money that I burn through every month. And, that money has to come from somewhere. And, if I only want to do things that I like, why would people give me money for just doing things that I like to do? And that's why I say there's brain prostitution… If I'm honest with myself, I'm not researching the things that I would like to research. And that is true with many of my colleagues as well.

Derrick offers a cogent account of how research funding can be used to entice faculty to engage in research that did not fall within their primary interests. He explained that research funding was one of the rationales that drove him to be part of the partnership in which he participated.

> Research takes funding and funding, money, normally comes with strings attached.…Research prostitution is something that's very alive and well in the hallowed corridors of the university. And so, if there's a large pot of money… we just become brain prostitutes.

Peter (N/N) admitted that his research within the Bolvania partnership was "more peripheral to my direct research interest".

However, some participants indicated that their reasons for getting involved in the partnership were because the research which was being funded clearly matched their interests and expertise. For example, Brian, (N/N, N/S) talked about how his involvement in the two partnerships was purely out of his desire to enhance his research programme. He maintained that he would never be interested to be part of a research collaboration for the sake of funding unless that collaboration fell within the purview of his research interest and expertise.

Liam (N/N) similarly indicated that there was no conflict between his research interests and expertise, and the funding priorities identified by the university and the Alberta Government. He stated that the research funding was indeed one of the factors that attracted him to the partnership. He stated, however, that he never compromised his research interest for the sake of monetary incentives. He pointed out that he needed funding badly to work on his area of research interest and he found the Bolvania partnership to be "a good opportunity to get funding from the government on a research area I am already working on".

After all what has been stated in this section, for most of the participants funding was a secondary rather than as a primary rationale for their international engagements.

Internationalization for increased intercultural competence

The idea that internationalization contributes for increased intercultural competence was emphasised by several participants. Intercultural competence is understood to mean "the ability to interact effectively and appropriately with people from other cultures" (Perry & Southwell, 2011, p. 455). For example, one participant explained how he had an inherent interest to learn about different cultures. He emphasized the role internationalization could contribute to the development of his intercultural competence. He spoke of how "science" and international "collaborations" after all are "about people" and "building relationships with people". He talked emphatically that international engagement, in the first place, "is not about the science; it is about the people". He argued that "the science will come" if these relationships are positive. He talked about how having an "international outlook" was important when dealing with people of different cultures. He explained, "Interacting with these people [his partners] teaches me and my students about the world we live in. It's just that simple". He talked about how a better world we could have if we went on enhancing our intercultural competence through internationalization.

Indeed, when asked pointed questions about whether the international engagement provides avenues for developing intercultural competencies, for example, many made comments such as: "That's very obvious" (Charles, N/N), "That becomes automatically

produced" (Chester, N/N, N/S), and "It comes naturally" as part of an international engagement (Dustin, N/S).

Tony commented on how his intercultural competence has improved over the years. He provided an example of how he attended to cultural diversity when it comes to his own teaching. He stated that his international experiences had "influenced… how [he] lectures" and how he communicates with his students in culturally appropriate ways. For example, he indicated that many of his students did not have "English as their first language". This meant that he is "always conscious of the way [he] talk[s], how [he] talk[s], and speaking clearly and slowly" to his students. He found this particularly important in order to communicate effectively with his exchange students from Moktovar.

The Bolvania Partnership as a "forced marriage"

What I found quite revealing as I continue to explore the meaning of and rationales for internationalization from the participants was how some of them found it difficult to articulate the rationales for their involvement in the international research partnerships. This was particularly evident among those involved in the Bolvania research partnership. They saw their engagement as stemming from a top-down initiative which had clear connections to provincial interests in energy and environment. Although participants held that it was part of their duty as academics to engage in a network of professional colleagues from outside their country whenever such opportunities arose, they saw this particular partnership as a "forced marriage," or a "marriage of convenience". As one participant (William N/N) explained, it was a partnership "that was organized by upper levels of administration and it wasn't necessarily a grassroots collaboration…there wasn't much input from the faculty". Derrick (N/N), in particular, noted that "the partnership did not leverage existing collaborations. It rather tried to engineer new collaborations, bringing people together from two continents to work together on problems". What "essentially" took place was, as Derrick eloquently articulated, "the parents talked and then the girl and the boy married. The marriage had nothing to do with the girl and the boy. It has to do with the parents talking about this. It was absolutely like this…. That marriage was made through the project and it was not a marriage that existed beforehand….It was a forced marriage". The result was, according

to Derrick, the partnership was a complete "failure…from an internationalization perspective". He explained,

> The test you can use is that this is now the first year that there is no funding for that project. How many of those collaborations are still going? And the answer is zero. The only collaboration … that is still going on [with Bolvania] is one with Dr. Harvey (Pseudonym). And that was a collaboration that existed before the Bolvania partnership and its continuing after the Bolvania partnership. And it was not part of the Bolvania partnership.

Another participant (Peter, N/N) agreed with Derrick's assessment, pointing to how

> forced collaborations tend to not work for the most part…. They're marriages of convenience, so the Bolvania partnership is an example. I don't know how many long-- once the funding stops, how many of those collaborations continued. If they continued, then that continuation would be a measure of success of that international existence. I've never been told of what level of continuation of those international collaborations has been.

My interviews with other participants in the Bolvanian partnership however revealed mixed messages. While some agree with the sentiment expressed by Derrick and Peter above, that they have reached a dead end in their partnership because of lack of funding, others stated that their partnerships were still active but only for the lack of funding. In fact, all the participants admitted to the changes in the Bolvanian internal politics where the extraction of oil sands had had bad publicity in that country, leading for their Bolvanian counterparts not to be able to get the necessary funding for their research. This, they believed, had later produced a ripple effect on the willingness of the Albertan government to release funds for their own research.

Derrick commented that a bottom-up approach to international partnerships was better than a top-down approach. He pointed out that "all academics have a network that is international" and thus if the university "wants to internationalize, so that there is a high level of collaboration with people outside of Canada, it should leverage on those personal relationships and those interactions that already exist". However, according to Derrick, this did not happen in the Bolvania partnership because it was basically "a politically driven program" where "senior powers in the university and the government" in both countries had the upper hand in the decision-making process. Indeed, according to

Derrick, the partnership only "moved ahead because that was what the politicians wanted". Reflecting on his overall experience, he sated,

> The research was successful .... we did some good research at the end of the day.... and in terms of engaging industry and leveraging the money ultimately to engage industry and benefiting oil sands and coal, well that was successful....So, I think the taxpayer got their money's worth in Canada for what they put in from a research perspective but not from an internationalization perspective.

Juxtaposing Participants' and Institutional Definitions of Internationalization

In order to probe deeply into faculty members' perspectives on internationalization and to analyze whether their conceptions of internationalization agree with or differ from the institution's internationalization, I asked participants in this study about their perspectives on the definition of internationalization adopted by the University of Alberta. As part of this procedure, I gave to each participant the university's working definition of internationalization in writing during the interview sessions. The definition read: "Internationalization is a process of integrating intercultural, international and global dimensions into the teaching, research and service function of the university". As I pointed out in Chapter II, this definition, adopted from two widely cited internationalization scholars (Knight ,2004; and de wit, 2002), was also the most widely used definition of internationalization in the literature and one that was broadly adopted in Canadian higher education.

Once participants had been asked about their opinions on the definition of internationalization, a follow up question also inquired about their views on how well the university's definition of internationalization described what they did as part of their international engagement in the context of the two partnerships.

Two groups of responses were apparent. First, the majority of participants indicated that they were perfectly happy with the definition and saw no problem in it. The fact that the definition was "a good definition" of internationalization was a common response to this group of participants. They all agreed that the definition accurately described what they were doing in their partnerships. However, as later analyses revealed, many participants expressed the view that they did not deliberately

attempt to integrate intercultural, international, and global dimensions into their courses.

On the other hand, two respondents remarked that the definition needed some fleshing out. Charles (N/N) suggested that "integration" should be clearly spelled out in the definition. He drew a distinction between what he called "real internationalization", one which involves student exchanges, collaboration with overseas partners and attracting international students, and "abstract internationalization", internationalization that appeared on paper and far removed or detached from the day to day practices.

Another participant (Peter, N/N) expressed particular discomfort with the university's definition of internationalization. He stated that the definition was an "inward-looking" definition as the word "integrating" seemed to suggest. Although Peter believed that integration was a crucial aspect of internationalization, he told me that the bulk of internationalization needed to focus on a cross-border collaboration, "image building" and "selling" the university to the entire world. He talked about the importance of trying to be more "outward-looking" in a globalizing world and to make concerted efforts to "brand" the university to the external world.

Overall, one striking observation was how most participants in this study seemed to agree with the definition of internationalization employed by the university and at the same time hold onto a view of internationalization that was broader than the definition and included the elements of "branding", "image building", "selling" and building of personal reputation in their understanding.

Juxtaposing Participants' and Institutional Rationales for Internationalization

With the intent of addressing the second research question, I drew on interview data to explore the rationales for internationalization from the perspective of participants. Yet, in an effort to juxtapose these rationales with those of the institution's rationales for internationalization and, in a way, provide "context" to "content" (Stake, 2010), I find it important to analyze the "official" rationales for internationalization offered by the University of Alberta. I will then analyze the extent to which the study participants' rationales compare with the institution's rationales.

At the heart of an institution's internationalization efforts lies the rationales that inform its engagement. What are the rationales that underpin internationalization at the University of Alberta? From a content analysis of several key strategic documents and official pronouncements produced by the University it can be gleaned that academic, economic, as well as socio/cultural rationales have been offered as rationales for internationalization. Among the most important legitimations offered for internationalization include the desire to enhance its reputation and world standing: "Different universities have different rationales for their internationalization plans. At the University of Alberta, internationalization is primarily expected to drive the reputation of the university and to further improve its worldwide standing" (The University of Alberta, 2010, p. 2).

On the other hand, the University recognizes that, "International engagement is a key academic strategy to improving the quality of teaching, learning, and research" (The University of Alberta, n.d.c, para. 2). But a comprehensive list of the rationales for internationalization has been explicitly stated in the *International Resource Document for the Academic Plan 2011-2015* (The University of Alberta, 2010, p. 2). Accordingly, the rationales are to:

- Bring additional opportunities and resources in and from other countries that will enhance the University's research outcomes;
- Attract highly talented and motivated researchers, professors, students, and staff from around the world;
- Enrich the teaching programs through international content and international modes of delivery;
- Project the University as an institution that is actively reaching out to partners around the globe to address worldwide challenges and take responsibility as a global institutional citizen, committed to improving the wellbeing, prosperity, health, and safety of people in Alberta, in Canada, and around the world;
- Develop the University into a worldwide hub of research and learning opportunities and create a truly global learning community;
- Transform the University into a microcosm of global citizenship with a strong commitment to seeking mutual understanding and respect between cultures,

fostering curiosity and open mindedness in learning about people from all around the world; and

- Associate the University with other world-leading institutions and become an active member of the most distinguished international scholarly networks.

Although it can be argued that most of the rationales in the above list are academic rationales, economic and socio/cultural rationales are also evident. This may suggest that despite increasing criticism of universities' internationalization efforts being motivated by commercial interests, at least at the rhetoric level, the University of Alberta's international objectives are driven more by academic and socio/cultural rather than economic interests.

Summary

This chapter dealt with the meaning of and rationales for internationalization from the perspective of study participants. Participants interpreted internationalization as a cross border activity/exchange of experiences between partners with a different set of experiences from their own. Internationalization was also a means to the enhanced learning that takes place as partners exchange knowledge and information across a spectrum of issues. Further, internationalization was also understood as branding the university internationally as well as a means of enhancing personal profile and status for the participants. Other themes that emerged from the data included the view of internationalization as a means for financial incentives and for increased intercultural understanding.

Most of the participants were in agreement with the University of Alberta's definition of internationalization. Two participants indicated that the definition was insufficient. In their views, it lacked specificity about what integration might mean. The definition was also seen as inappropriately inward-looking definition, focused more on integration of the international dimension rather than encouraging a more outward-looking engagement with the outside world.

Analyses of the rationales for internationalization at the University of Alberta found out academic, economic, and socio-cultural rationales. While it could be said that there are many commonalities in the institution's rationales for internationalization and those articulated by participating faculty members, one area

of discrepancy was in relation to how some participants saw internationalization as a means for enhancing their own personal profile and status. Since participants were asked as to their own personal rationales for internationalization, such a discrepancy in rationales is not surprising.

An important point to keep in mind in this chapter is to note how the rationales for internationalization often overlap with the very conceptions of internationalization offered by participants. This is not merely idiosyncratic to this group of participants but illustrates a prevailing point raised extensively in the literature on internationalization. The definitions of internationalization used in the literature of higher education, more often than not, are coupled with the reasons for internationalization. This is why de Wit (2010) has pointed out that

> When we talk about internationalization, it is important to distinguish the question of why we are internationalizing higher education, from what we mean by internationalization…. And in much literature meanings and rationales are confused, in the sense that often a rationale for internationalization is presented as a definition of internationalization. (p. 9)

It is therefore important to reiterate at this point that while internationalization, as stated in Chapter I, is often understood as "a process of integrating an intercultural, international, and global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education" (Knight, 2004, p. 11), the rationales "reflect the aspirational values for internationalization at points in time" (Hudzik, 2015, p. 46). Indeed, the interest to examine rationales for internationalization points to the widely-endorsed view that internationalization is a means to an end and not an end in itself (Green 2012; Hudzik, 2015; Knight, 2012).

CHAPTER V:

Impact of International Engagement on Faculty Members' Professional Practices

At a time when internationalization has increasingly become an "institutional imperative" (Hudzik, 2011, p. 7), and a "mainstreamed goal of almost every higher education institution" (Yemini & Gladi, 2015, p. 423), it behooves us to examine its ultimate worth to faculty members' professional teaching and research practices. In an effort to do so, I asked participants in this study the following question: How does your international engagement in the partnership/s influence your professional practices in your home university? Analyses of the participants' responses generated the following four themes.

Academic quality

The idea that international engagement improves teaching and research quality is a consistent theme that runs across participants' narratives. Many participants articulated the importance of "going international" as a way of redressing gaps in their research expertise. One participant indicated that his international experience assisted him "to stay in touch with research around the world" (Fred, N/N). Another talked about how her involvement in the Moktovar partnership was part of taking her research programme to "the next level" (Jessica, N/S). She recognized that she had limitations in her own capacity to conduct her research in all its dimensions and that she found her partner's expertise a complement to hers. She indicated that through the partnership, she was able to conduct not only the "experimental" part of her research but she also managed to include a "modelling part" that could potentially predict results in "a much broader range" of conditions. Another participant (Dustin, N/S) spoke passionately about how he was able to draw from the creative and innovative ways of doing science from his international engagement. He talked at length about how his involvement in the partnership was a way of keeping himself updated in his area of research interest and of tapping into the research of his "true

colleagues" and incorporating these into his own research and teaching in the university.

Charles (N/N) highlighted the wealth of experiences that could be drawn from his international engagement. His international engagement enhanced his own research. He stated that the partnership was "very useful" and had a significant "impact" on his research as it gave him the opportunity to augment his research capability by working together with overseas scholars who had similar research interests to his. He was glad to be part of a research where his partners had accumulated a wealth of knowledge on the research topic over many years and from which he benefited. Internationalization, he believed, had to do with "bringing of experience from other people and other countries into [one's] own research and teaching" to enhance academic quality.

William (N/N) talked about how the partnership had been of a "gain" for him "professionally". He spoke with interest how he and his partners managed to produce a number of publications out of their research which was quite rewarding. He expressed personal fulfilment when he said, "I feel that I am better off in the long run".

Chester (N/N, N/S) spoke of how his research team "got extra strength" and "increased research capacity" because, among other things, they were able to "buy more equipment" for conducting their research through funding that was made available for them.

Derrick (N/N) pointed out that "the different skill sets" of the partners were ultimately valuable in enhancing the quality of the research they were conducting. He talked about how their research benefited because people had "different thought patterns" as a result of their unique cultural backgrounds as well as differences in their education and training. Derrick also spoke about how cultural diversity and previous training was a factor for people to be "more sensitive to somethings than others" and to look at problems from different angles. Internationalization, he believed, is one of "leveraging" on the various skills people bring to the table to produce a high-quality research. He took on the example of language to elaborate his views. He stated that in one's native language, there were certain things that people could express more easily than they could express them in English. This meant that people's thought patterns in their native language would allow

them to think more easily about certain things than they would when they use another language. Derrick argued that people could bring that strength into their own research with the result that "the sum of the whole is more than the sum of the parts".

Fred (N/N) pointed out that the Bolvania partnership had been of enormous help to him in his efforts to improve "the curriculum for graduate students". He referred to the need to update the curriculum with international content for the purpose of "teaching students the latest developments" in his field. He found it critical that students should leave the university equipped with understanding of the state-of-the-art research in their field.

Charles, who said, "I always bring examples from …the international experience", also underscored how "using examples from international experience in teaching" enriched students understanding of important concepts in the courses he taught.

The Bolvania partnership was of particular interest to William (N/N) who managed to train his graduate students to gain employable skills. He told me how, through funding that was made possible through the partnership, he was able to draw students to an important research agenda that made them ultimately desirable to employers in the industry sector.

