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Introductions

• Who we are and why we are here.

• Who you are why you are here.
Overview

• Cultural Readiness for Internationalization (CRI): A Model for Planned Change
  • USA Case Studies
  • Canada Case Study
  • Australia Case Study

• Application of CRI Model

• Discussion on Strategy
Cultural Readiness for Internationalization (CRI): A Model for Planned Change
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research from USA : Melanie Agnew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Research Question</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does the interplay between ideology and university culture support or impede internationalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theoretical Framework</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Method</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative Research; Multi-level analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Research; 1 Teaching (public &amp; private)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews, Focus Groups, Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilot study: 4 senior admin; 7 faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger study: 5 senior admin; 12 deans; 37 faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 65 participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRI Change Model: Theoretical Framework
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Findings: The Interplay

Enabling External Environment
(context is important)
Weak economy; new immigration/migration patterns; reduced government funding; global competition; growing ICTs

University Culture
• Mission
  o purpose/type/size
• Governance
  o faculty/curriculum/tenure & promotion
  o Executive Authority
• Disciplines
• Academic Freedom

Ideology
• Global competencies/learning
• Local-global dichotomy
• Cooperation v. competition
• Internal v. external
### Disciplinary Context

Summary of Internationalization in the Context of Disciplinary Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applied</th>
<th>Pure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hard</strong></td>
<td><strong>Discipline is borderless</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive; purposive; functional</td>
<td>Universal language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic imperative</td>
<td>Transcends cultural context:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology and product driven</td>
<td>Value-free; impersonal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International governing regulations</td>
<td>Relevance of the scientific process (data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International faculty/little technology transfer</td>
<td>Standardized curricula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of language ability</td>
<td>English as the global language/homogenization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Soft** | **Inherently international** |
| Value of reflective practice | Inherently interdisciplinary |
| Relevance of local culture | Highly interpretative |
| Challenge beliefs, values, assumptions | Empathy |
| Value human experience | Value of human experience |
| Application of learning | Relevance of local culture |
| Multiple ways of knowing | Moral imperative |

---

Cultural Readiness for Internationalization (CRI) Change Model, Melanie Agnew / agnewm@uww.edu
Small Group Discussion

• What does faculty engagement in internationalization look like on your campus? (teaching, research, service)

• What do you want faculty engagement in internationalization to look like on your campus in 5 years?

• Report out.
Canada
**Major Research Question**

How faculty engage with institutional international strategy

**Theoretical Framework**

Internationalization rationales
Internationalization of the academic self

**Innovative Change**

**Method**

Qualitative
Interviews, document analysis
Six Canadian research universities
Five participants
Findings: Challenges of Having Clear (Common) Understanding

• Definition of internationalization
  • Confused relationship with globalization
  • Unclear understanding of ‘what’

• Basis of internationalization
  • Range of ideologies & rationales
  • Unclear understanding of ‘why’

• Outcomes of internationalization
  • How to evaluate progress
  • Unclear understanding of ‘how’ to achieve ‘success’
Key Drivers & Barriers

**Engaged**
- Aligned values + Good incentive

Values espoused in artifacts agree with faculty values; Macro & meso support for micro levels

**Opposed**
- Opposed values + Mixed incentive

Values espoused in artifacts undermine faculty values; Support for micro level varies

**Situational engagement**
- Non-Aligned, non-opposed values + Mixed incentive

Values espoused in artifacts different from faculty but not opposed; Support for micro level varies
Creating an internal enabling environment

- Ideology
- Drivers
- Activity
- Data
- Supports
- Strategy
- Institution

Individual faculty
Australia
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Research Question</th>
<th>Has the internationalization of Australian higher education changed faculty work?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical Framework</td>
<td>Institutional culture Organizational sociology Disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Qualitative 2 universities – 1 research; 1 comprehensive 2 disciplines – Business &amp; Science Document Analysis; Interviews with faculty members 18 + 19 = 37 total participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Melbourne

- 23 million people
- 43 universities
- 1.3 million university students
- 30%+ international students

Faculty staff
- 51% teaching and research
- 22% research only
- 23% teaching only
- 4% other
Findings: Key drivers & barriers

1. Strategic plans have little direct influence on the international dimensions of faculty work
   • Although most faculty are aware of strategy, disciplinary and personal drivers predominantly shape their work choices

2. Faculty give preference to the research dimension of internationalization
   • At one case study institution, 47% of international activities relate to research, 23% to teaching, 19% to service, 11% to other
   • Science – greater focus on research than teaching (55% vs 14%)
   • Business – equal focus on research and teaching (36%-37%)
Findings: Key drivers & barriers

3. “Distance” drives international engagement
   • Australia’s distance from the world is a key motivation for international engagement, particularly in Science
   • But, after $$ and workload, distance is also the most significant barrier
   • But many see this as a key motivation, particularly in Science

4. Transnational teaching as a transformative professional experience
   • Faculty who have taught degree courses abroad (often early in their career) appear to engage subsequently in a wider range of international activities
Summary of Findings

- Professional role, institutional type, and context matter
- Divergent understandings of internationalization
- Multiple ideologies operating simultaneously among sub-cultures (e.g., faculty, deans, admin)
- The role of governance
- Disciplinary differences
- Incongruence of values among and between the sub-cultures (herding cats)
- Congruence of values within & alignment to external
Small Group Exercise

Identify one (or two) volunteers in each group who will use their institutions as a case study.


- Select two or three disciplines/Faculties and identify how these faculty may think about international engagement in the context of their discipline.

- What are the motivations for faculty to engage in internationalization?

- How might these motivations be different than yours as an administrator?

Using the “blank” CRI Model handout:

- Identify ways in which faculty are currently supported in their engagement with internationalization?

- Identify new strategies that could further support faculty engagement in internationalization.
Strategies to Engage Faculty

• Report Out / Discussion
Bringing it all together

Learning objectives:

1. Describe key motivating factors for the international engagement of faculty;
2. Explain disciplinary differences in the context of internationalization;
3. Examine the extent to which ideology and organizational culture interplay to support or impede faculty engagement in the internationalization process, and
4. Produce strategies to engage faculty in internationalization.
Peter Senge, systems scientist at MIT:

Organizational learning “...is more radical than ‘radical organization redesign’—namely that our organizations work the way they work, ultimately, because of how we think and how we interact. **Only by changing how we think can we change deeply embedded policies and practices.** Only by changing how we interact can shared visions, shared understandings and new capacities for coordinated action be established.”

**Ideology is the target of change.**