

The Changing Academy – The Changing Academic Profession  
in International Comparative Perspective 24

Alper Çalikoğlu  
Glen A. Jones  
Yangson Kim *Editors*

# Internationalization and the Academic Profession

Comparative Perspectives

 Springer

# **The Changing Academy – The Changing Academic Profession in International Comparative Perspective**

Volume 24

## **Series Editors**

Timo Aarrevaara, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Lapland,  
Rovaniemi, Finland

Martin Finkelstein, Higher Education Department, Seton Hall University,  
Orange, NJ, USA

The landscape of higher education has in recent years undergone significant change. This has been particular the case for research training, academic life, employment, working conditions and entrepreneurial activities of universities around the globe. The academy is expected to be more professional in teaching, more productive in research and more entrepreneurial in everything. Some of the changes involved have raised questions about the attractiveness of an academic career for today's graduates. At the same time, knowledge has come to be identified as the most vital resource of contemporary societies. The Changing Academy series examines the nature and extent of the changes experienced by the academic profession. It aims to address these changes from an international comparative perspective, focusing at both the higher education system level as well as the STEM fields of science, technology, engineering and mathematics in particular. It explores both the reasons for and the consequences of these changes. The series considers the implications of the changes for the attractiveness of the academic profession as a career and for the ability of the academic community to contribute to the further development of knowledge societies and the attainment of national goals. It provides analyses on these matters drawing initially on available data-sets and qualitative research studies with special emphasis on the international studies of the Changing Academic Profession and the national surveys in STEM fields. Among the themes featured will be:

- Relevance of the Academy's Work
- Enrolment, graduation and the institutional setting of STEM
- Research, development and technology policies with regards to STEM
- Internationalization of the Academy Governance and Management
- The new generation in the academic profession – the doctoral graduates

Editorial Board: Elisabeth Balbachevsky, Department of Political Science, University of Sao Paulo, Brazil Jung Cheol Shin, Department of Education, Seoul National University Ulrich Teichler, International centre for Higher Education research (INCHER), University of Kassel William Cummings, Graduate School of Education and HD, George Washington University Akira Arimoto, Kurashiki Sakuyo University, Okayama.

Please contact Astrid Noordermeer at [Astrid.Noordermeer@springer.com](mailto:Astrid.Noordermeer@springer.com) if you wish to discuss a book proposal.


Alper Çalikoğlu • Glen A. Jones • Yangson Kim  
Editors

# Internationalization and the Academic Profession

Comparative Perspectives

 Springer

*Editors*

Alper Çalikoğlu   
Borsa Istanbul Vocational School  
Ministry of National Education  
Canakkale, Turkey

Glen A. Jones   
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education  
University of Toronto  
Toronto, ON, Canada

Yangson Kim   
Research Institute for Higher Education  
Hiroshima University  
Higashi-Hiroshima, Japan

ISSN 2214-5346

ISSN 2543-0378 (electronic)

The Changing Academy – The Changing Academic Profession in International Comparative  
Perspective

ISBN 978-3-031-26994-3

ISBN 978-3-031-26995-0 (eBook)

<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-26995-0>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature  
Switzerland AG 2023, corrected publication 2023

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors, and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG  
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

# Acknowledgments

The book emerged from the Academic Profession in the Knowledge-based Society (APIKS) project, perhaps the largest international comparative study in the field of higher education. This is a collaborative project involving more than twenty independent national or regional research teams, and we would like to acknowledge the key roles played by Timo Aarevaara and Monica Marquina who co-chair the coordinating body that moves the project forward through collegial processes.

The comparative analysis of research findings in the APIKS project has generally been pursued thematically through international conferences that have provided the foundation for the development of edited books and special issues of academic journals. In December of 2020 the Turkish team organized a major virtual conference focusing on the theme of internationalization, and the papers that appear in this volume emerged from discussions and the creation of international working groups at that very important meeting. We would like to acknowledge the leadership of the Turkish team (Baris Uslu, Fatma Nevra Seggie, Sedat Gumus, and Yasar Kondakci) in initiating this project.

Alison Elizabeth Jefferson, an outstanding doctoral student in higher education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, played a very important role in copy-editing draft chapters and helping prepare the manuscript for submission. We benefited greatly from her well-honed attention to detail in the editorial process. Her contributions to the project were supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

Alper's research on the APIKS project has been supported by The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TÜBİTAK - Project No: 117K917) and The Unit of Scientific Research Projects at Canakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Turkey (COMU-BAP - Project No: SBA-2017-1093).

Glen's research on the APIKS project has been supported by the Ontario Human Capital Research and Innovation Fund and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. He would also like to acknowledge the collegial support of Prof. Grace Karram Stephenson.

Yangson's research on the APIKS project has been supported by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science and she would like to acknowledge the support and mentorship of Prof. Akira Arimoto, Prof. Futao Huang and Prof. Tsukasa Daizen.