Frasor (N/N) emphasized the broad benefits of being able to interact with faculty members from overseas institutions. He explained how he "always" learned from his partners, "obviously growing through interaction" on the "professional level". Frasor saw "the benefits" of international engagement as "tremendous partly because of complementary expertise".

These comments summed up the general impression of the majority of the participants. That is, they all learned from the opportunity of interacting with academic researchers who had different set of skills, backgrounds and cultures.

Integration of International Experiences

Across interviews, participants spoke about integration of their international experiences in their own teaching and research. In particular, they pointed to integration of international content in their courses by way of providing examples and cases taken from their international engagement. Integration was interpreted to

113

mean bringing students closer to actual experience by incorporating experiences that they themselves have passed through and observed. As such, participants spoke of sharing their travel experience to students in class, providing hands-on examples, updating students to new developments in science, illustrating ideas with pictures and so on. Most spoke of providing examples or cases to students while teaching, and, when they found it appropriate, showing their students the pictures they had taken while abroad.

One participant expressed difficulty to pin down how he integrated his international experience into his teaching and research activities. He said repeatedly, "I cannot give an example of how", and "I cannot give a particular example". Thinking for a while, however, he stated "particularly when I talk about energy and environment in one of the graduate courses I teach, I definitely take examples from…my international experiences" (Chester, N/N/, N/S). He stated how his international experience "definitely" had an "impact" on what he did as an academic. He indicated that at the end of the day whatever he did was "based on all the experiences" he had "accumulated" over many years.

Chester understood integration to be a process that took place in one's thought process after one made judgements about the value of that experience and found it appropriate to improve one's own practices. Integration, for him, therefore meant incorporating a worthwhile experience in to one's own teaching and research. Further, he equated integration with drawing examples from his international experience, as he saw fit, to illustrate what he was teaching.

Some participants argued that the intercultural, international and global dimensions were already incorporated in the courses they taught. Charles (N/N) noted, that "nothing" of the content in "most of the course that [he] taught" was purely Canadian. He stated how the "international content is always there as a matter of what [he] do[es]". He stated that even when he was teaching specifically of "Canadian agriculture", he recognized that much of the content was developed by "introducing concepts from other countries". Charles, of course, inquired whether teaching in the 21st century could ever be done at all without recourse to the "international context". As for his own teaching, he said,

there is always international content, context… examples of research done in other countries, and briefing students about how people in other countries do about soil management and forest management and so forth... So nothing is going to be 'us-oriented' and solely Canadian. Most teaching is going to be international with international context, or international content. (Charles, N/N)

At times, the integration of the international dimension was understood as a passive process of relaying stories about one's international experience and a means of expressing one's reverence to other cultures and traditions. Asked about how he integrated his international experience into his teaching and research duties, Peter (N/N) stated:

I don't know if I'm actively integrating anything in my research or my teaching. Passively, you know I relay constantly my *stories* of international research and the qualities and the resources, and the people, and the problems all the time in all my research… during my teaching I give a *story* about things that I did in Peru. I'll give a story about things I did in Colombia recently or Australia or wherever.

I give *stories* about the problems and the people that are there, and I think what comes through in my lectures is that I'm always appreciative and respectful of people's differences. That's kind of the way I bring international exposure to our University.

Willliam (N/N) indicated that in a world of increasing interconnections and economic interdependence, one cannot confine teaching to the local. He maintained that there had to be a concerted effort to be internationally and globally minded when it comes to teaching. Explaining how he had incorporated international and global issues in one of the courses he taught, he said, "We talk about international and global issues a lot more in the class". He stated how as "an exporting country… we as Canadians interact with the world through the market". William drew ideas from the strategic management science to argue how "the way that food is bought and sold in a global market" impacts Canadian agriculture, thus making it extremely prudent for Canada to consolidate its strategic position to maximize its advantages. He stated how this growing interconnectedness brought about by globalization and the resultant effect on Canadian economy "came through a lot more in the class" he taught.

Speaking of integration of international experiences, another participant (Liam, N/N) indicated how he always encouraged students to take the initiative to bring international

issues to his class. At one time, he recalled, one of his students mentioned in class an event that had taken place in Europe—the case of the Hungarian dam collapse in which several people lost their lives and how subsequently a red sludge, a toxic sludge, inundated the entire village. The student wanted to know how this occurred. Liam told me that he had given "almost three lectures in full" in response to the student's query and to discussing with the entire class how the red sludge was produced and how it could be prevented and eliminated. Liam stated that he drew "heavily" from "global context" and "global research" in his teaching. He stated that because of the nature of the course he taught, whenever there was "any ocean spill" anywhere in the world, he brought those cases to his class.

Liam also stated how his partnership with Bolvanian colleagues had its own dividends on his professional practices in his university. He remarked that the partnership was "wonderful" as it helped him in many ways: "I teach [it] in my class. I gave examples out of it. I have included it in my course seminar. I've discussed the studies and the results [with people. He indicated that the research he did in the Bolvania partnership "heavily…enrich[ed] [his] teaching material".

Morgan stated that in his teaching he integrated his own international experience. He posited, "I teach first year geology and second year geology classes. A lot of that is about things like hazard earthquakes and volcanoes. So rather than just taking examples in the text book of places I have never been, I use my own photos, my own experiences".

William (N/N) also stated that he "include[d] some pictures and lectures" about his international experience when he found it appropriate. Integration of international dimension, at times, seemed to be an off-the-cuff activity of talking about one's travel itinerary. For example, Tony (N/S) said,

> I do talk about my travels a lot in class. …if I am going on a trip and talk about where I am going and what I am doing…when I come back I will tell them what I saw and what I was impressed with. So just give them a feel for particular area that I visited. I actually sometimes I even show them pictures. I talk about my trip.

Participants indicated that they found it difficult to point to instances of integration that were specifically connected to the partnership in which they were participating. For example, Tony(N/S) stated what integration of global issues meant to him by taking an example of a recent world event. He said, "I talk about certain big issues in class. Among these would be anti-doping, for performance enhancing drugs for athletes. These days everyone is talking about it in the Olympics. So that is certainly a topic we will discuss in our classes". Although this has nothing to do with the Moktovar partnership he was participating in, he saw it a useful part of integration of the international dimension in his teaching.

Other participants emphasized the challenge of culturally diverse classrooms and how, in this regard, international engagement can be of help in practicing culturally sensitive teaching. For example, Derrick (N/N) noted that "the single biggest challenge one has when dealing with people from different backgrounds is how to find ways to explain things to them". He elaborated on how "some things that we take for granted, cannot simply be taken for granted". He stated,

> I can't refer to Sherlock Holmes or captain Kirk or Superman and assume that everybody knows what I'm talking about… what we just assume everybody knows is not indeed what people growing up in [different countries are] exposed to….The impact of internationalization on teaching is …being sensitive to the fact that… [students] don't necessarily know this.

Derrick further emphasized that as part of the integration of the international dimension, it was necessary to "train" students by "exposing" them to overseas experiences. This he considered important for teaching students the practical applications of science. He sated how, for example, "If one is doing an engineering design in Ethiopia, one is going to do it very differently for exactly the same process as in Canada".

Exposure to a Different Academic Culture

Some participants stated that international research partnerships afforded them excellent opportunities for an exposure to different academic culture. As Eddie (N/S) stated, his international engagement "contributed to a better understanding of the academic culture in other contexts". He explained how "even in engineering there are different ways of thinking and doing things" across contexts. He noted how "Students

also differ in their approaches to learning." Reflecting on his experience, he told me how he found Canadian students to be more "critical" compared to those from Moktovar. He contended that being sensitive to these differences has enabled him to recognize the complexities of teaching students from diverse cultural backgrounds and how it was always important to attend to these differences in culturally appropriate ways in the process of teaching and learning.

Similarly, Tony (N/S) believed that the most important part of his learning came from the academic culture in Moktovar. He explained that such learning had "the biggest impact" on his professional career. He went on saying,

> The way they think about Chemistry is quite different from the way we think about Chemistry in North America. There, it's very much focused on 'what do I need to do to write a paper and publish the paper'. So, publishing in[an academic] journal[is highly valued] . That's what they want, high impact publications….[In] North America,… a lot of times we are … digging deeper into problems and try to deconvolute the details of what we are observing, more discovery based research whereas in Moktovar it is really focused on the result...what you are going to publish.

He also shared how this different academic culture he had experienced in Moktovar had an important influence on his overall approach to the conduct of his own research. The experience had such a considerable effect on him that, he told me, his research productivity considerably increased after this encounter. He talked about how in Moktovar "there is quite an incentive to publish" in reputable academic journals. Faculty members, he said, "get extra money like bonuses and a lot of prestige" for publishing in the top journals. He stated that in his field, publications are "the currency we use to evaluate if we are doing a good job" and that one "should publish a lot…[and] should publish in the best journals possible" to be recognized as an authority in the field. Reflecting on his experience, he stated how the whole experience had an effect on his research endeavors. He said, "So … I started to...change the way I thought about doing experiments ... in a pretty good way. It is really, really efficient. So, I do a series of experiments and I publish this paper, do the next series of experiments and publish another paper". He said that the experience "made [him]think about publishing key results as fast as possible".

Speaking of differences in the academic culture across contexts, another participant (Frasor, N/N) emphasized how an exposure to a different culture provided opportunities that encouraged deeper reflection on one's assumptions and deeply held values. He spoke about how, despite obvious similarities, "every single academic culture is different". He pointed out that across countries, "the approach to scientific problems is different" such as, for example, in Bolvania where "they approach things in a very literal way" and in Sweden where they approach things "in a more holistic way" and in Japan where everything becomes "brute force work".

Frasor indeed argued that the benefits of exposure to a different academic culture were invaluable. "I'm a different person as a result. It's just that simple, because it showed me how different environments worked," he stated. He pointed out that he received his PhD in Canada and did his post-doc in the United States "which is just a variation on Canada". Upon completion of his post-doc, he "came back and became a professor in Canada". Frasor argues that he held a "North American perspective" by virtue of his previous training. Speaking of the Bolvanian partnership, he told me how "the moment [he got] out of North America" his perspectives changed about the way he approaches science. For him, it was a wow moment: "Wait a minute, it is not day and night, but it is different enough that you'll learn". He acknowledged, "it showed me I should try [to look at things from a different perspective]".

Some participants spoke about how the benefits of international engagement went beyond professional growth. For example, Tony (N/S) emphasized the cultural nuances of openness and relationships he learned in Moktovar. He spoke about how his partners in Moktovar "love to introduce [him] to everyone they know. They are happy to introduce [me] to people that can help [me] succeed" and how such acquaintances had been extremely important for him to expand his "network" of colleagues in the country. For Tony, "it is a different feeling there" to be in a company of colleagues who provided him with the professional support he needed. What Tony did not have in his own university, he could get it from his partners and from the network of scholars he was able to establish. He stated, "Professionally I have gained so much from this experience".

119

Strong Convictions about the Value of International Exposure to Students

If there had been an area where international engagement had any influence on study participants' mindsets, it was most apparent in their strong convictions about the value of international exposure for their students. Many participants stressed that internationalization afforded better opportunities for their students to learn outside traditional settings and develop intercultural competencies.

Frasor (N/N) viewed internationalization as a "social interaction", where students of different cultural backgrounds interact and "get to know" each other through science. It all "comes back to sharing life, doing life together. It's not all academic". He remarked that students' exposure to overseas locations was not just a means of expanding their knowledge about science but it was equally a means of addressing cultural barriers across societies. As he saw it, "the experience of going out and being part of a joint orchestra" was necessary for the construction of "a better society through science".

A few spoke about how encouraging graduate students to be globally minded and providing them the opportunity to present their research in international conferences were important to broaden students' overall learning in an increasingly globalized world. For example, Tony (N/S) sent a number of his students to Moktovar as part of his project. He talked about how he always made sure that his students were informed about international exposure opportunities.

Linda (N/N) saw that international experiences were crucial for students "to have open minds". She "encouraged [her] students to go to international conferences to meet people from other universities and to communicate online with other professors". Dustin (N/S) also pointed out that he encouraged his students to have an international exposure. He maintained that when students had international exposure, they broadened their perspectives and gained new insights into the problems they are working on. He told me how he encouraged his students to participate in international conferences as a way of providing them with relevant experience. For example, he sent several students to Moktovar to "visit their labs". He particularly mentioned the case of one of his students whom he sent to Moktovar very recently to gain experience related to her own research. He stated how she "had the opportunity

to be exposed to their system, interacting with other international students participating in the same summer school". He spoke of how, "based on what she told [him] she considered the experience to be an eye-opening one". "She came back very excited".

Morgan (N/N) underscored how international exposure could be of great value for students' learning. "[I am] just trying to stress to students that economically we have a very good situation here in Canada and [I] encourage them to go overseas even if they just go travelling for the summer in Asia or in South America, I think the amount they will learn by doing that is going to be immense".

For Morgan, such learning had nothing to do with subject matter knowledge as such but learning in the broad sense of being more globally aware of the differences between countries, traditions, systems and the way of life of people across cultures and geographical regions. He explained that not only do such encounters offer students the possibility of acquiring new skills and knowledge, but they also provide the means by which students begin to appreciate the quality of opportunities they have been afforded in their home country.

In Frasor's (N/N) view, "The hardest part of our program of studies, the hardest part, is getting Canadian students to go". It was at this point that I interjected to ask him "To go where?". He responded rather quickly "Abroad". I followed up by asking him why he thought sending students abroad was essential. He responded, "I think it is absolutely essential because …you can do everything by Skype, but it does not work. Until you are there, you are in it…immersed in it, and you are working with it on a day-to-day basis, forget it! It's not worth it". He spoke how even a short-term exposure of "two weeks" was valuable to broaden students' perspectives and to open their minds to new ideas. He argued that "a major portion of internationalization [at the University of Alberta] must be sending students abroad as part of their program." He was strongly convinced of the value of study-abroad experiences for students. He saw such experiences as opportunities for students to develop their "soft skills" and as encounters whose value go beyond the learning of academic knowledge. He stated, how it was "extremely important" for students to improve their "soft skills" in an international environment by "engaging in the culture around them". The "soft"

skills he found important were empathy and respect for the cultures of others as well as a willingness to learn new things in an international environment.

Peter (N/N) also spoke of how he "deliberately…make[s] sure [his students] go away" as part of their PhD training. As he saw it, "it is absolutely essential for them …to learn to get out of the lab and…go abroad to see some different ways people do science". As a result, he said: "for every one of my PhD students, I send them at least for two months if not six months abroad". He argued how "going abroad" should be an "absolutely" essential part of the students' programme of studies at the PhD Level. For him, the international experience cannot be compensated for anything. He stated,

> It is like reading a book about Egypt and saying that you know everything about it. Of course, you don't. If you have never been there and never seen the people and know the culture and their history, then you are reading it through someone else's lens.

On her part, Linda (N/N) mentioned the several benefits that students could gain from an international experience. She noted:

> If students are only learning from the same group of people, their horizon is small. Whereas, if they are learning from other people and they are seeing different ways of thinking and seeing different approaches to do the same thing, then suddenly their knowledge base becomes big. They really have that opportunity to see how somebody does things the same which confirms what they're doing or does a little bit different which helped them to see there's more than one way to do this. They become much more open-minded, much more accepting, that there isn't always one rigorous straightforward approach that has to be followed.

Peter (N/N) also talked about how a short-term study abroad experience was beneficial for his students. He said that "it forces them to do things more independently". Indeed, he argued that "the biggest job that one has as a supervisor is to make sure one's PhD student is capable of surviving out in the big world with the rest of the scientists". The international experience helped students to "establish contacts with other universities and provided them opportunities to think on their own".

Summary

This chapter was concerned with the question of how study participants' engagement in strategic international research partnerships with overseas institutions influenced their teaching and research practices in their home university. The analyses revealed that international engagement had influenced participants' professional practices in several ways. It kept some participants up-to-date in areas of their research interest. It allowed them opportunities to develop their research skills, thereby improving the quality of the research they produced. International engagement was also an important factor for encouraging participants to integrate international experiences into their teaching practices in the form of discussing the results of their international research in their classes as well as providing illustrating cases and pictures from their international experiences.

Another important finding in this chapter which is worth reiterating at this point was how study participants described their international engagement as an exposure not just to a new environment but to a different academic culture. Such an exposure provided an opportunity for some faculty members to critically reflect on the pros and cons of their own practices and modify their own behaviours to improve their effectiveness. Finally, the chapter discussed how study participants had strong convictions about the value of international exposure to their students. In this connection, it was pointed out that international experiences offer students to broaden their perspectives and develop important "soft skills" that would help them engage effectively and succeed in a culturally diverse work environment.

Discussion of Findings

In this study, I set out to explore the international experiences of faculty members at the University of Alberta in order to better understand the meaning of and rationales for internationalization from their perspectives. I also aimed to examine the impact of participants' international engagement on their professional practices (specifically on their teaching and research activities) in their home university. With this in mind, I will synthesize the major findings of the study, linking them to the broader literature on internationalization as well as to the theoretical framework undergirding the study. To do so, I have first organized the major findings of this study as they pertain to (1) the meaning of and rationales for internationalization, and (2) the impact of faculty members' international engagement on their professional practices in their university. Thus, regarding the meanings of and rationales for internationalization, the following findings were obtained:

1. Internationalization was perceived as a series of cross-border activities involving student exchanges, collaboration with overseas partners, an exposure to a new location and condition, and which, at the most fundamental level, includes exchange of experiences as well as communication/connection among scholars;

2. Internationalization was a learning encounter which involved knowledge sharing between academics and an opportunity for exposure to a different academic culture that allowed academics to extend their academic horizons and to learn new practices.

