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ABSTRACT

Australian higher education appears to be in the vanguard of internationalisation worldwide. In line with global changes to higher education, Australian universities have adopted comprehensive international strategies across their teaching, research and outreach agendas. By many measures, this strategic approach to internationalisation has been successful. Given the central role of academic staff within the life of the university, and with international strategies now touching on all aspects of a university's activity, academic staff are important to the further internationalisation of Australian higher education. Yet little is known about the factors which influence the international engagement of Australian academics (that is, their involvement with the international dimensions of all aspects of their work) and the extent to which they consider international activities an important aspect of their academic work.

This study has investigated the engagement of academic staff with the international dimensions of their work. It sought to identify the extent to which different aspects of international engagement have been integrated into contemporary understandings of academic work in Australia, as well as to examine the factors which influence academic staff choices in relation to their international engagement. Based on an Adaptive Theory approach (Layder, 1998), the research took case studies of two universities – a younger progressive university and an older research intensive university – which, between them, are broadly representative of one third of the Australian university sector. Qualitative data were collected through document analysis and in-depth interviews with thirty-seven academic staff drawn from Science and Business disciplines.

The study found that the international dimensions of academic work are predominantly centred on research, despite the literature on internationalisation pointing to a more comprehensive focus and despite institutional strategies advocating for a more balanced approach to international engagement. In terms of contributions, the study has conceptualised a typology of international engagement to address the gap identified in the literature in relation to a holistic understanding of the international dimensions of academic work. Further findings are presented in relation to the influence of institutional and disciplinary context, as well as personal and individual factors. Particular to the Australian context is a finding in relation to geographic isolation, which
is commonly described as both a driver and barrier to the international engagement of
Australian academic staff.

This study argues that institutions need to recognise the complex and interweaving
nature of the factors which influence academic staff in relation to the international
dimensions of their work. This recognition is important if institutions seek to foster
greater international involvement amongst their academic community. In addition,
institutions could review the role of leadership at the local level in fostering greater
international engagement beyond research, as well as reconsider the availability of
funding and technology to mitigate the barrier to international engagement of
Australia’s distance from other countries.
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Chapter 1  INTRODUCTION

Internationalisation has become part of the fabric of higher education institutions around the world, with the most recent Global Survey by the International Association of Universities (IAU) indicating that 91% of surveyed institutions have some form of strategic plan for internationalisation (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2014). In addition, it is often claimed that academic staff (or faculty) are crucial to the success of internationalisation. Knight (1999b, p. 222) proposes that “the engine of internationalization at the institutional level is clearly the faculty and staff”, whilst Green and Olson (2003, p. 69) claim that “faculty engagement drives successful internationalization”. Within the higher education institution, academic staff are certainly considered to be “its most productive element, its source of distinction” (Kerr, 1963, p. 100) with responsibility for the generation, application and dissemination of new knowledge through their research, teaching and outreach.

Yet, despite the crucial role of academic staff within higher education and the significance attached to internationalisation in formal institutional planning, there appears to be limited congruence between the international dimensions of academic work and institutional commitments to greater international engagement in their various activities. Questions therefore arise as to just how internationally engaged academic staff are and what drives and inhibits their involvement with the international dimensions of their work. Although earlier research has shown that academic staff play a central role in institutional internationalisation (Childress, 2010; M. F. Green & Olson, 2003; Knight, 1999b, 2006), little is known about how academic staff engage internationally in their work and what supports and hinders this engagement.

In Australia, where institutions have been pursuing internationalisation strategies for over a quarter century (D. Davis & Mackintosh, 2011), earlier studies have generally focused on the teaching and learning aspects of academic work. Likewise, studies undertaken in other countries tend to focus on either teaching or research, rather than considering the international engagement of academic staff from a broader perspective. In this context, the term ‘international engagement’ is used to refer to the involvement of academic staff with the international dimensions of all aspects of their work. As such, earlier studies offer limited insights into what shapes the international engagement of
Australian academic staff, nor into exactly what the international dimensions of academic work are.

This introductory chapter sets the context for the study by presenting a discussion of what is meant by internationalisation, particularly as a process of institutional change. It then outlines the particular characteristics of the internationalisation of Australian higher education. The chapter closes with an outline of the study and a description of how the thesis is structured and organised.

**1.1. What is internationalisation?**

Definitions have been proposed and refined for the term ‘internationalisation’ since the early 1980s. Whilst different schools of thought have put forward a range of conceptual frameworks, most agree on a set of underlying rationales which include economic and political motivations (such as economic growth, support for the labour market, soft power and foreign policy, and the financial return of recruiting international students) and cultural and educational/academic motivations (such as the personal development of the individual, improvement in the quality of research, and the addition of an international dimension to teaching and learning) (Knight, 1999a; Knight & De Wit, 1995; Knight & de Wit, 1997; Maringe, 2010). Other views frame the principal rationale for internationalisation as the advancement of human knowledge (Yang, 2002) or the promotion of national identity and culture (Qiang, 2003), in line with the concept of internationalisation as a ‘public good’ of value to individuals and institutions and to be encouraged by governments for the benefit of the wider society and economy (Taylor, 2010b).