Finally, we appreciate the very hard work of the international research teams that contributed chapters to this book. Working within international research teams can be extremely rewarding, but there can also be complex challenges of coordination associated with scholarly collaboration across regions, countries, and cultures. This book is the legacy of successful international scholarly collaboration and partnership.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Internationalization and the Academic Profession: Key Concepts and Themes</b> . . . . .	<b>1</b>
	Glen A. Jones, Alper Çalıkoğlu, and Yangson Kim	
<b>2</b>	<b>International Dimensions in Teaching and Learning</b> . . . . .	<b>13</b>
	Sophia Shi-Huei Ho, Manja Klemenčič, and Edgar Oswaldo González Bello	
<b>3</b>	<b>Internationalisation Activities: The Influence of Governance and Management Models in Argentina, Canada, Lithuania, Portugal, and Taiwan</b> . . . . .	<b>37</b>
	Grace Karram Stephenson, Sude Pekşen, Nicolás Reznik, Maria João Manatos, and Robin Jung-Cheng Chen	
<b>4</b>	<b>Early Career Academics and Internationalization</b> . . . . .	<b>67</b>
	Alenka Flander, Pamela Guzmán, Carole Probst Schilter, Paula Tulppo, and Chang Da Wan	
<b>5</b>	<b>International Staff and Diversity in Missions.</b> . . . . .	<b>95</b>
	Maarja Beerkens, Anna Panova, and Pekka Vasari	
<b>6</b>	<b>Academics with International Educational and Research Experiences: Differences Across Countries?</b> . . . . .	<b>113</b>
	Futao Huang, Liudvika Leišytė, Aliya Kuzhabekova, and Sara Diogo	
<b>7</b>	<b>Internationalization Across Global Divides: Comparison Between Core and Semi-Periphery Doctoral Holders in Chile, Malaysia, and Turkey</b> . . . . .	<b>139</b>
	Sergio Celis, Fatma Nevra Seggie, and Norzaini Azman	



**8 Internationalization of Research Across Disciplines  
in Practice: Global Similarities and Differences . . . . . 165**  
Sebastian Kocar, Daniela Véliz, Lars Geschwind, and Pfo Marshall

**9 International Research Collaboration Practices  
and Outcomes: A Comparative Analysis of Academics’  
International Research Activities . . . . . 191**  
Olivier Bégin-Caouette, Timo Aarrevaara, Anna-Lena Rose,  
and Akira Arimoto

**10 The Comparative Study of Internationalization  
and the Academic Profession: Challenges and Possibilities . . . . . 217**  
Yangson Kim, Glen A. Jones, and Alper Çalikoğlu

**Correction to: Early Career Academics and Internationalization . . . . . C1**

**Index . . . . . 235**

# Chapter 1

## Internationalization and the Academic Profession: Key Concepts and Themes



Glen A. Jones , Alper Çalıkoglu , and Yangson Kim 

**Abstract** Internationalization has become a key issue in higher education as well as an important research topic in higher education scholarship. This paper provides an overview of research on internationalization focusing on the academic profession. Internationalization was identified as one of the key thematic areas of scholarship within the Academic Profession in the Knowledge-based Society (APIKS) project. The paper provides an overview of the book, including the core comparative research studies conducted by international research teams, and identifies a number of recent shifts and transformation that may be impacting internationalization and the academic profession.

**Keywords** Internationalization · Academic profession · Academic work · Higher education · Universities

### Introduction

Internationalization has become a key theme and an almost ubiquitous goal of higher education systems and institutions worldwide (Altbach, 2016). Defined by Knight (2003, p. 2) as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education,”

---

G. A. Jones (✉)

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada  
e-mail: [glen.jones@utoronto.ca](mailto:glen.jones@utoronto.ca)

A. Çalıkoglu

Borsa Istanbul Vocational School, Ministry of National Education, Canakkale, Turkey  
e-mail: [alpercalikoglu@gmail.com](mailto:alpercalikoglu@gmail.com)

Y. Kim

Research Institute for Higher Education, Hiroshima University, Higashi-Hiroshima, Japan  
e-mail: [yskim@hiroshima-u.ac.jp](mailto:yskim@hiroshima-u.ac.jp)

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature  
Switzerland AG 2023

A. Çalıkoglu et al. (eds.), *Internationalization and the Academic Profession*,  
The Changing Academy – The Changing Academic Profession in International  
Comparative Perspective 24, [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-26995-0\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-26995-0_1)

internationalization is a highly complex, multi-dimensional phenomenon covering a broad swath of transitions and transformations, from curriculum reforms, to increasing student and faculty mobility, to new forms of international partnerships and consortia. This increasing international dimension of higher education is supported by regional and national policies and funding mechanisms (Trilokekar et al., 2020), stimulated by global competition for prestige and resources, and motivated by a plethora of values and goals, ranging from cosmopolitanism to neo-liberalism.

This volume makes a major contribution to the scholarship on internationalization in higher education by focusing on the perceptions and experiences of the academic profession in comparative perspectives. Drawing from data collected by the Academic Professions in the Knowledge-based Society (APIKS) project, the largest comparative international project ever undertaken in the field of higher education (Aarveaara et al., 2021), the contributors to this volume are uniquely positioned to explore the impact and implications of internationalization on those who play the central role in the teaching and research functions of higher education: the professoriate. With access to data from a common questionnaire administered to members of the academic profession in more than twenty countries, the contributors to this edited volume have conducted comparative studies investigating core themes and questions that are central to the process of internationalization, and in doing so make highly original contributions to a body of scholarship that has been dominated by research focusing primarily on higher education systems, institutions, and students.