3. Internationalization was partly an activity that was carried out in order to enhance academics' profile and reputation as well as to brand the institution internationally;

4. Some faculty members rationalized their involvement in the Bolvania partnership as a means of getting funds that can be used to advance their research program as well as to support their graduate students.

5. Internationalization proved to be a means of enhancing academics' intercultural competence.

With regard to the impact of faculty members' international engagement on their professional practices in their university, the following findings were obtained:

1. International engagement was critical for enhancing academic quality;

2. International experiences provided faculty members with opportunities for the integration of the international dimension in their courses; and

3. International engagement had strongly influenced academics' convictions about the value of international experience for developing their students' intercultural competence.

Discussion

The meanings of and rationales for internationalization. Whereas internationalization has now become "a global phenomenon" (Hudzik, 2015), it still remains an often-contested concept in the literature (Garson, 2016; Leask & Bridge, 2013). It plays out differently in official discourses and in actual practices (Larsen, 2015). It appears as a process to some, a means and an outcome for others and a series of activities for still others (de Wit, 2002; 2012; Hudzik, 2011; Knight, 2004; Stier, 2004; van der Wende, 1997a). The question of "meaning" therefore lies at the heart of internationalization (Ergon-Polak & Hudson, 2014). Equally important are the rationales driving internationalization. Although there is much rhetoric about the importance of internationalization for universities in the 21st century (Hudzik, 2004; IAU, 2012; Scott, 2011; Yemini, 2012), the rationales driving it have been largely critiqued as shifting away from once important academic and socio-cultural rationales to profit-making, status building, and geopolitical and commercial advantages (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Scottt, 2011). Also, the fact that internationalization is increasingly linked to neo-liberalism (Scott, 2011; Welch, 2012), and academic capitalism (Paasi, 2005; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004) means that it is high time to reflect on the values that underpin internationalization. Finally, given the yawning gap in the existing literature about academics' perspectives on internationalization, attending to their voices becomes critical. With these ideas in mind, I will discuss the major findings of this study.

Internationalization as a cross-border activity/ exchange of experiences. One finding of this study was how participants understood internationalization as a cross-border activity involving exchange of experiences between overseas partners. This consisted of a series of activities such as student exchanges, collaboration and participants' own exposure to a new environment or condition. This view is very much consistent with some prior research on internationalization (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Khelm & Teichler, 2007; Teichler, 2004) and is labelled in the literature as an "activity approach" to internationalization. The "activity approach" to internationalization is one that is "most widely used in the description of internationalization" (de Wit, 2002, p. 116). It was also a pervasive view especially, in the 1980s where "definitions of internationalization focused on the activities and strategies associated with the IoHE [internationalization of higher education]" (Larsen, 2016a, p. 3). Indeed, at the most fundamental level, internationalization is considered a cross border human action (Marginson, 2009). In contrast with other approaches to internationalization, the "activity approach" describes internationalization "in terms of activities such as study abroad, curriculum and academic programs, institutional linkages and networks, development projects, and branch campuses" (Knight, 2004, p. 20).

It is also interesting to note how the finding here aligns with the literature that investigated the perspectives of internationalization from a diverse group of stakeholders in higher education. In their comparative study of internationalization investigating the meaning of internationalization in one UK and one Hong Kong university, Chan and Dimmock (2008) found out that the majority of their 24 participants "inclined towards the 'activity approach'" (p. 190). Further, Knight (2004) pointed out that "some people" interpret internationalization as "a series of international activities such as academic mobility for students and teachers; international linkages, partnerships, and projects; and new international academic programs and research initiatives" (pp. 5-6).

Given the fact that participants in this study were asked to articulate the meaning of internationalization as they experienced it within the context of their international engagement in the two partnerships, such a view of internationalization as a cross-border activity should not be surprising. Yet, albeit consistent with the literature, the notion of internationalization as a cross-border activity does not square well with some recent

literature on internationalization. For example, in view of increasing emphasis on internationalization to deliver results, i.e., to develop the intercultural competencies of students and staff alike via the infusion of the international dimension in the curriculum (Leask, 2013), the construal of internationalization as a cross-border exchange of experiences may be considered inadequate in itself.

The foregoing analysis also indicates that whereas the University of Alberta adopts a process oriented definition of internationalization, and sees internationalization as a strategic objective, the participants' interpretation of internationalization as an activity is, arguably, at odds with that of the institution. It should be pointed out also that most participants endorsed a process oriented definition of internationalization by way of their agreement with the university's definition of internationalization. This discrepancy in participants' views, may appear, at first sight, suggesting a lack of critical awareness on the part of academics about the different approaches at play at the institutional level. However, given the fact that approaches to internationalization are not mutually exclusive (de Wit, 2002), it may be that participants embraced an eclectic view of internationalization that views internationalization both as a process and an activity. Indeed, at this juncture an existing gap in the existing literature about approaches to internationalization should also be noted. As is indicated in Chapter II, while key writers on internationalization, notably Knight (2004) and de Wit (2002), have analyzed approaches to internationalization at the national and institutional levels, the extent to which these approaches are appropriated at the individual academic level still remains an open question requiring an in-depth investigation. A preponderance of the internationalization literature has been focused on institutional and/or national policy levels, offering little guidance for research at the grassroots level. This suggests that in view of "the central role of academic staff" (Belen, 2015, p. 51) in internationalization, future research on institutional research should find ways and means of addressing the views of academics at the grass roots level.

Internationalization as learning. Internationalization was also found by most participants as an opportunity that fostered learning and which participants found absolutely necessary for their own professional growth. Previous research has concluded that experiential learning occurs through internationalization owing to "[t]he variety of

experience available to an individual on a foreign sojourn" (Michailova & Wilson, 2008, p. 252). Research has also suggested that individual and organizational learning takes place as faculty members get an opportunity to "benchmark themselves against their peers worldwide" (p. 2). It is widely recognized that "partnerships provide opportunities for learning … sharing knowledge and experience and benchmarking" (Alexander, 2013, para, 2). For example, Christopher Yip, the University of Toronto's first associate vice-president (international partnerships), commenting on the partnerships he had with universities in Singapore, Cuba, the US and a number of European countries, commented: "It was very much a two-way street. They learned from us and we learned from them" (University of Toronto News, 2017), confirming a view expressed by the participants in this study.

How participants in the Moktovar partnership portrayed the context within which this learning takes place was worth noting. Participants' notions of learning as a "two-way street", involving "complementarity" and "knowledge-sharing" suggested that knowledge exchanges took place in a neutral and transparent manner and without recourse to resources of privilege and power.

On the other hand, given inequities in the global knowledge production and exchange (Altbach, 2006, Altbach, Reisberg & Rumbley, 2009; Czerniewicz, 2013) between the "global core" and the (southern) "periphery", participants' views of a neutral knowledge exchange between the two partners was at variance with the literature. Participants perspectives, in fact, down played the "power dynamics of global knowledge production and exchange" (Czerniewicz, 2013) as they saw the partnerships as being essentially amongst peers. Here are how the findings of this study depart from the pervasive discourse in post-colonial literature that depicts the Global North as the center of global knowledge production and relegates the Global South as peripheral in this production process.

However, participants' narratives indicated a convincing counterpoint to the claim that the North is the center and the South is the periphery. They stated that Zokundu's status as a flagship university in Moktovar and its ranking in the global league table did not allow a conventional analysis of North-South dichotomy using existing insights from post-colonial theory. Indeed, all participants engaged in the

Moktovar partnership saw it as a North-North partnership. They saw their partners as equal to, or even higher than themselves in academic expertise. All stated that there was not a one-way flow of knowledge from North to South. In fact, for one participant, the reverse is true given the status of the university and the expertise of his partner in Moktovar.

Admittedly, though, "most of the Canadian literature on north-south partnerships...is critical" (Larsen, 2015, p. 103). Thus, a caveat is in order here. The fact that the views above were reflective of academics situated in one single institution in the Global North meant that this finding should be read with caution. One can argue that a different picture might have emerged if the views of academics from Moktovar had been elicited. However, to do so was beyond the scope of this study.

On the other hand, my own analysis of the institution's internationalization plans suggested that there was little commitment to "positioning the university's knowledge at the service of others in less advantaged parts of the world" (Stromquist, 2007, p. 82), which was reflective of a pervasive trend across the globe. As Scott (2011) has stated, internationalization's "potential to build social and economic capacity (especially…in developing countries) …is dwindling in significance" (para. 5).

Internationalization as branding and profile building. The present study found that, from the perspectives of participants, internationalization at the University of Alberta also involved a branding and profile building exercise. This finding resonated with those from AUUC's 2014 survey on internationalization in Canadian universities where "global profile" was identified as becoming the driving force behind institutional efforts at internationalization. Further, the University of Alberta states that "international engagement… enhance[es] the reputation of the University" (The University of Alberta, n.d.c., para. 2). Participants in the present study were mindful of the fact that their university was operating in a competitive global atmosphere where reputation, visibility, and ranking increasingly became critical to remaining viable in the global market for talent. In this connection, they saw branding as a means of globally positioning their university among the best in the world. Participants acknowledged that the two

partnerships were part of raising the University of Alberta's ranking in the global league table, a finding that resonated with some of the institution's official internationalization pronouncements. It is important to note also that some of the participants' narratives were littered with the language of "branding", "visibility", and "competition". This is illustrative of the fact that economic values are making inroads into some faculty members' mindsets.

Branding an institution to an international level has come to be a global trend in higher education (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Kizilblash, 2011; Morley, 2011; Knight, 2011). For example, as two scholars have found in their internationalization study on the Israeli higher education system recently, "higher education institutions exploit internationalization to elevate their institutions' status" (Yemini & Gladi, 2015). Thus, to borrow from Slaughter and Rhoades (2004), internationalization has become "a marketing tool" to enhance institutional prestige.

Some analysts also argue that higher education across the globe has been prominently shaped by neoliberal exigencies that have led to the commercialization of higher education. The result has been a growing emphasis on global ranking, branding, fierce competition for students and faculty. Indeed, according to Altbach (2011), rankings and competition have become rampant in higher education worldwide. As a result, "competition is in danger of displacing collaboration as the foundation for internationalization" (IAU, 2012, p. 3). However, as most participants in the two partnerships saw it, internationalization was predominantly a collaboration between themselves and academics in the two countries.

It should be noted that even though branding and reputation building are not new findings at all, some of the nuances in this study that were associated with institutional status and status building were in some ways unique. That is, while previous research (Altbach, Rumbley & Reisberg, 2009) has linked branding and status building as a revenue generation endeavor prompted by competition and shortages of public funding, at least from the perspective of some participants in this study, institutional branding was fundamentally a way of expanding student opportunities for employment outside Canada as well as a means of attracting talented students and faculty to the university.

The participants in this study also viewed globalization as a key driver of internationalization. They talked about how a "borderless world" and a "flat world" allowed exchanges of ideas, people and information across the globe, thereby promoting the cause for internationalization. The global context was understood by participants to mean one involving interactions across borders and nations and characterized by competition where ranking, status and rivalry for international student recruitment were rampant and where only the fittest can survive.

The view that globalization is one of the factors associated with the intensification of internationalization of higher education is well endorsed in the literature (Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbley, 2009; de Wit, 2011; Foskett & Maringe, 2010; Knight, 2008; Teichler, 2004). At the same time another version of globalization, of a neo-liberal variety (or neo-liberal globalization) was also apparent in the narratives of participants, one that allows for "efficiency", "competition", "branding", "ranking", "visibility" as important values of the internationalization of higher education, thus blurring the boundaries between globalization and internationalization. Thus, one of the central findings of this study is how some academics (re-)produced the discourses of economic globalization and academic capitalism in their interpretations of internationalization as they saw the rationales for internationalization partly in terms of branding, ranking and reputation building.

Internationalization for financial incentives. Another finding of this study was how some participants saw financial incentives as shaping their decisions to participate in the two research partnerships. In their own words, "big money" or/ "easy money" acted as more appealing than other important consideration such as their own research interest or even the relevance of their special expertise to the research project. Thus, faced with increasingly competitive internal and external funding for their research, some faculty members were attracted to the partnership mainly because it provided for financial incentives to recruit and financially support graduate students. However, for other academics the research funding acted as an "opportunity" that enhanced their research program as well as a means to boost their international profile.

Previous research has found that "[s]uccessful internationalization efforts are dependent upon faculty engagement" (Childress, 2010, p. 27). Thus, it is perfectly

sound practice for the university to use government grants to encourage academics to engage internationally. Funding is an important factor that can positively influence faculty members to engage internationally. Previous research has not only identified faculty members as key agents and catalysts in internationalization (Cummings, Bain, Postiglione & Jung, 2014; Finkelstein, Walker & Chen, 2013; Friesen, 2012; Li & Tu, 2016; Schwietz, 2006), but it has also found that "[r]ewards and incentives are powerful tools for engaging faculty in international activities" (Childress, 2010, p. 34). This suggests that the University of Alberta's effort to provide incentives to encourage faculty members to engage internationally is a step in the right direction.

      Internationalization for increased intercultural competence. Another finding was how participants in this study rationalized their involvement in the two partnerships as a way of increasing their intercultural competence. They noted how their intercultural competence developed as a result of their international engagement. They understood intercultural competence as interacting and communicating effectively in intercultural situations, a view closely aligned with a standard definition of intercultural competence (Deardoff & Jones, 2012). Rresearch has shown that "the development of intercultural competence…has become established within the internationalization agenda "(Deardoff & Jones, 2012, p. 296). Intercultural competence has been presented partly as an outcome of international engagement (Deardoff, 2016; Perry & Southwell, 2011). For example, de Jong and Teekens (2003) noted that:

> The cultural impact of a period spent abroad comes mainly from the way it increases people's understanding of their own culture or subculture and their ability to deal with cultural differences in a nonjudgmental way within their own direct environment as well as in international contexts. (p. 48)

Intercultural competence has become the focus of research in recent decades (de Jong & Teekens, 2003; Jones & Killick, 2007; Leask, 2010, 2009) and some of this research has shown how "[f]aculty need a clearer understanding of intercultural competence in order to more adequately address this in their courses (regardless of discipline) and in order to guide students in developing intercultural competence" (Deardoff, 2014, p. 6).

The impact of international engagement on faculty members' professional practices

The internationalization of higher education is invariably understood as a means to an end rather than an end itself (Deardoff, 2006; de Wit 2002; Hudzik, 2011; Knight, 2008; Jones, 2013; Yemini, 2012). As such, it has come to be increasingly linked to a wide array of higher education objectives such as faculty development, curriculum design and delivery, research and scholarship, student and faculty diversity as well as civic engagement (Hudzik, 2011). The notion of internationalization as "a means to an end" therefore suggests that internationalization efforts should always be assessed for their impact. As Ergon-Polak and Hudson (2014) have noted, "Discussions among policy makers, higher education leaders and stakeholders and ongoing research have shown that the expansion of internationalization has brought with it questions about its … *impact*" (p. 5, emphasis added). Besides, the relationship between institutional partnerships and campus internationalization has been brought to the forefront in recent research on internationalization (Olson, 2012).Thus, given the central role of faculty members in internationalization (Childress, 2010; Friesen, 2012; Stohl, 2007), and the fact that internationalization is incorporated in the core mission of the University of Alberta, I find it quite expedient to examine how international engagement impacted participants teaching and research practices. Also, assessing the impact of international engagement is very much in line with one of the "fundamental principles" of international engagement at the University of Alberta: "International engagement activities are monitored and evaluated on an ongoing basis to assess outcomes, understand their impacts, and inform future engagement" (The University of Alberta, 2010, p. 3). With this in mind, I now discuss the three findings of this study that pertain to the impact that international engagement had on faculty members' professional practices.

Academic quality. Some study participants saw their international engagement as a means to improve the quality of their teaching and research in their university. This view highlights the importance participants attached to academic rationales. Not only was this view of the participants in agreement with some of the institution's rationales for internationalization, but it was also in accord with the broader literature on internationalization (Branderburg & de Wit, 2011; Childress, 2010; IAU, 2012; Cummings et al, 2014). Internationalization "is meant to be an instrument to improve the

quality of education or research" (Brandereburg & de Wit, 2011, para. 5). Indeed, "Improved quality of teaching and learning as well as research" is identified by IAU (2012, p. 2) as one of the "most worthy" and "enduring benefits of internationalization". As well, a recent and revised definition of internationalization by de Wit (2015) presents internationalization as a means to "enhance the quality of education and research for all students and staff and to make a meaningful contribution to society" (p. 24).