Unsurprisingly, this diversity of rationales and stakeholders has led to a range of definitions put forward over time by individual researchers and professional associations involved in international education. There is general agreement, however, that internationalisation should be understood (in line with its morphology) as an iterative process, rather than as an activity in itself, and that a commitment to internationalisation should shape the institution as a whole. Proposed by Harari (1989), these two key concepts have served to shape most subsequent definitions and
frameworks, together with an understanding that the principal site of internationalisation is the university or other post-secondary institution. In line with this thinking, Knight (1993, p. 6) developed a first working definition of internationalisation as:

the process of integrating the international dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of an institution of higher education.

Informed by the emergence of new concepts in international education, this working definition was revised a number of times (Knight, 1997, 2003; Knight & De Wit, 1995) in order to include first an intercultural dimension and then reference to the influence of a broader set of national and sectoral actors on the international dimension of postsecondary education, including national/regional governments and international organisations (Van Der Wende, 1997). Although the working definitions have become steadily more comprehensive in terms of the multiple stakeholders involved, they are criticised for their “inherent generality and ambiguity” (Sidhu, 2006, p. 3). Further criticism stems from the Western/European framework within which most interpretations and definitions of internationalisation are presented (Maringe, 2010). Yang (2002) also highlights that the conceptualisations of internationalisation in developing countries will necessarily be influenced by different histories and cultures, and points to an alternative interpretation of internationalisation as “westernisation” or "liberalisation" in the developing world.

Despite these criticisms, the working definition of internationalisation developed iteratively by Knight and De Wit has nevertheless received broad acceptance within both scholarly and practitioner groups (Maringe, 2010; Olson, Green, & Hill, 2005; Van Der Wende, 1997; Welch & Denman, 1997). It has also frequently been adopted as a foundational definition in the international strategies put forward by individual institutions (see, for example, Back, Davis, & Olsen, 1996). Indeed, Knight (2004, 2007) and Peterson and Helms (2014) maintain that the real process of internationalisation, or “the heavy lifting of global engagement” (Peterson & Helms, 2014, p. 4), operates at the
inhaltional level, even if governments/non-government organisations (NGOs) and other national or sectoral players have a role.

Nevertheless, questions remain over the distinction between internationalisation (as a process) and international education (as an activity or set of activities) and the precise interplay between these two related terms. In many ways, this definitional dilemma mirrors the tension between commercial and non-commercial approaches to international activities in higher education. Concerns have been expressed about the predominance of political and economic rationales for internationalisation in the latter part of the 20th century (De Wit, 1999), where commercial gain (principally from the recruitment of international fee-paying students) has become the key focus of institutional strategies. In a similar vein, calls have been made to re-think internationalisation in order to affirm academic values and to avoid the potential negative consequences of a predominant focus on commercial and competitive approaches to international education (International Association of Universities, 2012).

In response to these concerns, a further revision to the Knight and De Wit definition of internationalisation was proposed in 2015, now making specific reference to students and staff, as well as to improved quality and societal contributions as outcomes. In this revised definition, internationalisation is:

> 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 (De Wit, Hunter, Howard, & Egron-Polak, 2015, p. 29).

Whether the continued revision of process-oriented definitions of internationalisation has any direct effect on institutions and their academic staff is a moot point. Indeed, criticism has been directed at the various attempts to re-label internationalisation (for example, as ‘comprehensive’ or ‘inclusive’) due to the failure of these reclassifications to engage in informed debate or action on the key issues (Jones & De Wit, 2012). However, these definitional refinements and re-labellings do highlight the conceptual fluidity
related to the internationalisation of higher education and the fact that it can be seen from diverse perspectives – as both a traditional and a modern concept, influenced by both altruistic and economic motivations (Foskett, 2010). Of particular relevance to this study, however, is the predominant focus of definitional frameworks which centre on the institution, rather than on the various sets of actors within the institution, such as academic staff. Although internationalisation is seen to operate within the institution itself, at the level of the group and the individual (Ellingboe, 1998), it is generally understood as a process of change or transformation in institutional values and practices (Teichler, 2004; Welch & Denman, 1997).

1.1.1. A common understanding?

Although definitions of internationalisation in higher education have been proposed and revised, common understandings of the term remain elusive (Jones & De Wit, 2012). Some even propose that internationalisation has become so fluid and inclusive that it is essentially a ‘portmanteau concept’ (Callan, 2000), perhaps “better described as a loose collection of ideas rather than as a coherently structured definition” (De Haan, 2014, p. 256). In this light, the findings of a case study in a major US university are revealing:

Although the term ‘internationalization’ is commonly used in higher education, it is understood and implemented differently by administrators, faculty, and students within the same university (Schoorman, 1999, p. 35).