The objective of this chapter is to briefly introduce the concept of internationalization and locate this volume within the research literature on the internationalization of higher education. We will then discuss the APIKS project and the international dataset that has allowed the chapter authors to explore important research questions through the analysis of data on faculty perceptions obtained in more than twenty countries. Given that the APIKS data was collected in 2017–18 (with some variation by country), we discuss some of the recent changes, events, and transitions that have significant implications for internationalization, including the emergence of populist political regimes, the return of “big government” and, of course, the realities of a global pandemic. In some respects, given the timing of the APIKS study, the findings presented in this volume might be viewed as a baseline analysis collected just prior to a series of disrupting forces that we recognize have shifted or are shifting key international dimensions of higher education in ways that we do not yet fully comprehend. We conclude the chapter by briefly illuminating how each of the core thematic chapters contributes to the “whole” of the volume.

## **The Internationalization of Higher Education and the Academic Profession**

Internationalization is a multi-dimensional process, and it impacts almost every element or activity associated with higher education. From their origins in Europe, Asia, and North Africa, early institutions of higher education were regional/

international rather than local in scope. These hubs of intellectual activity attracted both students and teachers from far beyond the local environments (Huang, 2014). While universities would later emerge as national institutions funded by governments in order to further the interests of the state, they continued to have a strong international dimension; students, faculty, and knowledge continued to flow across national boundaries (Marginson & van der Wende, 2007).

By the later decades of the twentieth century, internationalization had become an almost ubiquitous dimension within higher education, in part as a response to globalization. The relatively free-flow of capital, communication, transportation, and labour across national borders provided a foundation for an exponential growth in international trade and mobility. Higher education was positioned as a space for the development of the highly educated human resources required in this rapidly changing, increasingly global economic system. The forces of globalization also impacted scholarship and international collaboration. The growth of international research networks was facilitated by increasing access to international transportation, and through the emergence of new information and communication technologies and new mechanisms for knowledge dissemination (Kim, 2009).

As a strategic process, internationalization is impacted by a multitude of factors and based on a diverse range of rationales. Government policies are important drivers of internationalization in some countries, as governments take steps to support student mobility, to support international research collaboration as part of national research and innovation strategies, and/or to encourage the development of “world-class universities.” Institutions of higher education frequently develop internationalization policies that encourage and incentivize certain types of activities or outputs. The reasons to support internationalization can vary dramatically (Knight, 2004; Seeber et al., 2016). Increasing the international dimension of curriculum is frequently associated with the notion of internationalization “at home” by creating opportunities for students to learn different cultural perspectives and develop more global understandings (Leask, 2013). International student recruitment can be a major source of institutional revenue in some systems, but international students can also contribute to cross-cultural learning and facilitate international relationships. Multiple rationales underscore international faculty recruitment, faculty mobility, international research collaboration and partnerships, inbound and outbound student mobility, and almost every other activity associated directly or indirectly with internationalization (Huang et al., 2014).

Research on internationalization has become a major area of scholarship within the field of higher education, and systematic reviews have indicated that the direction of attention in this growing area has been evolving (Deardorff et al., 2012). Kehm and Teichler (2007) reveal that academic mobility and institutionalization processes were at the forefront of internationalization studies with the domination of scholars from the United States. Recent studies, however, have addressed topics on internationalization at home and of the curriculum, multicultural issues, transnational delivery of higher education, and online learning as emerging areas in internationalization research (Bedenlier et al., 2018; Yemini & Sagie, 2016). Moreover, the dominating role of the United States (US) and other English-speaking countries

in the field has recently been challenged by studies from other regions, especially from Continental Europe, China, and South America (Kuzhabekova et al., 2015; Yemini & Sagie, 2016). Buckner (2019) notes that even in the Anglophone world there are important regional/national differences in how internationalization is interpreted and positioned, which, in turn, differ from other regions. Hence, the implementation of internationalization has become broadened and diverse both in terms of region and form of practice. Internationalization is a global phenomenon in higher education, but the concept has become an umbrella term for a plethora of activities and processes with both international and distinctly local understandings.

Related literature has also shown that faculty members' perspectives are critical in understanding and implementing internationalization. For instance, Schwietz (2006) posits that attitudes towards internationalization and prior international experiences play a critical role in enhancing faculty involvement in internationalization. Childress (2010) notes the essentiality of organizational structures and institutional networks to encourage faculty for international activities. Friesen (2013) reveals that faculty rationales for internationalization may differ from institutional motivations. Similarly, Li and Tu (2016) confirm that faculty members' intrinsic motivations are critical in expanding international efforts, although environmental factors can also be important. Finally, Calikoglu et al. (2022) indicate that faculty motivations to become involved in internationalization are diverse, and those motivations have academic, institutional, socio-cultural, student, and international development aspects. The authors also note that faculty perspectives toward internationalization can be either stimulated or discouraged through institutional, governmental, national, geo-political, and financial factors.

Despite the growing body of literature regarding the importance of faculty perspectives toward internationalization, one can note that most of these studies appear limited in terms of their scope (e.g., conceptualization or specific practical forms of internationalization) or geographical focus. Here, previous studies based on the Carnegie (e.g., Welch, 2005) and Changing Academic Professions (CAP) (Huang et al., 2014) projects play a vital role in the literature as studies examining the topic through a diverse body of researcher groups, cases, and areas. There is also a growing recognition of the need to consider important national differences in the structure and nature of academic careers in the comparative analysis of the academic profession (Jones & Finkelstein, 2019), including the study of internationalization. Given that the nature of internationalization and its sub-topics are continuing to evolve with diverse challenges around the world, the current volume aims to contribute to the efforts toward linking faculty perspectives to the internationalization of higher education by examining critical areas in internationalization research through the analysis of a unique comparative dataset by teams of scholars from different countries/higher education systems.