Integration of international experiences. Another finding of this study was how participants saw their international engagement as part of bolstering their own efforts to integrate international dimensions in their own teaching and research. They saw that their international engagement had influenced them to infuse global/international perspectives into their own teaching and research. They cited instances where they used specific examples and cases from their international experience in their classrooms while teaching. They indicated how they incorporated new insights into their own research practices. Their narratives of integration or incorporation of global/international perspectives has been very much in line with the standard definitions of higher education internationalization (Knight, 2004; de Wit, 2002) and internationalization of the curriculum (Leask, 2009; van der Wende, 1997a) which have brought the integration of the internal dimension as fundamental to the conception of internationalization. Given the view of "international partnerships as an enabler for internationalization of home curricula" (Belen, 2015, p. 47), participants' notion of the integration of the international dimension is consistent with the literature.

Yet, notably absent from their accounts of integration are any coherent and systematic way of integration of these experiences into the core curriculum. Instead, their accounts of integration gave credence to an ad hoc approach where integration seemed to be understood only in terms of providing examples from an international experience, often in a random fashion perhaps best reflected in Tony's talk of his travels to his students.

Thus this suggests that in view of "the increasing focus on internationalization of the curriculum as the vehicle for *preparing university graduates for life in a globalizing world*" (Leask & Bridge, 2013, p. 82 emphasis added), as well as the "differing cultures among scholarly fields with respect to internationalization" (Stohl, 2007, p. 368), there is

134

an urgent need to provide training for faculty members as to how to infuse intercultural, international and global perspectives into their teaching and research roles in ways that ae are specifically tailored to their own disciplines. Leask (2014) offers a guiding principle in this regard. She noted,

> Approaches to and interpretations of internationalization of the curriculum will inevitably vary across disciplines. What is important is that, regardless of the discipline, the focus of the process of internationalizing the curriculum is on student learning. This puts faculty and the disciplines at the center of internationalization of the curriculum. (p. 6)

Strong convictions about the value of international exposure to students. Finally, this study revealed how participants described their strong convictions about the value of international experience for their students. All participants saw international experience as a means of developing students' intercultural competence which, in turn, was seen as an important experience that would make them more attractive to employers in an increasingly globalized labour market. For participants in the present study, "intercultural competence" was seen as open-mindedness and the ability to effectively operate in intercultural situations as well as to understand and appreciate the worldviews of other cultures. The literature on internationalization clearly points to a global imperative to "engage students with internationally informed research and cultural and linguistic diversity", and to "purposefully develop their international and intercultural perspectives as global professionals and citizens" (Leask, 2009, p. 209). The finding here was, therefore, very much consistent with the growing internationalization literature on the value of international experience to students (Childress, 2010; Deardoff, 2006; Deardoff & Jones, 2012; Jones, 2013; Hudzik, 2011; Yemini, 2012). For example, research has found that an important purpose of internationalization is "producing world-conscious graduates and citizenry capable of broad and effective civic engagement" (Hudzik, 2011, p. 8). Besides, "the development of interculturally competent students" has been seen as "[o]ne meaningful outcome of internationalization efforts at postsecondary institutions" (Deardoff, 2006, p. 241). It has also been argued that the goal of internationalization should be one of bringing qualitative improvements to the students learning experience (Jones, 2013). The development of intercultural competencies in

135

students is a key outcome of an internationalized curriculum. As the world has become increasingly more connected and more divided, it becomes more important than ever before to build "bridges of tolerance and respect for other cultures" (Kramsch, 2002, p. 272).

The participants' convictions about the value of international exposure to students' intercultural competence also sits well with the findings of AUCC's 2014 survey. The survey found that preparing internationally and interculturally competent graduates was one of the top-ranking rationales for internationalization in Canadian universities. In addition, the notion of employing internationalization as a means of developing students' intercultural competence is a prevalent theme across Canada. For example, according to one Pan-Canadian organization engaged in international education, internationalization is a means to:

> educate students as global citizens, including attributes of openness to and understanding of other worldviews, empathy for people with different backgrounds and experience to oneself, the capacity to value diversity, and respect for indigenous peoples and knowledge. (CBIE, 2014, p. 1)

However, there is a striking nuance that should be noted here, i.e., the association of intercultural competence with enhancing students job prospects in "the new economy"/ or even the construction of intercultural competence as a means of making students more attractive to global employers. As Canadian higher education is slowly but surely opening up its doors to the tenets of the neoliberal economy (Beck, 2012; Metcalfe, 2010), faculty members associated the value of what should be an educational experience with the production of graduates that serve the economy. In fact, the juxtaposition of intercultural competence with students' skills development to the job market is nowhere more evident than in the AUCC (2014) latest survey which stated,

> The twin imperatives of raising students' awareness as global citizens and of *preparing future workers for a globalized labour market* and cross-cultural competencies are increasingly seen as vital reasons for promoting international experience for Canadian students, both abroad and on campus. (p. 20)

Thus, the notion of "a globalized labour market" in a discussion of student preparation in higher education connotes, more than anything, a market orientation toward the purpose of university education. This suggests, according to Garson (2016), the:

> need to reframe internationalization in Canada in a way that would acknowledge the economic rationales, yet balance them with the social and academic outcomes necessary for all students to develop the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary for effective participation as professionals and citizens in increasingly multicultural and global contexts (p. 19).

Summary

In this chapter, I discussed the key findings of the study, linking them to broader literature on internationalization. I noted that some of the key findings in this study were broadly consistent with previous research. For example, participants' perspectives of internationalization as a series of cross border activities, as learning as well as branding were not unique to this study but reflected results that were broadly known in the extant literature. So were the views of participants that international engagement enhanced academic quality as well as students and academics' intercultural competence. Yet the major contribution of this study was that it offered a grounded, contextualized and original accounts of internationalization from academics who were actually engaged in internationalization.

Chapter VII

Summary, Conclusions, Recommendations and Implications

In this final chapter, I will first provide an overview of the study. In so doing, I will state the purpose of the study and the research questions guiding it, offer a synopsis of my literature review, highlight the theoretical framework underpinning the study, and outline the methodology and the key findings. In a subsequent section, I draw some conclusions in the light of the research questions posed in Chapter I, offer recommendations that can be used to improve practice and finally unpack the implications of this study for practice, theory and future research.

Summary

The overall purpose of this study was to explore the experiences of academics at the University of Alberta who were engaged in strategic international partnerships with overseas institutions. The study was specifically intended to find out: (1) the meaning of internationalization from faculty member' perspectives, (2) the rationales undergirding their international engagement, and (3) the particular influences that their international engagement had on their professional practices in their home university. The central research question that guided the study was:

- How do faculty members engaged in strategic international research partnerships with overseas institutions chronicle their experiences of internationalization?

In order to address this central research question, the following sub-questions were formulated:

1. How do faculty members understand the meaning of internationalization?
2. What are the rationales underpinning their international engagement in the partnerships?
3. In what ways does their international engagement influenced their professional practices (teaching and research) in their home university?

In order to locate my study in the pertinent scholarly literature, I reviewed prior research particularly as it related to the intersections among internationalization, globalization, and the knowledge based economy. I pointed out that although the meaning

of internationalization was contentious, the most widely accepted definition saw it as "the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education" (Knight, 2004, p. 11). I also stated how the literature on internationalization broadly presented internationalization as a response to or an agent of globalization (Altbach, 2004). Internationalization and globalization were at times presented as overlapping. At other times, they were seen as interpenetrating and dialectically related (Marginson, 2009). Yet while there was broad consensus that globalization was a multifaceted phenomenon, unveiling itself in quite different ways across a variety of contexts and that this had given way to contestations about its meaning, two strands of literature on the conceptualization of globalization were nonetheless evident. While one strand presented globalization from a neutral ideological perspective (Marginson & van der Wende, 2006) defining it as a flow/transfer of information, ideas, people and capital across societies at an unprecedented pace, the other strand saw it as part of the intensification of capitalism with neoliberalism as its core ideology. Thus, the term "neo-liberal globalization" (Rhoads, Torres, & Brewster, 2005) had been coined to refer to a variant of globalization that privileged unbridled competition, free markets, privatization, and deregulation.

The impacts of neoliberal globalization on higher education were many and varied. One of the impacts that was particularly relevant to the present study was the intrusion of market values into the day-to-day conduct of the academic functions of universities as was broadly argued in critical scholarly research on higher education (Ball, 2012; Currie, 1998; Giroux, 2002, 2004, 2014; Stromquist, 2007) and most notably in the "academic capitalism" literature (Cantwell & Kauppinen, 2014; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997; Rhodes & Slaughter, 2004). Academic capitalism saw such growing entrepreneurialism within universities as a strategy universities deploy "to achieve prestige and position in the knowledge economy" (Kauppinen, Coco, Choi, & Brajkovic, 2016, p. 35).

I also made the point that while internationalization in our time was also sustained by academic and socio-cultural rationales, the literature suggested that it had come to be predominantly driven by economic rationales. In Canada, for example, internationalization was linked to growing entrepreneurialism and drawing fee-paying international students (Beck, 2009; Garson, 2016). Major federal policies on

internationalization emphasized economic objectives as more important than traditional educational objectives. National, provincial, and institutional policies on internationalization also drew from the discourse of knowledge based economy which emphasized "the importance of knowledge in creating economic growth and global competitiveness" (Marginson & van der Wende, 2006, p. 8). Academic capitalism was in fact seen as a product of the shift from an industrial to a knowledge-based economy (Rhoades & Slaughter, 2004, p. 38). It was here, therefore, that we saw the intersection of internationalization, neoliberal globalization, and the discourse of the knowledge based economy.

I employed a theoretical framework informed by neo-liberal globalization and academic capitalism to examine the meaning of internationalization from the participants' perspectives, the core values underpinning the rationales for their engagement, and to examine participant's narratives about the impact of their international engagement on their professional practices in their home universities. In this study, academic capitalism, "the involvement of colleges and faculty in market-like behaviors" (Rhodes & Slaughter, 2004, p. 37), was understood as one of the most manifest impacts of neoliberal globalization on universities.

A qualitative case study design (Yin, 2014) based on the naturalistic paradigm (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) with a focus on understanding the subjective experiences of participants was employed in order to explore the meaning and rationales of internationalization from the perspectives of academics who were engaged in international research partnerships with overseas institutions. The overall purpose was "to capture the deep meaning of experience in the participants' own words" (Marshall & Rossman, 2011, p. 93) while maintaining the view that participants' realities were subjective, differing from one another (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Thus, I approached this study from the ontological stance of relativism and the epistemological stance of subjective individual constructions.

Sources of data for this study included 25 semi-structured interviews with 16 faculty members involved in two strategic international partnerships at the University of Alberta. The common participant inclusion criteria in this study included participation in a strategic international research partnership in the position of an academic researcher in

the two strategic international research partnerships. In this study, strategic international research partnership was defined as a formal partnership (MoU-based) agreement established between the University of Alberta and a peer overseas institution as part of extending bi-lateral socio-economic ties between the province and the overseas country. Other sources of data that were used to complement the findings from the interview were reflective memos, institutional documents (strategic planning documents, MoUs, annual reports, and official statements from top-level administrators), institutional (university, faculty, University of Alberta International) websites, and other publicly accessible online data on the internationalization in Canadian higher education.

Data were analyzed using conventional qualitative data analysis techniques including coding for themes and categories, writing analytical memos, offering interpretations, doing constant comparative analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Marshall & Rosmann, 2011), and finally asking key questions throughout the data analysis. These led to the development of themes and categories within the data which were later presented in the preceding sections of this study. In what follows, I outline the key findings of the study:

Key findings

Drawing on analysis of the data gathered through semi structured interviews, document analysis and reflective journal, the following key findings were obtained:

1. A large majority of participants' narratives indicated that they held on to an activity focused definition of internationalization. They understood internationalization as a cross-border activity involving student exchanges, collaboration, connection/communication, and exposure to new locations and new conditions.

2. Some participants also interpreted internationalization as one of "branding" the university internationally in order to enhance its world-wide standing and boost its global ranking. As such, branding was not only seen as a "marketing strategy" to attract international students but also as a way to enhance students' employment opportunities in the increasingly globalized labour market.

3. Still some others saw internationalization as learning that takes place through cross-border human action and one that involved knowledge-sharing, reciprocity,

collaborative effort and as one that can lead to better intercultural understanding for themselves as academics.

4. Some participants expressed the rationales for their participation in the partnership/s as part of enhancing their own personal reputation or profile; others as a way of developing their intercultural competence and still others as a way of extending their academic horizons by broadening their experience and perspectives on a wide array of issues, and finally some expressed their rationales as a means of securing funds for research.

5. The participants in both partnerships saw the impact of their international engagement from the perspective of enhancement of the quality of their teaching and research practices in their home university.

6. Some faculty members saw the impact in terms of learning a new academic culture that had in turn caused them to examine their practices from a different perspective. Still others saw the particular impact of their international engagement in terms of the integration of the international dimension in their teaching through the use of visual images, providing examples, and cases taken from an international experience.

7. Finally, international engagement had influenced participants to form strong convictions about the merit of international exposure to the development of their students' intercultural competence.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn in light of the research questions and the objectives set out in this study.

While it was conceptually difficult for participants in this study to untangle the meaning of internationalization from the rationales underpinning it, faculty members in this study articulated different meanings of internationalization. For some, internationalization was a cross-border activity that has to do with student exchanges, collaboration with overseas institutions, communication/connection between academics across countries, and one that involves exposure to a new location, or condition. For others, internationalization was connected to institutional branding as well as personal profile building for themselves. Still others saw internationalization as learning that

involves knowledge-sharing between partners, and an opportunity that enhances not only their own learning of new skills but also one that augments their intercultural competence.

Regarding the rationales for internationalization, it can be concluded that a combination of political, socio-cultural, academic and economic rationales was at work in driving the two strategic international partnerships examined in this study. The political and economic rationales for internationalization are particularly overwhelming at the institutional policy level. In this connection, internationalization was couched as a political tool to strengthen the province's socio-economic ties with two "priority" countries with which the province needs to establish and maintain long-lasting relationships in the areas of energy and environment. This implies that the two partnerships, far from advancing educational objectives such as promoting student learning and the enhancement of the quality of higher education (that is what "true" (Bols, 2013) or "genuine" (Welch, 2012) internationalization should be), were primarily politically driven initiatives designed to promote economic agendas at the local level. At the institution level, the rationales assumed more of economic and reputation building; that is; branding the university internationally. As stated before this was most noticeable in the following statement taken from one of the University's international documents: "Different universities have different rationales for their internationalization plans. At the University of Alberta, internationalization is primarily expected to drive the reputation of the University and to further improve its worldwide standing" (The University of Alberta, 2010, p. 2).

Thus, "internationalization is directly linked to what is perceived as global competitiveness" (Kauppinen, Coco, Choi, & Brajkovic, 2016, p. 37). Although this broadly reflects a general trend in higher education (Currie, 1998), it also points to an instrumental approach to the internationalization of higher education (de Wit, 2011) in which internationalization presents itself as a response to the challenges of the "neo-liberal imaginary of globalization" (Rizvi, 2008). Finally, at the grassroots level, academics emphasized the academic, economic and socio-cultural rationales for internationalization. This has given way to different interpretations of

internationalization as branding, learning, capacity building, benchmarking, and the development of intercultural competence for academics as well as students.

Further, while the present study indicated that internationalization at the institutional level was rationalized as a means of gaining financial and reputation benefits for the institution, it also showed that faculty members embraced market agendas and entrepreneurialism in their university not only in their framing of internationalization as branding but also by rationalizing their international engagement as a means of advancing their own international reputation and profile.

While it is important to note how some participants saw internationalization as institutional branding, and rationalized their international engagement in terms of advancing personal reputation and profile building, such understandings of internationalization by participants were regarded by others as "myths" (Knight, 2011b) and "misconceptions" (de Wit, 2012) of internationalization. These rationales might point to the particular influence of local, national and global discourses impacting on academics' understanding of internationalization. For example, the fact that faculty members are part of a strategic international research partnership whose benefits are directly tied not only to the province's key economic activity but also to themselves as researchers (in the sense of access to funds for travel, to run lab, etc.) might suggest that participants could view internationalization from an economic perspective.

Another important point was how integration of the international dimension was understood by participants. Integration was understood as relaying stories passively about one's international experience, as well as illustrating concepts and theories by using visual images, providing examples, and cases taken from an international experience. While such an understanding was far from what was understood as integration of the international dimension in the extant literature, it might point to a lack of concerted effort on the part of the university to provide faculty members with the appropriate knowledge and skills regarding how such integration takes place within their own specific disciplines.

At the same time, it should be noted that faculty members nuanced understanding of internationalization as learning, knowledge sharing, intercultural understanding, connection/communication emphasized academic and sociocultural rationales. On the

other hand, branding, financial again and reputational benefits indicated a preponderance of economic rationales. No discernible differences were observed in rationales for internationalization between faculty members engaged in both Bolvania and Moktovar partnerships. That is, both groups of participants cited academic, socio-cultural and economic rationales for their engagement in both partnerships. Further, it should be noted that this study had provided some empirical basis for the claims of commercialization, and entrepreneurialism noted in broad scholarly works of higher education as well as in the academic capitalism literature.

As was evident in both institutional documents on internationalization as well as from the participants' narratives, internationalization in the University of Alberta was closely aligned with the imperatives of neo-liberal globalization. First, the global context was understood by the institution and by participants as characterized by intense competition for rank and reputation among universities. In such a context, internationalization was justified as a means of enhancing students' knowledge and skills to function effectively in the global market. In addition, it was apparent that internationalization was understood as a means of branding and reputation building for the institution. Thus, the hegemonic neoliberal globalization discourse allowed for the intrusion of market agendas in institutional policies and in the academics' mindsets to such an extent that reputation seeking has become not only an institutional objective but in a way part of a personal goal for many academics.

Finally, how important was an international experience for shaping academics' professional practices? As analysis of interview data in this study indicated, international engagement is important for enhancing academic quality, for learning new practices from a different academic context, for the integration the international dimension in the curricula and finally for enhancing students' intercultural competence. This all suggested that the potential of strategic international partnerships as a means for increased internationalization of academic staff and students was compelling.

Recommendations

1. This study was based on a comparatively small number of faculty members who were engaged in strategic international research partnerships with overseas institutions as part of a top-down initiative to establish long standing socio-

economic ties with two countries that were prioritized as Tier 1 countries. While one central objective of this study was to explore the values that underpin these international research partnerships that were executed in the name of internationalization, in the course of this study I did not come across a single study that has investigated international partnerships in the university. This calls for the need to conduct further in-depth studies across the university in order to take stock of lessons learned as well as to examine the merits and demerits of the international partnerships so as to better inform future internationalization policy within the institution.

2. It should be noted that the findings presented in a preceding section only reflected the views of faculty members in this study. Further studies should be conducted to understand how academics engaged in international research partnerships across a spectrum of faculties see internationalization from their own disciplinary perspectives. This, it is believed, will provide the institution with a broader range of understandings about internationalization within and across faculties which can then become the basis for framing more appropriate policies on how best to internationalize disciplines with particular attention paid to their uniqueness. For example, the fact that the meaning of international differs across disciplines suggests that faculties can adopt different approaches to the integration of internationalization that best suits their particular needs.

3. It was stated previously that some participants in this study saw internationalization as a way not only to brand the university but also to promote their own international reputation. However, the use of internationalization for branding and reputation building could be seen as arguably problematic given the nature of the academic duties these faculty members were primarily entrusted with as well as in light of the urgent call for ethical internationalization in Canadian higher education (Beck, 2009; Garson, 2016; Ricketts & Humphries, 2015; Khoo, Taylor & Andretotti, 2016). Allowing reputational benefits to dictate international engagement for faculty members could lead to the erosion of the many educational benefits of internationalization. This calls for the need to reorient internationalization policies that only emphasize the academic and socio-

cultural benefits for faculty members. There is also a need to reframe internationalization within the institution broadly as "a vital means to achieving global-level civic engagement, social justice and social responsibility and, ultimately, the common good" (Ricketts & Humphries, 2015, para. 6). At this juncture, it is appropriate to take heed of the International Association of Universities' (2012) advice in his respect: "The benefits of internationalization are clear. In pursuing internationalization, however, it is incumbent on institutions of higher education everywhere to make every effort to avoid or at least mitigate its potential adverse consequences" (p. 4).

4. This study found that some faculty members held onto an activity-focused view of internationalization. Research suggests that an activity-focused view involves "more of the same thing", i.e., adding partnerships, more student exchanges, and recruiting more international students (Olsen, 2012). From such a perspective, it means that the participants failed to see internationalization as one that involves deeper changes or transformations through the planned and intentional process of integrating the intercultural, international and global dimensions into curricula. Thus, an activity-focused view may limit what internationally engaged faculty members might possibly do to bring out needed changes in the curriculum or the pedagogy to effect qualitative changes in students learning. This suggests that the university with the help of a professional curriculum specialist and an internationalization expert needs to organize and facilitate a forum where faculty members can collectively discuss with themselves how they might possibly incorporate the intercultural, international and global dimensions into curricula. The purpose is an exchange of ideas that will clarify faculty members' understandings of internationalization that is specifically catered to their disciplines as well as how to best internationalize programs and courses within their disciplines.

5. Finally, while top-down institutional approaches to internationalization were recognized as having their own merits such as ensuring funding availability for academics interested in international experiences, this study has shown that a number of faculty members perceived there were drawbacks to such an approach.

For example, some faculty members in this study had little freedom to choose individuals with whom they work in the overseas country other than those they met in a pre-arranged workshop. This means that there is a need to strike balance between a top-down approach to internationalization and a bottom-up one in which faculty members' views can also be entertained. The need to engage in an honest and transparent manner with faculty members in establishing international partnerships will always remain a sound practice from a previous research perspective. For example, research into educational change has consistently shown how the best intentions of policy reformers often fail to get implemented at the grassroots level simply because the knowledge, values and philosophy of the reformers are not in agreement with those of the implementers. Thus, faculty members "ignore, resist, subvert, misinterpret, selectively adopt, or otherwise distort reformers intentions" (Lefstein, 2008, p. 701).

Implications for practice, theory and future research

Implications for practice. This study has important implications for practice relating to internationalization. One implication is that faculties within the University of Alberta that offer career development opportunities for their faculty members may find it helpful to know that internationalization affords opportunities for faculty members to learn, benchmark, and exchange ideas with their international peers as well as to develop their intercultural competence.

Another implication emerging from the present study is the need to take heed to the views of faculty members regarding their experiences of internationalization so that useful lessons can be drawn that will in turn lead to effective internationalization practices within the institution. For example, participants in this study spoke strongly of the value of international experience for the students' academic and intercultural competence. Since it is the University's objective also to (1) "provide enriched and transformative student experiences, resulting in graduates who are engaged citizens prepared to contribute to the social and economic well-being of the province, the nation, and the world" (The University of Alberta, 2014, p. 35), and (2) "develop global competency in our graduates through access to short and long-term outbound international experiences" (The University of Alberta, 2016a, p. 14), it behooves the

university and faculties in the university to support, and /or arrange more opportunities for their students to have international experiences.

Finally, the larger implication of this study is how faculty members should take appropriate steps to use university publications to familiarize themselves with the internationalization policy of their institution and the roles that they ought to play on their part to find ways and means of integrating their international experiences into their day-to-day academic responsibilities. In the course of this study, I came to know that faculty members were not conversant with the institutional policies on internationalization. For example, faculty members will find out that the rationales for internationalization at the university are more than just branding and reputation building but include other more important academic and socio-cultural rationales as well. This suggests that faculty members can draw on university resources to better understand the international goals of the university.

Implications for theory

Globalization. This study demonstrated how globalization continues to be invoked as an important factor for inducing internationalization in the local context. While previous research has documented that higher education internationalization in Canada and elsewhere is a response to globalization, this research provides some empirical support to such a view. For example, as was indicated in the discussion section, the participants in this study saw globalization as a key driver of internationalization. They talked about how a "borderless world" and a "flat world" facilitated exchanges of ideas, people and information across the globe, thereby promoting the cause for internationalization in their own context too. This means that the present study provides support to the claim that globalization is a force to be reckoned with, and that it is impossible to understand internationalization of higher education without globalization theory (Larsen, 2016b).

This study also highlighted the potential for globalization theory to explain why universities enter into international partnerships. Participants' narratives in this study as well as the university's policies on internationalization spoke about global reputation, global rankings, as well as the development of global competence in their students as important factors as are the provincial/local interests. So, the global was as much an

important factor as are the national/ local /provincial factors in inducing the partnerships in this study.

Academic capitalism. This study offers implications to academic capitalism theory. First, we see in this case study a university entering into a global knowledge production network (Kaupipinen & Cantwell, 2014) by engaging in a research partnership with overseas institutions as part of its effort to establish itself as an international university to enhance its status and prestige. Recent research (Marginson, 2016) on global rankings has indicated that the primary means for achieving global status is through success in research, as measured, among other things, by number of publications in high impact journals.

This study demonstrates that the two international partnerships are partly ways of solidifying the University of Alberta's position in the global market place for reputation and ranking. As well, it is important to note that "academic capitalism has entered a transnational phase" (Kaupipinen & Cantwell, 2014, p. 143) as universities engage in capitalist knowledge production by partnering with high tier universities to establish a place in the sun, so to speak, and play the prestige and reputation game and win the competition. This partly explains the University of Alberta's engagement in the two partnerships. This means that as global rankings become more and more important, knowledge production is increasingly taking place at a transnational level often by engaging with partners from different countries and producing high quality research that brings prestige and better ranking to the universities.

Seen within this context, two points are worth noting in relation to faculty members' engagement in the partnerships. On the one hand, it would be erroneous to conclude that faculty members in this study acted as academic capitalists to maximize their personal economic advantages and reputation over and above their core teaching and research responsibilities. On the other hand, a closer examination of their expressed rationales for their international engagement somehow points to the infiltration of the academic capitalist knowledge regime on academics' mindsets. For example, some joined the partnership because they saw the partnerships as opportunities for enhancing their personal reputation and status *internationally*. Eddie spoke about prestige and reputation. Jeremy spoke about publishing in high impact journals and Jessica aimed at publishing a

paper everyone knows. Academic capitalism holds that universities and faculty members have become more entrepreneurial and more competitive as they continue to adopt market values to run their core functions even at the transnational level as neo-liberal globalization values continue to engulf universities. While seeking reputation and status are not problematic in themselves, we clearly see a shift in discourse from the traditional values of that were firmly entrenched in institutional partnerships (i.e., aid and development) to one of a "market discourse" that employs partnerships as devices to promote institutional and personal reputation, thereby contributing to the commodification of internationalization efforts. This suggests that academic capitalism as a theory might have some validity to explain the reasons behind academics' engagement in international partnerships in an era of globalization. However, some caution is warranted. Further, in depth institutional studies both across and within universities are required to determine whether academic capitalism can be a valuable framework to understand and explain contemporary internationalization in varying institutional contexts.

Implications for future research. This study contributes to the literature by illuminating the complexities associated with the conceptualization of internationalization. It has demonstrated that there are competing voices about the meaning of internationalization across contexts. Internationalization meant different things for academics working within the same institution and engaged in the same international partnership. Although this speaks of the difficulty of pinning down internationalization to a single definition, it also points how formal, "normative definitions of internationalization" (Larsen, 2016a) such as one offered by Knight (2004), AUCC (2014) and CBIE (2014) are limited to fully capture the views of academics who are engaged in strategic international partnerships, thus "pointing to the gap between official discourses of internationalization and on-the-ground realities" (Larsen, 2015, p. 101). This research had also provided nuanced, context-related bottom-up description of internationalization within an institutional setting.

Besides, although internationalization, as it manifested in the Canadian institutional context, was increasingly taking place in the form of engagement in strategic international partnerships, the shortage of research in this area was evident. This study

has contributed to fill this gap by shedding light on the meaning of and rationales for internationalization from the perspectives of faculty members engaged in strategic research partnerships with overseas institutions as well as the implications of these on their day-to-day professional practices. Further, while faculty members' perspectives seem to have been largely neglected in previous internationalization literature, this study had brought them to the forefront, providing a view of internationalization from "the key agents of [the] internationalization process in Canadian universities" (Friesen, 2012, 219).

Research had found that academics were "critically important 'academic heartland' that support and implement internationalization on a daily basis" (Cummings, Bain, Postiglione & Jung, 2014, p. 57). Thus, one implication of this study is the need to place academics front and center in future studies on internationalization of higher education in Canada. In particular, future research is needed in the Canadian higher education context to explore the international experiences of faculty members from diverse institutional contexts and to understand the ways in which they integrate their international experiences in their day-to-day responsibilities. The results of such research will provide the knowledge base needed for designing better institutional policies that will improve the quality of education offered in universities.

Research is also needed to examine the perspectives of faculty members drawn from both Bolvania and Moktovar to elicit their views about internationalization in the two strategic international research partnerships. Such a study could be important as could provide a nuanced understanding of the meaning of and rationales for internationalization from diverse contexts.

References

Advisory Panel (2012). *International education: A key driver of Canada's future prosperity*. Retrieved from http://www.international.gc.ca /education/assets /pdfs/ies)report _rapport_sei-eng.pdf

Agnew, M., & Van Balkom, W.D. (2009). Internationalization of the university: factors impacting cultural readiness for organizational change. *Intercultural Education*, *20*(5), 451-462.

Alexander, S. (2013, February 3). *Practical considerations for international partnerships*. Retrieved from http://www.eaie.org/blog/practical-considerations-for-international-partnerships/

Allen, J., & Thompson, G. (1997). Think global—then think again. Economic globalization in context. *Area*, *29*(3), 213-227.

Altbach, P. G. (2001). Higher education and the WTO: Globalization run amok. *International Higher Education*, *23*, 2-4.

Altbach, P. G. (2004). Globalisation and the university: Myths and realities in an unequal world. *Tertiary Education and Management*, *10*, 3–25.

Altbach, P. G. (2006). Globalization and the university: Realities in an unequal world. In: J. J. F. Forest, & P.G. Altbach (Eds.), *International handbook of higher education* (pp. 121-140). Dordrecht: Springer.

Altbach, P. G. (2011). The past, present and future of the research university. In P.G. Altbach & J. Salmi (Eds.), *The road to academic excellence. The making of world-class research universities* (pp. 11-32). Washington, D.C: IBRD.

Altbach, P. G. (2013). Foreword. In D. Tefera, (Ed.), *Funding higher education in sub-Saharan Africa* (pp. xv-xvi). New York. Palgrave McMillan.

Altbach, P. G., & de Wit, H. (2015). Internationalization and global tensions: Lessons from history. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 19*(1), 4-10.

Altbach, P. G., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education. Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(3/4), 290-305.

Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L.E. (2010). *Trends in global higher education. Tracking an academic revolution*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Altbach, P. G., Reisberg, L., & Rumbley, L.E. (2009). *Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution. A report prepared for the UNESCO 2009 World Conference on Higher Education*. Paris: UNESCO.

Altbach, P. G., & Teichler, U. (2001). Internationalization and exchanges in a globalized University. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *5*(1), 5-25.

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Association of Canadian Deans of Education (ACDE). (2014). Accord on the internationalization of education. Retrieved from http://www.csse-scee.ca/docs/ acde/ Accord _Internationalization_EN.pdf

AUCC (2014). Canadian universities in the world. AUCC internationalization survey. Retrieved from http://www.aucc.ca/wp content/uploads/2014/12/ internationalization-survey-2014.pdf

AUCC (2008). *Internationalizing Canadian campuses: Main themes emerging from the 2007 Scotiabank workshop on excellence in internationalization at Canadian universities*. Retrieved from http://www.aucc. Ca/pdf/ english/publications/aucc-scotia_web_e.pdf

Aurbach, C. F., & Silverstein, L.B. (2003). *Qualitative data. An introduction to coding and analysis*. New York: New York University Press.

Baldwin, G. (1994). The student as customer: The discourse of "quality" in higher education. *Journal of Tertiary Education Administration*, *16*(1), 125-133.

Ball, S. (2012). *Global education inc.: Policy networks and the neo-liberal imaginary*. New York: Routledge.

Bartell, M. (2003). Internationalization of Universities: A university culture-based framework. *Higher Education*, *45*, 43-70.

Becher, T., & Trowler, P. (2001). *Academic tribes and territories. Intellectual inquiry and the culture of disciplines*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Beck, K. (2009). Questioning the emperor's new clothes: Towards ethical practices in internationalization. In R. D. Trilokekar, G. Jones, & A. Schubert (Eds.), *Canada's universities go global* (pp. 306 – 336). Toronto: James Lorimer & Co. Ltd., Publishers.

Beck, K. (2012). Globalization/s: Reproduction and resistance in the internationalization of higher education. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 35*(3), 133-148.

Beck, K. (2013). Making sense of internationalization. A critical analysis. In Y. M. Hebert & A. A. Abdi (Eds.), *Critical perspectives on international education* (pp. 43-59). Rotterdam/Taipei: Sense Publishers.

Beerkens, E. (2004, September 17-19). *Global opportunities and institutional embeddedness. Higher education consortia in Europe and Southeast Asia.* Paper presented at CHER conference, Twente, The Netherlands.

Belen, J. (2015). Left to their own devices. The roles of skills of academics in partnerships for the future. In N. Jooste, H. de Wit, & S. Heleta (Eds.), *Higher education partnerships for the future* (pp. 47-62). Port Elizabeth, South Africa: Unit for Higher Education Internationalisation in the Developing World, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University.

Bennett, R., & Kane, S. (2009). Internationalization of U.K. university business schools: A survey of current practice. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 15*(4), 351-373.

Birchard, K. (2007). Educators discuss Canada's gains in internationalizing campuses and ways of extending that trend. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Educators-Discuss-Canadas/121978/

Bogdan, R.C., & Biklen, S.K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education. An introduction to theories and methods*. (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Böhm, A. et al. (2004). *Vision 2020. Forecasting international student mobility. A UK perspective*. Retrieved from www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/vision-2020.pdf

Bols, A. (2013, June 29). The benefits of true internationalization. *University World News*. Retrieved from http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20130622124844262

Bostrom, C. A. (2010). Diffusion of internationalization in Turkish higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *14*(2), 143-160.