## The Academic Profession in the Knowledge-Based Society Project

This volume is a product of the Academic Profession in the Knowledge-based Society (APIKS) project, the most recent of a series of international and comparative studies of the academic profession. Given the tremendous transformations in higher education and higher education systems since the last decades of the twentieth century, there has been an increasing interest in understanding the changing nature of academic work and the ways in which these broad changes and transitions have been experienced and understood by those who are on the ‘shop floor’ of the higher education enterprise. The Carnegie Foundation Survey of the Academic Profession, conducted between 1991 and 1993, was the first international and comparative survey of academics (Altbach, 1996). A collective of national research teams led the development of the Changing Academic Professions (CAP) project, which included a larger group of jurisdictions (19) and an expanded questionnaire, including a series of questions on the international dimension of academic work. CAP project national research teams collected data in the (roughly) 2007–2008 period (Teichler et al., 2013). The CAP project was followed by a series of other regional and national surveys, including regional projects in Europe and Asia (Aarrevaara et al., 2021).

The APIKS project was initiated in 2014 with the objective of developing a comparative project that would survey faculty roughly ten years following the CAP project, but also include a number of new components and foci in recognition of the potential repositioning of higher education and the academic profession in the context of notions of a knowledge society and/or a knowledge economy. Aarrevaara et al. (2021) provided a detailed description of the evolution of the project which would emerge as the largest comparative study of higher education ever undertaken. Over thirty national or jurisdictional research teams have been involved with the project, and well over twenty administered the international questionnaire during the 2017–2020 time period. Data from these common national studies have now been combined to create an international dataset that is stored and overseen by colleagues in Finland.

Aside from its size, one of the unusual features of the APIKS project (like the previous CAP project) is that there is no central project funding. APIKS is essentially a collaboration between national/jurisdictional research teams. The research teams worked together to develop a common questionnaire that would later be translated and administered at the national level. Each research team was funded locally, often through national research funding agencies. The leader of each team is a member of the core governance group for the project. While there is ongoing electronic communication between groups, thematic international conferences focusing on specific elements of the questionnaire have been the major forum for the development of international/comparative analyses. Several of these international conferences took place virtually in the context of the global pandemic.

A thematic conference focusing on the theme of internationalization was organized by the Turkish national team and took place (virtually) in Turkey in December 2020. Conference presentations and other contributions from the collaborative work among each country's team members became the foundation for a special issue of *Yükseköğretim Dergisi/Journal of Higher Education* (Turkey).

At the same time, the conference provided the space for comparative discussions that were foundational to the strategic design of this volume. A discussion of key themes and research questions led to the development of international working teams that co-authored book chapters. Encouraging international and comparative perspectives was foundational to the strategic design and organization of the project. Each of the core chapters involves a systematic analysis of an internationalization issue or theme through an exploration of relevant elements of the international APIKS dataset and other relevant national and international data. Each of these chapters is written by an international team of three or more scholars from different countries and regions that was organically constructed during or shortly after the Istanbul conference. The three co-editors are located in different continents within very different national systems.

The core thematic chapters address essential questions related to internationalization and the academic profession. Each of these chapters draws on the existing research literature in these thematic areas as a foundation for the systematic analysis of the international APIKS dataset to illuminate and discuss key findings, in some cases comparing the experiences of faculty in countries selected because of national system characteristics, comparing and contrasting experiences within regions, or exploring an internationalization theme across all twenty countries represented in the international dataset at the time these studies were completed. We will provide a brief overview of each study later in this chapter.

## **Recent Shifts and Transformations in the Internationalization of Higher Education**

As we have noted, the APIKS international data that is foundational to the analyses presented in this volume was collected during a period beginning in 2017 and therefore provides a snapshot of faculty perceptions of internationalization during this time. While internationalization has never been a static phenomenon and has always been impacted by broader national, international, and global trends, there is little doubt that more recent events and global geo-political shifts have been extremely dramatic and have and will continue to influence the internationalization of higher education.

The rise of new populist governments has challenged either directly or indirectly many of the foundational elements of globalism. The election of Donald Trump as President of the United States in 2016, for example, led to major shifts in American foreign policy (Ashbee & Hurst, 2020) including, but far from limited to, a travel

ban related to several predominantly Muslim countries, an “America first” approach to discussions of global trade that evolved into a trade war with China, and a distrust or repositioning of international organizations such as the United Nations and NATO. All of these policy shifts had important implications for American higher education, but perhaps particularly for internationalization (Douglas, 2021a). Nationalism clearly underscored the Brexit victory in the United Kingdom referendum and the country’s withdrawal from the European Union, leaving many lingering questions on a range of key issues, including the future of international research collaboration and partnerships in the context of these shifting relationships (Corbett & Gordon, 2018). In Brazil, the election of Bolsonaro’s neo-nationalist government had huge implications for that nation’s foreign policy and the entire higher education system (Balbachevsky & Albuquerque, 2021). These, and somewhat parallel shifts in other countries, served to disrupt and destabilize global geo-politics, with implications for international faculty and student mobility, and even for the conceptual foundations of internationalism in the face of neo-nationalist movements (Hammond, 2016; Lee, 2016; Lee et al., 2017; Pan, 2021). Some of these shifts have had even broader implications for the positioning of higher education. Douglas notes, “We have entered an era in which neo-nationalists often attack universities as hubs of dissent, symbols of global elitism, and generators of biased research” (Douglas, 2021b, p. 22).

The emergence of a global pandemic in 2019 had immediate implications for the international activities of higher education. In many parts of the world international travel suddenly became impossible. In many countries, higher education transitioned to online education in order to protect the health and safety of students and faculty, and to reduce the spread of disease within broader communities. International projects, partnerships, and conferences were frequently paused in the initial phases of the pandemic, and then re-initiated or resumed through virtual communication media.

The short-term implications of the pandemic on the internationalization of higher education were dramatic, and while the pandemic is far from over as we write this chapter in the spring of 2022, there are signals of longer-term shifts and transitions. The pandemic illuminated systemic inequities within many societies, and within higher education systems. International student mobility appears to have rebounded as travel restrictions have decreased, but markets and patterns may shift given the experience of online education and transitions in the broader geo-political environment. The implications of international travel for the climate crisis may (and should) lead to shifts in international scholarly communication, and in particular the important role that in-person conferences have historically played in the development of international networks and academic collaboration. In short, there may be important changes in internationalization that extend well beyond the current concerns with public health.

We would also note that the pandemic, as well as a number of other related factors, has led to a shift in the role of government in many jurisdictions. There has been a return to “big government” as governments have tried to address the crises and uncertainties associated with the rapidly changing economic realities of the



pandemic. This phenomenon is far from universal, but direct government involvement in the economy has clearly grown in many countries, and with it a sense of increased legitimacy for government steering and/or intervention. Whether “big government” will be sustained post-pandemic, and the implications of this shift, if any, for higher education systems and internationalization, is impossible to predict at this time.

## **Organization of This Volume: Chapter Contributions**

In many ways, the dramatic changes and events discussed above reinforce the importance of the unique analyses of internationalization presented in the chapters of this volume. The APIKS project provides a unique opportunity to compare the perceptions of members of the academic profession across nations using data from a common questionnaire. The core chapters of this book not only make significant contributions to the literature on internationalization in higher education, but they provide us with an important pre-pandemic snapshot, a base-line from which to explore and understand the implications of many of the dramatic changes that we have recently experienced. The next two chapters focus on the institutional context by looking at internationalization in teaching and learning, and issues of governance and incentivization. The following series of papers look at internationalization in relation to characteristics of the profession, such as career stage, international experience, and educational background. The final two core chapters look at internationalization of research.

In “International Dimensions of Teaching and Learning” (Chap. 2), Sophia Shi-Huei Ho, Manja Klemenčič and Edgar Oswaldo González Bello focus on internationalization at home through a comparative analysis of faculty perceptions of, and reported activities related to, internationalization of teaching and learning. They note major differences in faculty responses to these issues by country and region, and the importance of institutional internationalization strategies.

Grace Karram Stephenson, Sude Pekşen, Nicolás Reznik, Maria João Manatos, and Robin Chen explore the relationships between university governance styles and incentives and/or strategies for internationalization. Their paper, entitled “Internationalisation Activities: The Influence of Governance and Management Models in Argentina, Canada, Lithuania, Portugal and Taiwan” (Chap. 3) provides a very unique comparative analysis of relationships between faculty perceptions of university governance elements and institutional internationalization policies in five countries.

The perceptions of more junior members of the academic profession concerning internationalization is the focus of attention of Chap. 4. In “Early Career Academics and Internationalization,” Alenka Flander, Pamela Guzmán, Carole Probst Schilter, Paula Tulppo, and Chang Da Wan analyze and compare the responses from early career faculty with the responses from their more senior colleagues in sixteen countries. They focus on differences between junior and senior career academics in

international training background and in international work activities (teaching, research, and external engagements).

In “International staff and diversity in missions” (Chap. 5), Maarja Beerkens, Anna Panova, and Pekka Vasari compare responses between “international” staff, individuals who hold citizenship in a country other than one they are working in, and “local” staff who are citizens of the country of their employment. Focusing on faculty responses from six countries, they explore whether there are differences between these two groups on a range of issues, including research emphasis and local engagement.

Instead of looking at citizenship, Futao Huang, Liudvika Leišytė, Aliya Kuzhabekova and Sara Diogo compare responses from faculty who obtained their final degree or a postdoctoral experience in a foreign country with those who did not. In “Academics with International Educational and Research Experiences: Differences across countries?” (Chap. 6), the authors analyze data from respondents in seven countries in order to determine whether there are differences in characteristics and academic activities between these two groups of academics.

Sergio Celis, Fatma Nevra Seggie, and Norzaini Azman are also interested in the background educational experiences of academics, but their focus is on semi-peripheral systems of higher education and the comparison is between faculty who obtained their doctoral degree from a core country and those who obtained their degree from a country classified as peripheral or semi-peripheral. Noting the dramatic imbalances in power and prestige between the Global North and the Global South, their paper, “Internationalization Across Global Divides: Comparisons Between Core and Semi-Periphery Doctoral Holders in Chile, Malaysia and Turkey” (Chap. 7), explores differences between countries in the employment of faculty educated in core countries, as well as analyzing differences between faculty educated within these very different geo-graphic and economic spheres in terms of time allocation, preferences, and overall satisfaction.