Bothwell, E. (2016, January 14). *The world's most international universities 2016. Times Higher Education world university rankings data reveal the top 200 most outward-looking institutions*. Retrieved from https://www.timeshighereducation.com/ features/ 200-most-international-universities-world-2016

Bothwell, E. (2017, February 1). *The world's most international universities 2016.The institutions with the strongest global connections have a 'cultural disposition' to think beyond borders.* Retrieved from https://www.timeshighereducation.com /features/worlds-most-international-universities-2017

Brandenburg, U., & de Wit, H. (2011). The end of internationalization. *International Higher Education*, *62*, 15-17.

British Council (2012). *The shape of things to come: higher education global trends and emerging opportunities to 2020. Going global 2012*. Retrieved from http://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files /the_shape_of_things_to_come__ higher_education_global_trends_and_emerging_opportunities_to_2020.pdf

Brown, M. (2017). *University of Alberta jumps to 31st in Times Higher Education's new "most international" universities*. Retrieved from https://www.ualberta.ca/why-ualberta/rankings/news/2017/february/ualberta-ranks-31st-in-time-higher-educations-new-most-international-rankings

Callan, H. (1998). Internationalization in Europe. In P. Scott (Ed.), *The Globalization of Higher Education* (pp. 44-57). Buckingham: Open University Press/SRHE.

157

Cantwell, B., & Kauppinen, I. (2014). Academic capitalism in theory and research. In B. Cantwell, & I. Kauppinen, (Eds.), *Academic capitalism in the age of globalization* (pp. 3-9). Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Canadian Bureau for International Education (CBIE) (2014). *Internationalization statement of principles for Canadian educational institutions*. Retrieved from http://cbie.ca/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/ Internationalization-Principles-for-Canadian-Institutions-EN.pdf

Czerniewicz, L. (2013, April 29). *Inequitable power dynamics of global knowledge production and exchange must be confronted head on*. The London School of Economics and Social Science. Retrieved from http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/impactofsocialsciences/2013/04/29/redrawing-the-map-from-access-to-participation/

Chan, W. W. Y., & Dimmock, C. (2008). The internationalization of universities. Globalist, internationalist and translocalist models. *Journal of Research in International Education*, *7*(2), 184-204.

Childress, L. K. (2009). Internationalization plans for higher education institutions. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 13*(3), 289-309.

Childress, L. K. (2010). *The twenty-first century university. Developing faculty engagement in internationalization*. New York. Peter Lang Academic Publishers.

Cho, Y. H. & Palmer, J. D. (2013). Stakeholders' views of South Korea's higher education internationalization policy. *Higher Education*, 65(3), 291-308.

Chiose, S. (2017, May 14). Canadian universities see surge of international students.

The Globe and Mail. Retrieved from https://beta.theglobeandmail.com/news/ national/education/ international-admissions-to-canadian-universities-see-significant-increase/article34984977/?ref=http://www.theglobeandmail.com&

Clandinin, D. J. (2012). Locating narrative inquiry historically: Thematics in the turn to narrative. In D. J. Clandinin (Ed.), *Handbook of Narrative Inquiry: Mapping a Methodology* (pp. 2-39). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cook, L. (2015, May 20). It takes a global village. *New Trail*, Spring Issue. Retrieved from https://www.ualberta.ca/newtrail/spring-2015/features-and-departments/it-takes-a-global-village

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research. Planning, conducting and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research.* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design. Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods Approaches* (4th Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Cross-Border Education Research Team (2015, October 15). C-BERT Branch Campus Listing. [Data originally collected by Kevin Kinser and Jason E. Lane]. Retrieved from http://globalhighered.org/branchcampuses.php Albany, NY: Author.

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. London: Sage.

Cummings, J. (2003). *Knowledge sharing. A review of the literature*. Washington DC: The World Bank.

Cummings, W. K., Bain, O., Postiglione, G. A., & Jung, J. (2014). Internationalization of the academy: Rhetoric, recent trends, and prospects. In F. Huang, M. Finkelstein & M. Rostan (Eds.), *The internationalization of the academy. Changes, realities and prospects* (pp. 55-78). New York: Springer.

Currie, J. (1998). Globalization practices and the professoriate in Anglo-Pacific and North American universities. *Comparative Education Review*, *42*(1), 15-29.

Currie, J., Deangelis, R., de Boer, H., Huisman, J., & Lacotte, C. (2003). *Globalizing practices and university responses. European and Anglo-American differences*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.

Dale, R., & Robertson, S. L. (2002). The varying effects of regional organizations as subjects of globalization in education. *Comparative Education Review*, *46*(1),10-36.

Danielescu, A., & Perez-Danielscu, D. (2014). Internationalization of higher education, a present must. *Quality-Access to Success, 15*(S2), 33-37.

Daquila, T. C. (2013). Internationalizing higher education in Singapore: Government policies and the NUS Experience. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *17*(5) 629–647.

de Haan, H. (2014). Internationalization: Interpretations among Dutch practitioners. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *18*(3), 241-260.

de Jong, H., & Teekens, H. (2003). The case of the University of Twente: Internationalization as an education policy. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *7*(1), 41-51.

de Wit, H. (1999). Changing rationales for the internationalization of higher education. *International Higher Education*, 15, 1-2.

de Wit, H. (2000). Changing rationales for the internationalization of higher education. In L.C. Barrows, M. A. Dumitrescu, & R. Fancy (Eds.), *Internationalization of higher education. An institutional perspective (Papers on higher education)* (pp. 9-21). Paris: UNESCO.

de Wit, H. (2002). *Internationalization of higher education in the United States of America and Europe: A historical, comparative and conceptual analysis*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

de Wit, H. (2010). *Internationalization of higher education in Europe and its assessment, trends and issues*. Den Haag: NVAO. Retrieved from http://www.nvao.net/page/ downloads/ Internationalisation_of_Higher _Education_in_Europe DEF_december_2010.pdf

de Wit, H. (2011). Globalization and internationalization of higher education. Introduction to online monograph. *Revista de Universidad y Sociedad del Consocimiento*, *8*(1), 241-248.

de Wit, H. (2012). Internationalization of higher education. Nine misconceptions. In J. Beelen, & H. de Wit (Eds.), *Internationalization revisited. New dimensions in the internationalization of higher education* (pp. 5-8). Amsterdam: Centre for Applied Research on Economics and Management

de Wit, H. (2015). *Quality assurance and internationalization. Trends, challenges and opportunities* [PowerPoint slides]. Retrieved from http://www.inqaahe.org/main/events-   and-proceedings/inqaahe-2015-conference

de Wit, H., & Hunter, F. (2015). The future of internationalization of higher education in Europe. *International Higher Education*, *85*, 2-3.

Deardorff, D. K. (2006). Identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *10* (3), 241-266.

Deardorff, D. K. (2014, May 15). *Some thoughts on assessing intercultural competence.* Retrieved from http://www.aieaworld.org/assets/docs/Conference_Materials /2017/Session_Materials/b05.02.darla.handout.2.pdf

Deardorff, D.K., & Jones, E. (2012). Intercultural competence: An emerging focus in international higher education. In D. K. Deardorff, H. de Wit, J. D. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.), *The sage handbook of international higher education* (pp. 283-303). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Deem, R. (2001). Globalization, new managerialism, academic capitalism and entrepreneurialism in universities: Is the local dimension still important? *Comparative Education*, *37*(1), 7-20.

Deem, R., & Brehony, K. J. (2005). Management as ideology: the case of 'new managerialism' in higher education. *Oxford Review of Education*, *31*(2), 217-235.

Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (1994). Introduction: entering the field of qualitative research. In N. Denzin, & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 1-18). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada (2014). *Canada's international education strategy. Harnessing our knowledge advantage to drive innovation and prosperity*. Retrieved from http://international.gc.ca/global-markets-marches-mondiaux/assets/pdfs/overview-apercu-eng.pdf

Ergon-Polak, E., & Hudson, R. (2014). *Executive Summary. Internationalization of Higher Education: Growing expectations, fundamental values. IAU 4th Global Survey. Retrieved from* http://www.iau-aiu.net/sites/all/files/IAU-4th-GLOBAL-SURVEY-EXECUTIVE-SUMMARY.pdf

Fast, E. (2014). Message from the Minister of International Trade. In Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada (Author), *Canada's international education strategy. Harnessing our knowledge advantage to drive innovation and prosperity*. Retrieved from http://international.gc.ca/global-markets-marches-mondiaux/assets/pdfs/overview-apercu-eng.pdf

Finkelstein, M. J., Walker, E., & Chen, R. (2013). The American faculty in an age of globalization: Predictors of internationalization of research content and professional networks. *Higher Education*, 66, 325–340.

Maringe, F., & Foskett, N. (2010). *Globalization and internationalization in higher education. Theoretical, strategic and management perspectives.* London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Friesen, R. (2012). Faculty member engagement in Canadian university internationalization: A consideration of understanding, motivations and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 17*(3), 209-227.

Gao, Y. (2015). Toward a set of internationally applicable indicators for measuring university internationalization performance. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *19*(2) 182–200.

Garson, K. (2016). Reframing internationalization. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, *46*(2), 19-39.

Gay, L., Mills. G., & Airasian, P. (2009). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application* (9th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Giesy, J. P. Anderson, J. C., & Wiseman, S.B. (2010). Alberta oil sands development. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 107*(3), 951-952. Retrieved from http://www.pnas.org/content /107/3 /951.full.pdf

Giroux, H. A. (2002). Neoliberalism, corporate culture, and the promise of higher education: The university as a democratic public sphere. *Harvard Educational Review, 72*(4), 425-463.

Giroux, H. A. (2004). *The terror of neoliberalism*. Aurora, Ontario: Garamond Press.

Giroux, H. A. (2014). *Neoliberalism's war on higher education*. Toronto: Between the Lines.

Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

Green, M., & Olson, C. (2003). *Internationalizing the campus. A user's guide*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Green, W., & Whitsed, C. (2012). Reflections on an alternative approach to continuing professional learning for internationalization of the curriculum across disciplines. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *17*(2) 148–164.

Gregersen-Hermans. J. (2014). The missing link in intercultural competence development: The university's organizational capability to deliver. *International Higher Education*, *78*, 8-10.

Guba, E. G. (1981). Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries. *Educational Technology Research and Developmen*t, 29 (2), 75-91.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1998). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 195-220). London: Sage.

Harman, G. (2005). Internationalization of Australian higher education: A critical review of literature and research. In P. Ninnes & P. Hellsten (Eds.), *Internationalizing Higher Education* (pp. 119-140). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Harvey, D. (1990). *The condition of postmodernity: An enquiry into the origins of cultural change*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Held, D, McGrew, A. Goldblatt, D. & Perraton, J. (1999) *Global transformations: politics, economics, culture.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Henard, F., Diamond, L. & Rosevere, D. (2012). *Approaches to internationalization and their implications for strategic management and institutional practice: A guide for*

higher education institutions. Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org /edu/imhe
/Approaches%20to%20internationalisation%20-%20final%20-%20web.pdf

Henry, M., Lingard, B., Rizvi, F., & Taylor, S. (1999). Working with and against
globalization in education. *Journal of Education Policy*, *14*(1), 85-97.

Heyward, M. (2002). From international to intercultural: Redefining the international
school for a globalized world. *Journal of Research in International Education*,
1(1), 9-32.

Hollanders, H. & Soete, L. (2010). The growing role of knowledge in the global
economy. In S. Schneegans (Ed.), *UNESCO science report 2010. The current
state of science around the world* (pp. 1-28). Paris: UNESCO.

Huang, C. (2016). *University of Alberta and China* [PowerPoint slides]. Retrieved from
http://www.international.ualberta.ca/en/News/2016/May/~/media/uaiss/docs/UAlbe
rta_and_China_DrCenHuang.pdf

Hudzik, J. (2004). *Why internationalize NASULGC institutions? Challenge and
opportunity*. Retrieved from http://www.aplu.org/projectsandinitiatives/
international-programs/comprehensive-internationalization/comprehensive-
internationalization-documents/why-internationalize-hudzik.pdf

Hudzik, J. K. (2011). *Comprehensive internationalization*. Washington D.C: NAFSA.

Hudzik, J. K. (2015). Strategic institutional partnerships and comprehensive
internationalization. In N. Jooste, H. de Wit, & S. Heleta (Eds.), *Higher education
partnerships for the future* (pp. 23-40). Port Elizabeth, South Africa: Unit for
Higher Education Internationalisation in the Developing World, Nelson Mandela
Metropolitan University.

Huisman, J., & van der Wende, M. (Eds.) (2004). *On cooperation and competition. National and European policies for the internationalization of higher education.* Bonn, Germany: Lemmens.

Ilieva, R., Beck, K., & Waterstone, B. (2014). Towards sustainable internationalization of higher education. *Higher Education*, 68, 875-889.

Imagine Education au /in Canada (n.d.). Retrieved from http://imagine.cmec.ca/en/understanding/

Independent Commission on International Development Issues (1980). *North-South: A programme for survival. Report of the Independent Commission on International Development Issues under the chairmanship of Willy Brandt.* London: Pan Books.

International Association of Universities (IAU) (2003). *Internationalization of higher education practices and priorities: 2003 IAU survey report.* Paris: IAU.

International Association of Universities (2005). *Internationalization of Higher Education new direction—new challenges, new directions* (2nd Global IAU survey, International Association of Universities). Paris: IAU.

International Association of Universities (2010). *Internationalization of higher education: Global trends, regional perspectives (3rd Global IAU Survey)*. Paris: IAU.

International Association of Universities (2012). *Affirming academic values in internationalization of higher education: A call for action*. Retrieved from http://www.eaie.org/dms/pdf/in-the-field/policy-and-advocacy/IAU-Call-for-Action/Affirming%20Academic%20 Values%20in%20internationalization %20of%20Higher%20Education.pdf

International Association of Universities (2014). *Internationalization of Higher Education: Growing expectations, fundamental values (4ᵗʰ Global IAU survey)*. Paris: IAU.

Jessop, B. (2008a). A cultural political economy of competitiveness and its implications for higher education. In B. Jessop, N. Fairclough, & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Education and the knowledge-based economy in Europe* (pp. 13-39). Rotterdam/Taipei: Sense Publishers.

Jessop, B. (2008b). Introduction. In B. Jessop, N. Fairclough, & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Education and the knowledge-based economy in Europe* (pp. 1-9). Rotterdam/Taipei: Sense Publishers.

Jones, E. (2013). The global reach of universities: leading and engaging academic and support staff in the internationalization of higher education. In R. Sugden, M. Valania, & J.R. Wilson (Eds.), *Leadership and cooperation in Academia. Reflecting on the roles and responsibilities of university faculty and management* (pp. 161-183). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

Jones, E., & de Wit, H. (2012). Globalization of internationalization: Thematic and regional reflections on a traditional concept. *The International Journal of Higher Education and Democracy*, *3*, 35-54.

Jones, E., & de Wit, H. (2014). Globalized internationalization. Implications for practice. *IIE Netwworker Magazine*, Spring Issue, pp. 28-29. Retrieved from http://www.nxtbook.com/naylor/IIEB/IIEB0114/index.php?startid=28#/30

Jones, E., & Killick, D. (2007). Internationalisation of the curriculum. In E. Jones, & S. Brown (Eds.), *Internationalising higher education*. London: Routledge.

168

Jones, E., & Killick, D. (2013). Graduate attributes and the internationalized curriculum: Embedding a global outlook in disciplinary learning outcomes. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 17*(2) 165–182.

Jones, G. (2009). Internationalization and higher education policy in Canada: Three challenges. In R. D. Trilokekar, J. Glen, & S. Adrian (Eds.). *Canada's Universities Go Global* (pp. 355-369). Toronto: James Lorimer and Company (CAUT Series).

Kauppinen, I., & Cantwell, B. (2014). The global enterprise of higher education. In B. Cantwell, & I. Kauppinen, (Eds.), *Academic capitalism in the age of globalization* (pp. 137-146). Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Kauppinen, I., Coco, L., Choi, H., & Brajkovic, L. (2016). Blurring boundaries and borders: Interlocks between AAU institutions and transnational corporations. In S. Slaughter, & B. J. Taylor (Eds.), Higher *education, stratification, and workforce development competitive advantage in Europe, the US, and Canada* (pp.35-58). New York. Springer.

Kaznowska, E., & Usher, A. (2011). *Internationalization at Canadian universities: Are students seeing the value?* Higher education strategy associates. Retrieved from http://higheredstrategy.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/HESAInsightBrief2.pdf

Kehm, B. M. (2003). Internationalization in higher education. From regional to global. In R. Begg (Ed.), *The dialogue between higher education research and practice* (pp. 109-119). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Khelm, B. M., & Teichler, U. (2007). Research on internationalization in higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *11*(3/4), 26—273.

Khoo, S., Taylor, L.K., & Andreotti, V. (2016). Ethical internationalization, neo-liberal restructuring and "beating the bounds" of higher education. In L. Shultz, & M.

Viczko, (Eds.), *Assembling and governing the higher education institution. Democracy, social justice and leadership in global higher education* (pp. 85-110). London: Palgrave McMillan

Kirby, D. (2008). Globalization and post-secondary education policy in Canada: A review of trends. *Canadian and International Education*, *37*(2), 21-17.

Kizilbash, Z. (2011). *Branding Canadian higher education*. CBIE, CBIE PhD Research Series. Retrieved from http://cbie.ca/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/CBIE-research-Kizilbash-EN-FINAL.pdf

Knight, J. (1994). Internationalization. Elements and checkpoints. *CBIE Research*, *7*, 1-14.