The next two papers focus on the internationalization of research. Drawing on the literature focusing on discipline differences, Sebastian Kocar, Daniela Véliz, Lars Geschwind, and Pío Marshall explore differences in response by faculty in different discipline areas in terms of international research activities. Their paper, entitled “Internationalization of research across disciplines in practice: Global similarities and differences” (Chap. 8), analyzes data from twenty countries and notes important differences by broad discipline categories and jurisdiction.

In their paper “International research collaboration practices and outcomes: A comparative analysis of academics’ international research activities” (Chap. 9), Olivier Bégin-Caouette, Timo Aarrevaara, Anna-Lena Rose, and Akira Arimoto analyze the relationship between international research collaboration activities and outcomes in five countries. Conceptually grounded in the theory of scientific and technical human capital, their study examines whether practices and outcomes are correlated.

The concluding chapter, entitled “The comparative study of internationalization and the academic profession: Challenges and possibilities” (Chap. 10) reviews the core findings and illuminates how these studies contribute to the broader literature

on internationalization and the academic profession. Yangson Kim, Glen A. Jones, and Alper Çalikoğlu draw important conclusions emerging from the volume and raise important questions for further study.

All of these papers make important contributions to the study of internationalization and the academic profession. While internationalization has become a very important research topic within the field of higher education, most of the emphasis has been on issues of student mobility (and the student experience), system-level policy, and institutional strategy and initiatives. University professors clearly play a key role within the institutionalization process, especially given their central positioning in the teaching and research activities of universities, but the perceptions and activities of academics has received surprising little attention within the research literature. All of the chapters in this book explore extremely important research questions on internationalization through original and insightful comparative analyses.

## References

- Aarveaara, T., Finkelstein, M. J., Jones, G. A., & Jung, J. (2021). The academic profession in the knowledge-based society (APIKS): Evolution of a major comparative research project. In T. Aarveaara, M. J. Finkelstein, G. A. Jones, & J. Jung (Eds.), *Universities and the knowledge society: The nexus of National Systems of innovation and higher education* (pp. 49–64). Springer.
- Altbach, P. G. (Ed.). (1996). *The international academic profession: Portraits of fourteen countries*. Princeton.
- Altbach, P. G. (2016). *Global perspectives on higher education*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Ashbee, E., & Hurst, S. (2020). The trump foreign policy record and the concept of transformational change. *Global Affairs*, 6(1), 5–19.
- Balachevsky, E., & Albuquerque, J. A. G. (2021). Bolsonaro's Brazilian neo-nationalism and universities. In J. A. Douglas (Ed.), *Neo-nationalism and universities: Populists, autocrats, and the future of higher education* (pp. 239–556). Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Bedenlier, S., Kondakci, Y., & Zawacki-Richter, O. (2018). Two decades of research into the internationalization of higher education: Major themes in the Journal of Studies in International Education (1997-2016). *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 22(2), 108–135.
- Buckner, E. (2019). The internationalization of higher education: National interpretations of a global model. *Comparative Education Review*, 63(3), 315–336.
- Calikoglu, A., Lee, J. J., & Arslan, H. (2022). Faculty international engagement: Examining rationales, strategies, and barriers in institutional settings. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 26(1), 61–79.
- Childress, L. K. (2010). *The twenty-first century university: Developing faculty engagement in internationalization*. Peter Lang.
- Corbett, A., & Gordon, C. (2018). Brexit and higher education research. In P. Diamond, P. Nedergaard, & B. Rosamond (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of the politics of Brexit* (pp. 103–117). Routledge.
- Deardorff, D. K., de Wit, H., Heyl, J. D., & Adams, T. (Eds.). (2012). *The SAGE handbook of international higher education* (1st ed.). Sage.
- Douglas, J. A. (2021a). Trumpian nationalism and American universities. In J. A. Douglas (Ed.), *Neo-nationalism and universities: Populists, autocrats, and the future of higher education* (pp. 61–91). Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Douglas, J. A. (2021b). Neo-nationalism and universities: A conceptual model. In J. A. Douglas (Ed.), *Neo-nationalism and universities: Populists, autocrats, and the future of higher education* (pp. 22–42). Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Friesen, R. (2013). Faculty member engagement in Canadian university internationalization: A consideration of understanding, motivations and rationales. *Journal of studies in international Education, 17*(3), 209–227.
- Hammond, C. D. (2016). Internationalization, nationalism, and global competitiveness: A comparison of approaches to higher education in China and Japan. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 17*(4), 555–566.
- Huang, F. (2014). The internationalisation of the academic profession. In F. Huang, M. Finkelstein, & M. Rostan (Eds.), *The internationalization of the academy: Changes, realities and prospects* (pp. 1–21). Springer Netherlands.
- Huang, F., Finkelstein, M., & Rostan, M. (Eds.). (2014). *The internationalization of the academy: Changes, realities and prospects*. Springer.
- Jones, G. A., & Finkelstein, M. (2019). Looking across systems: Implications for comparative, international studies of academic work. In M. Finkelstein & G. A. Jones (Eds.), *Professorial pathways: Academic careers in global perspective* (pp. 265–290). Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kehm, B. M., & Teichler, U. (2007). Research on internationalisation in higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(3/4), 260–273.
- Kim, T. (2009). Shifting patterns of transnational academic mobility: A comparative and historical approach. *Comparative Education, 45*(3), 387–403.
- Knight, J. (2003). Updated internationalization definition. *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.
- Kuzhabekova, A., Hendel, D. D., & Chapman, D. W. (2015). Mapping global research on international higher education. *Research in Higher Education, 56*, 861–882.
- Leask, B. (2013). Internationalizing the curriculum in the disciplines—Imagining new possibilities. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 17*(2), 103–118.
- Lee, J. J. (2016). Neo-nationalism: Challenges for international students. *International Higher Education, 84*, 23–24.
- Lee, J., Jon, J.-E., & Byun, K. (2017). Neo-racism and neo-nationalism within East Asia: The experiences of international students in South Korea. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 21*(2), 136–155.
- Li, B., & Tu, Y. (2016). Motivations of faculty engagement in internationalization: A survey in China. *Higher Education, 71*(1), 81–96.
- Marginson, S., & van der Wende, M. (2007). *Globalisation and higher education*. OECD education working papers, no. 8. OECD Publishing.
- Pan, S. (2021). Reconceptualizing ‘internationalisation’ in higher education: The case of Hong Kong. *Higher Education Quarterly, 75*(3), 48–499.
- Schwietz, M. S. (2006). Internationalization of the academic profession: An exploratory study of faculty attitudes, beliefs and involvement at public universities in Pennsylvania. (doctoral dissertation).
- Seeber, M., Cattaneo, M., & Huisman, J. (2016). Why do higher education institutions internationalize? An investigation of the multilevel determinants of internationalization rationales. *Higher Education, 72*(5), 685–702.
- Teichler, U., Arimoto, A., & Cummings, W. (Eds.). (2013). *The changing academic profession: Major findings of a comparative study*. Springer.
- Trilokekar, R. D., Jones, G. A., & Tamtik, M. (2020). Introduction: The emergence of international education as public policy. In M. Tamtik, R. D. Trilokekar, & G. A. Jones (Eds.), *International education as public policy in Canada* (pp. 3–25). McGill-Queen’s University Press.
- Welch, A. (Ed.). (2005). *The professoriate: Profile of a profession*. Springer.
- Yemini, M., & Sagie, N. (2016). Research on internationalization in higher education—Exploratory analysis. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education, 20*, 90–98.

**Glen A. Jones** is Professor and Director of the Centre for the Study of Canadian and International Higher Education, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), University of Toronto. His research focuses on higher education governance, systems, policy and academic work. Recent co-edited or co-authored books include *Professorial Pathways: Academic Careers in a Global Perspective* (Jones & Finkelstein, 2019), *International Education as Public Policy in Canada* (McGill-Queen's, 2020), *Universities and the Knowledge Society: The Nexus of National Systems of Innovation and Higher Education* (Springer, 2021), and *University Governance in Canada: Navigating Complexity* (McGill-Queen's, 2022). He is a former dean of OISE, and he has received numerous awards for his research, including an honorary doctorate (University of Manitoba).

**Alper Çalkoğlu** is a researcher in Turkey. His research interests include the internationalization of higher education, the academic profession, and higher education governance and management. His recent articles related to internationalization and the academic profession include Faculty international engagement: Examining rationales, strategies and barriers in institutional settings (with Jenny J. Lee and Hasan Arslan, *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 2022) and Changing patterns of international academic mobility: Experiences of Western-origin faculty members in Turkey (with Fatma Nevra Seggie, *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 2021). Based on articles from the Academic Profession in the Knowledge-Based Society (APIKS) project, he has co-edited a special issue on internationalization in the *Journal of Higher Education, Turkey*. He has also served as an administrative board member of the Association for Higher Education Studies (YÖÇAD) in Turkey.

**Yangson Kim** is Associate Professor of Research Institute for Higher Education at Hiroshima University in Japan. Her research focuses on the academic profession, internationalization of higher education, research productivity and collaboration, institutional context and governance of higher education, and comparative higher education in Asia-Pacific countries. Her recent co-authored articles and book chapters include *Being Academic: How Junior Female Academics in Korea Survive in the Neoliberal Context of a Patriarchal Society* (Higher Education, 2021), *Junior Female Academics: Experiences and Challenges* (Japan Documents, 2021), and *International Faculty Members in China, Japan, and Korea: Their Characteristics and the Challenges Facing Them* (Edward Elgar, 2022). She had co-edited a special issue on *the Research and Teaching Nexus of Academics in the New Era* (Higher Education Forum, 2020).

# Chapter 2

## International Dimensions in Teaching and Learning



Sophia Shi-Huei Ho , Manja Klemenčič ,  
and Edgar Oswaldo González Bello 

**Abstract** With the spread of globalization, the need to equip *all* students in higher education with international, intercultural, and global competencies has become more pronounced. International mobility has long been the preferred practice to achieve this. However, despite the continuous increases in international education, the limits on student mobility are undisputed. This is how internationalization at home became a policy priority. One of the most direct and impactful mechanisms of internationalization at home is through teaching, specifically through emphasizing international perspectives and content in course teaching. In this chapter, we analyze international dimensions in teaching and learning by comparing survey data from

---

Using CRediT - Contributor Roles Taxonomy, the co-authors of this chapter performed the following roles: Sophia Shi-Huei Ho was the primary responsible for formal analysis of data, contributed to methodology, data interpretation, and to writing of the original draft, editing, and proofreading. Manja Klemenčič was the primary responsible for writing the original draft, review and editing, and contributed to methodology and to interpretation of findings. Edgar Oswaldo González Bello was the primary responsible for the interpretation of findings and contributed to writing and to methodology. All co-authors jointly conceptualized the chapter. The division of intellectual property rights on authorship is equal among the three co-authors with Sophia Shi-Huei Ho as first author.