Knight, J. (1995). *Internationalization at Canadian universities. The changing landscape*. Ottawa, Canada: AUCC.

Knight, J. (1997). A shared vision. Stakeholders' perspectives on the internationalization of higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *1*(1), 27-44.

Knight, J. (2000). *Progress and promise: The 2000 AUCC report on internationalization at Canadian universities.* Ottawa, Ontario: AUCC.

Knight, J. (2003). Updating the definition of internationalization. *International Higher Education*, 33, 2-3.

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *8*(1), 5–31.

Knight, J. (2007a). Internationalization: A decade of changes and challenges. *International Higher Education*, *50,* 6-7.

Knight, J. (2007b). Internationalization brings important benefits as well as risks. *International Higher Education*, *46,* 8-10.

Knight, J. (2008a). *Higher education in turmoil. The changing world of internationalization*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Knight, J. (2008b). The internationalization of higher education: Complexities and realities. In D. Teferra. & J. Knight (Eds.), *Higher education in Africa: the international dimension* (pp. 1-43). Chestnut Hill MA: Center for International Higher Education, Boston College and Association of African Universities.

Knight, J. (2011a). Doubts and dilemmas with double degree programs. *Revista de Universidad y Sociedad del Conocimiento, 8*(2), 297-312.

Knight, J. (2011b). Five myths about internationalization. *International Higher Education*, *62*, 14-15.

Knight, J. (2012). Concepts, rationales, and interpretive frameworks in the internationalization of higher education. In D. K. Deardorff, H. de Wit, J. D. Heyl, & T. Adams(Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of International Higher Education* (pp. 27-42). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Knight, J. (2013). The changing landscape of higher education internationalization—for better or worse? *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, *17*(3), 84-90.

Knight, J. (2014a). *Higher education and diplomacy. CBIE briefing note*. Retrieved from http://www.cbie-bcei.ca/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Jane-Knight-Briefing-Oct-2014.pdf

Knight, J. (2014b). Understanding education hubs within the context of cross border education. In J. Knight (Ed.), *International education hubs: student, talent, Knowledge innovation models* (pp.13-28). New York: Springer.

Knight, J. (2015). International universities: Misunderstandings and emerging models? *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *19*(2) 107–121.

Kramsch, C. (2002). In search of the intercultural. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *6*(2), 275-285.

Lambert, J., & Usher, A. (2013). *Internationalization and the domestic student experience.* Toronto: Higher Education Strategy Associates.

Larkin, A. M. (2013). *Internationalizing Canadian higher education through North-South Partnerships: A critical case study of policy enactment and programming practices in Tanzania* (unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Western Ontario. London, Ontario, Canada.

Larsen, M. (2015). Internationalization in Canadian Higher Education: A case study of the gap between official discourses and on-the-ground realities. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, *45*(4) 101-122.

Larsen, M. (2016a). *Internationalization of higher Education. An Analysis through spatial, network, and mobilities theories*. New York: Palgrave McMillan.

Larsen, M. (2016b). Globalisation and internationalisation of teacher education: a comparative case study of Canada and Greater China. *Teaching Education*, 27(4), 396-409.

Larsen, M. & Al-Haque, R. (2016). Higher education leadership and the internationalization imaginary: Where personal biography meets the socio-

172

historical. In L. Shultz, & M. Viczko, (Eds.), *Assembling and governing the higher education institution. Democracy, social justice and leadership in global higher education* (pp. 403-423). London: Palgrave McMillan

Leask, B. (2009). Using formal and informal curricula to improve interactions between home and international students. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 13(2), 205–221.

Leask, B. (2010) "Beside me is an empty chair": The student experience of internationalization. In E. Jones (Ed.), *Internationalisation and the student voice: Higher education perspectives* (pp. 3–17). London: Routledge.

Leask, B. (2013). Internationalization of the curriculum and the disciplines current perspectives and directions for the future. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *17*, 99-102.

Leask, B., & Beelen, J. (2009). *Enhancing the engagement of academic staff in international education*. Paper presented at the IEAA-EAIE Symposium: Advancing Australia-Europe Engagement, University of New South Wales, Sydney.

Leask, B. & Bridge, C. (2013) Comparing internationalization of the curriculum in action across disciplines: Theoretical and practical perspectives. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, *43*(1), 79-101.

Lefstein, A. (2008). Changing classroom practice through the English National Literacy Strategy. A micro-interactional perspective. *American Educational Research Journal, 45*(3), 701-737.

Li, B., & Tu, Y. (2016). Motivations of faculty engagement in internationalization: A survey in China. *Higher Education*, 71, 81-96.

Lichtman, M. (2013). *Qualitative research in education: A user's guide* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2000). Paradigmatic controversies, contradiction and emerging confluences. In N.K. Denzin, & Y.S. Lincoln, (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research (2nd ed.)* (pp.163-188). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Lincoln, Y. S., Lynham, S. A., & Guba, E. G. (2011). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences, revisited. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed., pp. 97– 128). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lingard, B. (2009). Testing Times: The need for new intelligent accountabilities for schooling. *Queensland Teachers Professional Magazine, 24,13-19.*

Loseke, D. R. (2013). *Methodological thinking. Basic principles of social research design*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Luijten-Lub, A., van der Wende, M., & Huisman, J. (2005). On cooperation and competition: A Comparative analysis of national policies for internationalization of higher education in seven western European countries. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 9*(2), 147-163.

Mahon, R. & McBride, S. (2009). Standardizing and disseminating knowledge: The role of the OECD in global governance. *European Political Science Review, 1*(1), 83– 101.

Marginson, S. (1999): After globalization: emerging politics of education. *Journal of Education Policy*, *14*(1), 19-31.

Marginson, S. (2009). Notes on globalization and higher education: with some reference to the case of Australia. In R. D. Trilokekar, G.A. Jones & A. Shubert (Eds.), *Canada's universities go global* (pp. 17-64). Toronto, Ontario: Harry Crowe Foundation.

Marginson, S., & van der Wende, M. (2006). Globalisation and education. Paris: OECD. Retrieved from https://www.oecd.org/edu/research/37552729.pdf

Marmolejo, F. (2011, August 30). The future of higher education internationalization. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/blogs/worldwise /defining-internationalization/28615

Marginson, S. (2016, May). Global university ranking and performance improvement. What kind of international academic relations are created by rankings? Paper presented at the IREG-8 conference, Lisbon, Portugal. Retrieved from http://www.ireg-observatory.org/ireg-8/presentations/I/Simon-Marginson-additional-material.pdf

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2011). *Designing qualitative research* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McBride, K. (2015, January 21). One Year Later – Progress on Canada's International Education Strategy. Retrieved from http://cbie-bcei.ca/news/one-year-later-progress-on-canadas-international-education-strategy/

Merriam S. B. (1985). The case study in educational research: A review of selective literature. *The Journal of Educational Thought, 19*, 204-217.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). Case study research in education. a qualitative approach. San Francisco, CA.: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, CA.: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Merrill, M. (2012). This rethinking exercise is about reinserting the values: An Interview with Eva Egron-Polak, Secretary-General of the International Association of Universities. *The International Journal of Higher Education and Democracy*, 3, 164-177.

Metcalfe, A. S. (2010). Revisiting academic capitalism in Canada: No longer the exception. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *81*(4), 489-514.

Michailova, S. & Wilson, H.I. (2008). Small firm internationalization through experiential learning: The moderating role of socialization tactics. *Journal of World Business, 43*, 243–254.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *An expanded source book: Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Miller- Idriss, C. & Worden, E.A. (2010) Internationalization in US higher education: studying the Middle East in the American university. *Globalization, Societies and Education*, *8*(3) 393-409.

Mitacs (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.mitacs.ca/en/about-mitacs

Monkman, K., & Baird, M. (2002). Educational change in the context of globalization. *Comparative Education Review*, *46*(4), 497-508.

Morley, L. (2011) Misogyny posing as measurement: disrupting the feminisation crisis discourse. *Contemporary Social Science*, *6*(2), 223-235.

Neave, G. (2000). Diversity, differentiation and the market: the debate we never had but which we ought to have done. *Higher Education Policy, 13*, 7-21.

Nilsson, B. (2003). Internationalization at home from a Swedish perspective: The case of Malmö. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 7(1), 27-40.*

OECD (1996). *The knowledge based economy*. Paris: OECD.

OECD (2004). *Internationalization and trade in higher education*. Paris: OECD.

OECD (2009). *Education at a Glance.* Retrieved from www.oecd.org/education/skills-beyond-school/43636332.pdf.

Ohmae, K. (1990). *The borderless world. Power and strategy in the interlinked economy*. New York. Harper Business.

Ohmae, K. (1995). *The end of the nation state. The rise of regional economies.* New York: The Free Press.

Olson, C. L. (2013). A Canadian lens on facilitating factors for North American partnerships. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 17*(3), 228-243.

Paasi, A. (2005). Between national and international pressures: Contextualizing the progress of Finnish social and cultural geography. *Social and Cultural Geography, 6*(4), 607-615.

Patton, M. (1980). *Qualitative evaluation methods*. Beverly Hills, California: Sage.

Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

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

Patton, M.Q. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (4th.ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Perry, L. B., & Southwell, L. (2011). Developing intercultural understanding and skills: models and approaches. *Intercultural Education*, *22*(6), 453-466.

Porter, T., & M. Webb (2008). Role of the OECD in the orchestration of global knowledge networks. In R. Mahon & S. McBride (Eds), *The OECD and transnational governance* (pp. 43-59). Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Powell, W. W., & Snellman, K. (2004). The knowledge economy. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *30*, 199–220.

Rana, A. (2016, September 25). Meritocracy in Obama's gilded age. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://www.chronicle.com/article/Meritocracy-in-Obama-s/237857

Rhoades, G., & Slaughter, S. (2004). Academic capitalism in the new economy: challenges and choices. *American Academic*, 37-59.

Rhoads, R. A., Torres, C.A., & Brewster, A. (2005). Neoliberalism, globalization, and Latin American higher education: The challenge to national universities. In J. Zaida (Ed.), *International handbook on globalization, education and policy research* (pp. 131-145). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Ricketts, P., & Humphries, J. (2015, February 3). Taking an ethical approach to internationalization. *University Affairs*. Retrieved from http://www.universityaffairs.ca /opinion/in-my-opinion/taking-ethical-approach-internationalization/

Rizvi, F. (2008). Rethinking education aims in an era of globalization. In P.D. Hershock, M. Mason, & J.N. Hawkins (Eds.), *Changing education. Leadership and development in a globalizing Asia Pacific* (pp. 63-92). The University of Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre.

Ruby, A. (2014). Preparing global citizens. *International Educator*, *23*(5), 54-57.

Rumbley, L. E. (2015). Intelligent internationalization: A 21st century imperative. *International Higher Education, 80, 16-17.*

Rumbley, L. E., Altbach, P. G., & Reisberg, L. (2012). Internationalization within the higher education context. In D. K. Deardorff, H. de Wit, J. D. Heyl, & T. Adams (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of International Higher Education* (pp. 3-24). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Saldana, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Santiago, P., Tremblay, K., Basri, E., & Arnal, E. (2008). *Tertiary education for the knowledge society*. Volume 2. Paris: OECD.

Schapper, J. M., & Mayson, S.E. (2004). Internationalization of curricula: An alternative to the Taylorization of academic work. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, *26*(2), 189-205.

Scholte, J. A. (2000). *Globalization: A critical introduction*. London: Macmillan.

Schwandt, T. A. (1998). Constructivist, interpretivist approaches to human inquiry. In N. K. Denzin, and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The landscape of qualitative research: Theories and issues* (pp. 221-259). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schwandt, T. A. (2000). Three epistemological stances for qualitative inquiry: Interpretivism, hermeneutics and social constructionism. In Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y (Eds.), The landscape of qualitative research: Theories and issues. (pp. 189-214). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schwietz, M. S. (2006*). Internationalization of the academic profession. An exploratory study of faculty attitudes, beliefs, and involvement at public universities in Pennsylvania*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Scott, P. (2000). Globalization and higher education. Challenges for the 21st century. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *4*(3), 5-10.

Scott, P. (2011, June 7). Universities are all internationalizing now. *The Guardian.* Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/education/2011/jun/07/universities-global-ambitions-internationalising

Seidman, I. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research. A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences (4th ed.).* New York: Teacher's College Press.

Shaw, K. (2014). Internationalization in Australia and Canada: Lessons for the future. *The College Quarterly*, *17*(1). Retrieved from http://higheredstrategy.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/ HESAInsightBrief2.pdf

Shubert, A., Jones, G.A. & Trilokekar, R. D. (2009). Introduction. In R.D. Trilokekar, G.A. Jones & A. Shubert (Eds.), *Canada's universities go global* (pp. 7-15). Toronto, Ontario: Harry Crowe Foundation.

Shultz, L. (2013). Exploring partnership principles and ethical guidelines for internationalizing post-secondary education. In Y. M. Hebert & A. A. Abdi (Eds.), *Critical perspectives on international education* (pp. 75-87). Rotterdam/Taipei: Sense Publishers.

Singh, J. K. N., Schapper, J., & Jack, G. (2014). The importance of place for international students' choice of university: A case study at a Malaysian university. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 18*(5), 463–474.

Slaughter, S., & Leslie, G. (1997). *Academic capitalism*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Slaughter, S. & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy. Markets, state, and higher education.* Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Spring, J. (2009). *Globalization of education. An introduction*. New York: Routledge.

Spring, J. (2008). Research on globalization and education. *Review of Educational Research*, *78*, 330-363.

Stake, R. A. (1988). Case Study methods in educational research. In R. M. Jaeger (Ed.), *Complementary methods for research in education* (pp. 253-300). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage

Stake, R. E. (2006). *Multiple case study analysis*. New York: Guildford Press.

Stake, R. (2010). *Qualitative research. Studying how things work*. New York: The Guildford Press.

Stensaker, B. Frølich, N., Gornitzka, A. & Maassen, P. (2008) Internationalization of higher education: the gap between national policy- making and institutional needs. *Globalization, Societies and Education*, *6*(1), 1-11.

Stier, J. (2010). International education: trends, ideologies and alternative pedagogical approaches, *Globalization, Societies and Education*, *8*(3), 339-349.

Stier, J. (2004) Taking a critical stance toward internationalization ideologies in higher education: idealism, instrumentalism and educationalism. *Globalization, Societies and Education, 2*(1), 1-28.

Stohl, M. (2007). We have met the enemy and he is us: The role of the faculty in the internationalization of higher education in the coming decade. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *11*(3/4), 35-372.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Procedures and techniques for developing grounded theory.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stromquist, N. P. (2007). Internationalization as a response to globalization: Radical shifts in university environments. *Higher Education*, *53*, 81–105.

Stromquist, N. P. (2013). The provost office as key-decision maker in the contemporary US university: Toward a theory of institutional change. In H. G. Schuetze, W. Bruneau & G. Grosjean (Eds.), *University governance and reform. Policy, fads, and experience in international perspective* (pp. 25-45). New York: Palgrave McMillan.

Tadaki, M. (2013, June 1). How are we doing higher education internationalization? *University World News*. Retrieved from http://www.universityworldnews. com/article.php? story =2013052818005080

Taylor, J. (2004). Toward a strategy for internationalization: Lessons and practice from four universities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *8*(2), 149-171.

Teichler, U. (2004). The changing debate on internationalization of higher education. *Higher Education*, *48*, 5-26.

The Government of Alberta (n.d.). *International education*. Retrieved from http://advancededucation.alberta.ca/post-secondary/international/

The Government of Alberta (2010). *Alberta's international strategy. Global advocacy for Alberta.* http://economic.alberta.ca/documents/international_strategy_web.pdf

The Government of Alberta (2013). *Alberta's international strategy 2013. Building markets*. Retrieved from http://bio.albertainnovates.ca/ media/59913/ abinternationalstrategy2013.pdf

The Government of Alberta (2014a). *Program overview. Campus Alberta grant for international learning. November 2014-round of learning*. Retrieved from http://www. international.ualberta.ca/en/FundingOpportunities /~/media/uai/docs/CAGFILOverview2014.pdf

The Government of Alberta (2014b). *Alberta international offices. Business report 2013-2014*. Retrieved from http://economic.alberta.ca/documents/InternationalOffices BusinessReport_2013-14.pdf?0.653810755815357

The Government of Canada (2009). Seizing global advantage. A global commerce strategy for securing Canada's growth and prosperity. Retrieved from https://www.international.gc.ca/commerce/assets/pdfs/gcs-en.pdf

The Government of Canada (2012). *Jobs growth and long-term prosperity. Economic action plan 2012*. Retrieved from http:/www.budget.gc.ca/2012/plan/pdf/Plan2012-eng.pdf

The Government of Canada (2013a). *Global markets action plan. The blueprint for creating jobs and opportunities for Canadians through trade.* Retrieved from http://international.gc.ca/global-markets-marches-mondiaux/assets/pdfs/plan-eng.pdf

The Government of Canada (2013b). *Jobs growth and long-term prosperity. Economic action plan 2012*. Retrieved from http://www.budget.gc.ca/2013/doc/plan/budget 2013-eng.pdf

The University of Alberta (n.d.a). *Dare to deliver academic plan 2011-2015*. Retrieved from http://www.research.ualberta.ca/OfficeoftheVice-PresidentResearch/~/media/vpresearch/Documents/OVPR/AcademicPlan2015.pdf

The University of Alberta (n.d.b). *Global challenges, innovative solutions.* Retrieved from http://www.international.ualberta.ca/AboutUniversityofAlberta International/~/media/uai/docs/UAlbertaGlobalChallenges.pdf

The University of Alberta (n.d.c.). *International strategy*. Retrieved from http://www. international.ualberta.ca/en /AboutUniversityofAlbertaInternational/ International Strategy.aspx

The University of Alberta (n.d.d.). *Research partnerships go global*. Retrieved from https://www.ualberta.ca/because-we-dared/achieve/research-partnerships-go-global

The University of Alberta (n.d.e.). *Ualberta facts*. Retrieved from
  https://www.ualberta.ca/about/facts/studentsofAlbertaInternational/~/media/uai/doc
  s/UAlberta_International_Resource_Document_Nov_2010.pdf

The University of Alberta (2010*). International resource document for the academic plan
  2011-2015.* Retrieved from http://www.international.ualberta.ca/AboutUniversity

The University of Alberta (2012, October 2). *Leading universities team up to tackle
  energy, environment*. Retrieved from www.folio.ca/leading-universities-team-up-to-
  tackle-energy-environment

The University of Alberta (2014). *University of Alberta comprehensive institutional plan*
  2014. Retrieved from https://cloudfront.ualberta.ca/-/media/ualberta/office-of-the-
  provost-and-vice-president/cip/cip2014.pdf

The University of Alberta (2015). *University of Alberta comprehensive institutional plan
  2015*. Retrieved from https://cloudfront.ualberta.ca/-/media/ualberta/office-of-the-
  provost-and-vice-president/cip/cip2015.pdf

The University of Alberta (2016a). *University of Alberta comprehensive institutional plan
  2015*. Retrieved from https://cloudfront.ualberta.ca/-/media/ualberta/office-of-the-
  provost-and-vice-president/cip/cip2016.pdf

The University of Alberta (2016b). *For the public good.* Retrieved from https://d1pbog
  36rugm0t.cloudfront.net/-/media/isp/final doc/12885institutionalstrategicplan
  33final.pdf

Tikly, L. (2001). Globalization and education in the postcolonial world: Towards a
  conceptual framework. *Comparative Education*, *37*(2), 151-171.

Trilokekar, R. (2010). International education as soft power? The contributions and challenges of Canadian foreign policy to the internationalization of higher education. *Higher Education, 59*, 131–147.

Trilokekar, R., & Kizilbash, Z. (2013).   IMAGINE: Canada as a leader in international education. How can Canada benefit from the Australian experience? *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, *43*(2), 1-26.

Trilokekar, R., & Jones, G. (2007). Internationalizing Canada's universities. *International Higher Education*, *46*,12-14. Retrieved from https://ejournals.bc.edu /ojs/index.php/ihe/issue/view/798

Tudvier, N. (1999). *Universities for sale: Resisting corporate control over Canadian higher education.* Toronto: The Canadian Association of University Teachers/James Lormier and Company.

UNESCO Institute of Statistics (n.d.). *Global flow of tertiary-level students*. Retrieved from http://www.uis.unesco.org/Education /Pages/international-student-flow-viz.aspx

UNESCO (2010). *UNESCO science report*. Paris : UNESCO.

University of Toronto News (2017, March 31). Professor Christopher Yip chosen to head international partnerships. Retrieved from https://www.utoronto.ca/news/professor-christopher-yip-chosen-head-international-partnerships

Vaira, M. (2004). Globalization and higher education organizational change: A framework for analysis. *Higher Education*, *48*(4), 483-510.

van Damme, D. (2001). Quality issues in internationalization of higher education. *Higher Education, 41*, 415-441.

van der Wende, M. (1997a). Internationalizing the curriculum in Dutch higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *1*(2), 53-72.

van der Wende, M. (1997b). Missing links. In T. Kalvemark, & M. van der Wende (Eds.), *National policies for the internationalization of higher education in Europe* (pp. 10-38). Stockholm, Sweden: The National Agency for Higher Education

van der Wende, M. (2001). Internationalization policies: about new trends and contrasting paradigms. *Higher Education Policy, 14,* 249-259.

van der Wende, M. (2007). Europe's agenda on global competition. *International Higher Education, 49,* 11-12.

van Manen, M. (2006). Writing qualitatively or the demands of writing. *Qualitative Health Research, 16*(5), 753-722.

Viczko, M. (2013). Internationalisation of Canadian higher education. Troubling the notion of autonomy through an examination of policy actors, knowledge and spaces. *Learning and Teaching*, 6(1), 26–46.

Viczko, M. (2015). *Assembling internationalization through policies in the governance of higher education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Alberta, Edmonton, Canada.

Vidovich, L., Yang, R., & Currie, J. (2007) Changing accountabilities in higher education as China 'opens up' to globalization. *Globalization, Societies and Education*, *5*(1), 89-107.

Walker, P. (2010). Guests and hosts — the global market in international higher education: Reflections on the Japan—UK axis in study abroad. *Journal of Research in International Education*, *9*(2), 168-184.

Weber, L. (2007). Internationalization at Canadian universities: Progress and challenges. *Canadian and International Education*, *36*(2), 15-32.

Welch, A. (2002). Going global? Internationalizing Australian universities in a time of global crisis. *Comparative Education Review*, *46*(4), 433-472.

Welch, A. (2012). Opportunistic entrepreneurialism and internationalization of higher education: lessons from the antipodes? *Globalization, Societies and Education*, *10*(3), 295-315.

Wildavsky, B. (2010). *The great brain race. How global universities are reshaping the world*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

World Bank (1994). *Higher education in Africa: The lessons of experience*. Washington DC: The World Bank.

World Bank (2000). *Higher education in developing countries: Peril and promise. The task force on higher education and society*. Washington DC: The World Bank.

World Bank (2002). *Constructing knowledge societies: New challenges for tertiary education*. Washington DC: The World Bank.

Yang, R. (2002). University internationalization: its meanings, rationales and implications. *Intercultural Education*, *13*(1), 81-95.

Yemini, M. (2012). Internationalization assessment in schools: Theoretical contributions and practical implications. *Journal of Research in International Education*, *11*(2) 152–164.

Yemini, M. (2014). Internationalisation discourse. What remains to be said? *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, *18*(2), 66-71.

Yemini, M., & Gladi, A. (2015). Internationalization motivations and strategies of Israeli educational administration programs. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *19*(5), 423–440.

Yin, R. K. (1994). Case study research. Design and methods (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Yin, R. K (2014). *Case study research design and methods (5th ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Zha, Q. (2003). Internationalization of higher education: towards a conceptual framework. *Policy Futures in Education*, *1*(2), 248-270.

Appendix A: Participant's Profiles

Brian Wilson. Brian is in his late 40s and has been a faculty member at the University of Alberta for about a decade and half, progressing from an assistant professor to a full professor position. Originally from outside Canada, he did his first postgraduate study in his native country and earned his doctorate at the University of Alberta. For the past several years, he had held various leadership positions at the university and at the national level. He has also participated in a number of major research projects between the University of Alberta and a number of overseas institutions. His areas of research deal with energy and environment.

Charles Frasor. Now in his 50's, Charles is originally from outside Canada. He had served as a faculty member at the University of Alberta for about a decade, progressing from an assistant professor to a full professor position. He has traveled to many overseas universities as a member of a collaborative research team He is engaged in research dealing with soil conservation environment.

Chester Brown. Also from outside of Canada originally and now in his late 50's, Chester has served as a faculty member at the University of Alberta for more than a decade. He has been involved with a number of overseas research projects with the University of Alberta He is particularly I interested in energy research dealing with coal combustion.

Derrick Smith. Derrick is now in his 50s, and has been a faculty member at the University of Alberta for about seven years. Originally from outside Canada, he did his undergraduate and graduate study in his native country. For the past several years, he had held research leadership positions at the university. He has also participated in major research projects between the University of Alberta and several overseas institutions mainly dealing with oil sands bitumen research.

Dustin Shultz. Dustin, now in his late 50s, has been a faculty member at the University of Alberta for about a decade. Originally from outside Canada, he did his undergraduate

study in his native country and received his doctorate in the US. He has participated in major research projects between the University of Alberta and several overseas institutions mainly dealing with biological processes in water and wastewater treatment.

Eddie Chambers. Now in his late 40's, Eddie is originally from outside Canada. After receiving his doctorate at the University of Alberta he accepted a faculty position at a different Canadian university. But returned to the University of Alberta six years ago. He has strong ties with some overseas universities as part of research projects between the University of Alberta and those institutions. He is engaged in research dealing with construction and automation.

Frasor Golden. Now in his 50's, Frasor is a Canadian. He has been a faculty member at the University of Alberta for more than a decade. Earning his undergraduate and graduate studies in Canadian universities, he traveled to the US for his post-doc. He has widely traveled to many overseas universities as part of research projects between the university of Alberta and overseas institutions. He is engaged in research dealing with nanotechnology.

Fred Jones. Now in his 40's, Fred was originally from outside Canada. He did his undergraduate study in his native country and earned his graduate degrees in the US. He has been a faculty member at the University of Alberta for about six years. He traveled to several overseas universities to teach courses, and has also participated in a number of international research collaborations. His area of research is the management of thermal energy.

Jeremy Davies. Now in his 50's, Jeremy is originally from outside Canada. He did his undergraduate study in his native country and earned his graduate degrees in the US. He has been a faculty member at the University of Alberta for about five years. He has been a member of a number of overseas research projects with the University of Alberta. He is engaged in research dealing with public economics and industrial organization.

Jessica Meme. Jessica, now in her 50's, is originally from outside Canada. She did her undergraduate study in her native country and earned her PhD degrees in a Canadian university. She joined the University of Alberta as a faculty member more than two decades ago. She has been engaged in several research projects between the University of Alberta and several overseas institutions. She is involved in research dealing with corrosion and electrochemistry.

Liam Webb. Now in his 40's, Liam was originally from outside Canada. He did his undergraduate study in his native country and earned his graduate degrees in the US. He has been a faculty member at the University of Alberta for about seven years. He traveled to several overseas universities as part of research projects between the University of Alberta and a number of overseas institutions. He is engaged in research dealing with soil chemistry and environmental conservation.

Linda Franklin. Linda, now in her 50's, is originally from Canada. She did her undergraduate study in her native country and earned her PhD degree in a Canadian university. She joined the University of Alberta as faculty member more than a decade ago. Like many of her colleagues she has been involved in several other overseas projects. Her research focuses on environment and soil science.

Morgan Dakin. Now in his 50's, Jeremy was originally from outside Canada. He did his undergraduate and graduate studies in his native country before joining the University of Alberta twelve years ago. He has traveled extensively to overseas countries as part of research projects between the university of Alberta and overseas institutions. He is engaged in research dealing with environmental geophysics and tectonics.

Peter Andrews. Peter, now in his 50's, is from Canada. He did his undergraduate and graduate studies in Canada before joining the University of Alberta about two decades ago. He has traveled extensively to overseas countries as part of research projects between the university of Alberta and overseas institutions. He is involved in research dealing with environmental toxicology and watershed science.

Tony Briggs. Tony, now in his 40's, was originally from outside Canada. He received his undergraduate and graduate degrees from universities in his home country. He came to the University of Alberta about seven years ago and has traveled to a number of overseas countries as a member of research teams from the University of Alberta. He is engaged in research dealing with polymer-based materials.

Study Title: Making Sense of Internationalization via Strategic International Research Partnerships. Faculty Members' Experiences in a Canadian University

Research Investigator:	**Supervisor:**
Name: Girmaw Abebe Akalu	Name: Frank Peters

Dear _____

My name is Girmaw Abebe Akalu. I am a PhD Candidate at the department of Educational Policy Studies, Faculty of Education, University of Alberta. I received your contact information from a relevant unit within your institution.

I am conducting research to explore the experiences of faculty members at the University of Alberta who are engaged in international research partnerships with universities in overseas locations.

The purpose of my study is to describe and explore the experiences of faculty members engaged in research partnerships with institutions in overseas locations within the framework of existing Memorandum of Understanding signed between the University of Alberta and another overseas institution. This study will have its own benefits to the university and the scholarship of internationalization as it seeks to contribute to a better understanding of the meaning and rationales of internationalization by exploring the experiences of academics engaged in international research partnerships. A related benefit is also to gain insights about how faculty members' engagements in these partnerships have impacted their professional practices in their own universities.

My data collection will rely heavily on a one-on-one interview between you and me. I have chosen you for this interview because of your engagement in a research partnership with an overseas institution.

If you are willing to participate in this study, I will contact you to decide on a mutually convenient time and location for the interview. The initial interview will take about 60 minutes of your time. A follow up interview may also be arranged if necessary. With

your permission, the interviews will be audio-taped using a digital voice recorder device and later transcribed. My interview with you will revolve around your personal experiences about the research partnerships you are involved in, your own understanding of internationalization, the rationales for your engagement in the research partnership, and how those experiences have shaped your professional practices in your own university. You can opt out of answering any of the questions during the interview.

After the interview, I will provide you a transcription and summary of what I learned so that you can review and verify the accuracy of your statements and my interpretations. You are absolutely free to make any changes and provide further information or clarification so that the information is an accurate reflection of what you provided in the interview.

Your participation in the study is highly valuable to advance existing knowledge about internationalization, its meaning, and how it is rationalized by faculty members engaged in international partnerships. Your participation will also provide relevant information for those units and individuals at the University of Alberta tasked with enhancing the internationalization efforts of the university.

I do not anticipate any risks associated with your participation in this research. If we learn anything during the research that may affect your willingness to continue being in the study, we will tell you right away. There are no costs involved in being in this research.You are under no obligation to participate in this study. Your participation is completely voluntary. You can change your mind and withdraw from this study at any time without penalty and have any collected data withdrawn from the data base and not included in the study.

You will not be requested at any time to provide identifying information. I will use a pseudonym when transcribing the interview and labeling the recording material for confidentiality purposes. I will keep the interview transcripts in a safe locked cabinet in a secure location. I will store audio recordings safely in a password protected personal computer. Both the transcripts and electronic data will be kept for five years after the study is over, at which time it will be destroyed.

Data collected from this research study may be used to prepare academic papers and related conference presentations. The data will solely be used for academic purposes only, not for commercial interest or gain. Participant's identities will only be disclosed on the signed consent form, and they will only be available to Girmaw Abebe Akalu and Professor Frank Peters at the Department of Educational Policy Studies, University of Alberta. If you have concerns about this study, you may contact the Research Ethics Office at the University of Alberta.

The plan for this study has been reviewed for its adherence to ethical guidelines by a Research Ethics Board at the University of Alberta. For questions regarding participant rights and ethical conduct of research, contact the Research Ethics Office. If, after going through the above, you are willing to provide your consent to be interviewed, I would be grateful if you would please complete the Consent Form attached to this letter and return it to me as soon as possible.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours sincerely,
Girmaw Abebe Akalu

Appendix C: Consent Form

Title of Project: Making Sense of Internationalization via Strategic International Research Partnerships. Faculty Members' Experiences in a Canadian University

Principal Investigator: Girmaw Abebe Akalu

Please answer these questions by circling Yes or No:		
Do you understand that you have been asked to be in a research study?	Yes	No
Have you read and received a copy of the attached Information sheet?	Yes	No
Do you understand the benefits and risks involved in taking part in this research study?	Yes	No
Have you had an opportunity to ask questions and discuss this study?	Yes	No
Do you understand that you are free to refuse or participate, or to withdraw from the study at any time, without consequence, and that your information will be withdrawn at your request?	Yes	No
Has the issue of confidentiality been explained to you?	Yes	No
Do you understand who will have access to your information?	Yes	No

I have read and understood the attached information letter and agree to take part in this study.

_____   _____

Signature of Research Participant   Date

Printed name_____

I believe that the person signing this form understands what is involved in the study and voluntarily agree to participate.

_____

_____

Signature of Investigator or Designee   Date

Appendix D: Sample Interview Schedule

1. Tell me about the Bolvania/Moktovar research partnership you have been involved in for the last few years.

    - How did this partnership/collaboration get started?

    - What are the purposes of this partnership/collaboration?

    - Who is involved, how and why?

    - How do you personally come to be involved in this partnership/collaboration?

    - What does internationalization mean to you?

    - Internationalization is most commonly used in Canada to refer to "a process of integrating international, intercultural, or global dimension into the purpose, functions and delivery of higher education?" What is your take on this definition?

2. In your opinion, what are your personal rationales for your engagement in this partnership/collaboration?

    - How would you describe the personal/academic/economic benefits of your engagement in this partnership/collaboration?

    - Tell me how you time is divided between your research responsibilities in your home university and in the partner institution?

3. How does your engagement in these partnerships influence your professional practices in your home university?

    - In what ways have those international experiences shaped the way you carry out your teaching/research at your home university? In what manner?

    - Have you made any explicit efforts to incorporate your international experiences in your teaching/research? If yes, how? If no, why not?