---

S. S.-H. Ho (✉)  
University of Taipei, Taipei, Taiwan  
e-mail: [shihuei@utapei.edu.tw](mailto:shihuei@utapei.edu.tw)

M. Klemenčič  
University of Harvard, Cambridge, MA, USA  
University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia  
e-mail: [manjaklemencic@g.harvard.edu](mailto:manjaklemencic@g.harvard.edu)

E. O. G. Bello  
University of Sonora, Sonora, Mexico  
e-mail: [edgar.gonzalez@unison.mx](mailto:edgar.gonzalez@unison.mx)

academics' self-reported behaviors and perceptions. This study is guided by two research questions: (1) How do countries compare according to academics' emphasizing international perspectives and content in teaching? and (2) How do the internationalization practices impact the internationalization of the curriculum across countries? The chapter utilizes the survey data of academic staff acquired within the global research network APIKS (Academic Profession in Knowledge-based Society) with a geographic focus involving 20 countries from three world regions. Our findings point to notable differences between countries and world regions in academics' implementation of international perspectives or content in their course teaching.

**Keywords** APIKS · Internationalization of the curriculum · Internationalization strategy · Outcomes of internationalization

## Introduction

Internationalization of higher education is seen as one of the key markers of quality higher education. Student mobility, recruitment of international students and staff, and international research collaboration have long been held as important aims and key indicators of internationalization of higher education (Huang, 2014). Other themes have also emerged, such as academic mobility and international knowledge transfer (Huang, 2014). With the spread of globalization, the need to equip *all* students with international, intercultural, and global competencies have become more pronounced. This is to fulfill one of the purposes of higher education as “as the key engines of human resource development and ultimately their economic competitiveness” (Huang, 2014, p.1). Despite the continuous increase in international education, both in terms of mobile degree students and short-time mobile students, the limits to student mobility are undisputed. It is unlikely that most of the student population in any country will benefit from study abroad opportunities despite increases in funding and increased offers of mobility programs. This is how internationalization at home became a policy priority. Internationalization at home enables the development of international, intercultural, and global competencies for students who do not engage in mobility programs. Practices of internationalization at home also more purposefully engage incoming foreign students.

Internationalization at home is an umbrella term to describe the variety of instruments and activities to enable all students, regardless of whether they participate in study abroad programs or not, to develop international, intercultural, and global competencies (Leask et al., 2013). One such instrument of internationalization at home is the internationalization of the curriculum. This too has several dimensions, including measures whereby academics emphasize international perspectives and content in course teaching. Another practice includes international modules as part of study programs offered by the departments.



In this chapter, we focus specifically on international dimensions in teaching as the most direct measure of internationalization of the curriculum and thus of internationalization at home. We are interested in academics' behaviors in terms of their emphasizing international perspectives and content in teaching, comparing these behaviors across countries in different world regions. We also compare academics' observations of the two indirect indicators of internationalization of the curriculum: the increase in the number of incoming international undergraduate students, and the presence of international graduate students. Furthermore, we are interested in understanding how different internationalization practices at a higher education institution influence the international dimension in teaching. Does a clear internationalization strategy at an institution positively impact academics' propensity to emphasize international perspectives and content in teaching? Our research is guided by two research questions: (1) How do countries compare according to academics' emphasis of international perspectives and content in teaching? and (2), How do internationalization practices impact the internationalization of the curriculum across countries? We utilize survey data of academic staff acquired within the global research network, Academic Profession in Knowledge Societies (APIKS), with the geographic focus involving 20 countries from three world regions (APIKS – IDB, 2021).

Academics' insights on this topic are relevant since academic staff are one of the key agents of internationalization (Brotherhood et al., 2020). Academics have the capability to drive internationalization by directly implementing the desired policy measures, such as emphasizing international perspectives and content in teaching. Academics can also stall internationalization processes if they lack the capability to implement the policy measures or are otherwise unwilling to do so. The existing studies of the internationalization of curriculum focus mostly on the analysis of policies and practices at the national, institutional, or study-program level (Childress, 2010; Jones & Killick, 2013). The approach taken in our study aligns with the work conducted by Coates et al. (2014) included in the edited volume *The Internationalization of the Academy: Changes, Realities and Prospects* (Huang et al., 2016). The survey data from the country studies conducted as part of the APIKS survey offers first-hand reports from academic staff on their actual behavior, i.e., how likely they are to include international perspectives or content into course teaching, as well as their perceptions of internationalization practices, such as incoming student mobility and presence of international graduate students. The APIKS data we utilize in our study also has a unique geographic reach involving survey data from 20 countries from three world regions: the Americas, Asia, and Europe.

In the remainder of the chapter, we first review the literature on the internationalization of the curriculum and international dimensions in teaching to locate our research within broader scholarly conversations. Next, we describe the methodology of our study which focuses on academics' agentic behavior with respect to international dimensions in teaching, and their perceptions of other internationalization practices. In the section on findings, we present data from international