Despite the development of international strategies by institutions and the adoption of preferred institutional definitions of internationalisation, the literature demonstrates that it is not uncommon for individual members of an institution to have diverse understandings of what internationalisation is (Agnew, 2012; Friesen, 2013). Indeed, as discussed in greater detail in Chapter 2, understandings of internationalisation are likely to vary between individuals, between disciplines, and between institutions. Amongst academic staff, the intersections between these diverse understandings can become a critical determinant of how they engage with the internationalisation process of their institution (Turner & Robson, 2007).
Looking beyond the institution itself, a broader set of modifications to the global higher education environment is affecting all institutions and by extension the academic work undertaken within them. Although more directly linked to increased globalisation than to the particular internationalisation strategies of an individual institution (Marginson & Van Der Wende, 2007; Maringe, 2010), external influences brought to bear on higher education include the worldwide integration of research, the growing use of English in the academy, an expanding job market for scholars and students, the growth of multinational communications and publishing firms, and the pervasive use of information technology (Altbach & Knight, 2007). The advent of international rankings and typologies of universities, as well as new forms of cross-border or transnational education, are brought to this list by other analyses (Knight, 2008; Marginson & Van Der Wende, 2007; Ward, 2008).

As such, in relation to this study, it appears that academic staff are exposed to multiple likely definitions and interpretations of what internationalisation is and what it means for contemporary higher education and for their work. An additional vector for understanding internationalisation relates to the personal experience of academic staff, with a number of empirical studies highlighting the importance of individuals constructing and developing their own personal understanding of internationalisation (Schoorman, 1999; Schuerholz-Lehr, Caws, Van Gyn, & Preece, 2007). Although academic work has always been predisposed to an international context in the generation of new knowledge (as discussed in Chapter 2), the coordinated support of internationalisation within universities is a newer initiative (Hudzik, 2015). Indeed, Scott (1998) refers to the potential tension between the individual pursuit of international engagement and broader and institutional rationales, leading to the proposal that internationalisation is more readily expressed through the ‘private life’ of the university (that is, through its intellectual endeavours) than through its ‘public life’.

1.2. Internationalisation and the institution

Whilst disagreement may exist about the precise historical origins of an international focus in higher education (Knight & De Wit, 1995; Scott, 1998; Welch & Denman, 1997), it
is commonly understood that the pursuit of knowledge production is itself borderless, requiring academic staff to have an awareness above and beyond their local and national context in the conduct of research. Similarly, early constructs of the university were underpinned by the promotion of international values, with international student mobility (albeit at very limited levels) underscoring the potential for knowledge acquisition to transcend borders (Welch & Denman, 1997).

Although certain aspects of higher education have had an international focus since the earliest days of the academy, it is only more recently that institutions have moved to ensure greater integration of their international activities through the development of international strategies and internationalisation plans (Middlehurst & Woodfield, 2007; Taylor, 2010a). These institutional strategies and plans have been developed in response to multiple external factors, including the growth of mass student mobility across borders (Ward, 2008), the advent of international rankings of universities (Marginson & Van der Wende, 2007) and new forms of cross-border or transnational education (Knight, 2008). They are also firmly in line with an increasingly managerial approach within higher education, which has fostered and promoted the use of strategic planning within institutions (Clark, 1963; Slaughter, 1997). As such, whilst internationalisation may not previously have been acknowledged as an activity requiring internal leadership or management, changing economic, political, academic and social conditions have highlighted new opportunities and threats for institutions and underscored a need for greater institutional coordination of their international activities (Childress, 2009; Edelstein & Douglass, 2012; Taylor, 2004).

Regular global surveys of higher education institutions, undertaken since 2005 by the UNESCO-based International Association of Universities (IAU), provide an indication of the extent to which formalised international strategies/plans have been adopted by institutions around the world. Results of the most recent IAU Global Survey (carried out in 2013) indicate that 91% of surveyed institutions (n=1336 from 131 different countries) have some form of strategic plan for internationalisation, whether it be stand-alone, under development or integrated into a broader institutional strategy (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2014). This marks an increase on the previous 2009 survey, where 87% of the
respondent institutions (n=745) indicated that their institutional strategic plan contained reference to internationalisation, whilst 67% of institutions had a stand-alone strategic plan for internationalisation (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2010).

Although it is not clear from the IAU Global Surveys just how the respondent institutions frame and define internationalisation, there is evidence that universities in Anglophone countries understand the term holistically (Childress, 2009) and are adopting comprehensive approaches “to infuse international and comparative perspectives throughout the teaching, research, and service missions of higher education” (Hudzik, 2011, p. 6). Initially introduced by Engberg & Green (2002), the concept of ‘comprehensive internationalisation’ is framed as “a philosophy rather than a policy, a process rather than a set of activities, a journey rather than a destination” (Olson, 2005, p. 53). Further developed and elaborated since that time (Hudzik, 2011; Hudzik & McCarthy, 2012; Olson et al., 2005; Olson, Green, & Hill, 2006), ‘comprehensive internationalisation’ draws on a family of definitions which cast internationalisation as a process of change within higher education (as discussed at section 1.1).

In spite of these holistic or comprehensive aspirations, questions remain as to the scope of institutional change strategies in relation to internationalisation. For example, the various guidelines and handbooks on comprehensive internationalisation (cited above and all issued by US authors) appear to have a much stronger grounding in teaching and learning than they do in other parts of the university’s mission. Hudzik, who has written on this topic most recently, argues that “(y)ou can’t have comprehensive internationalisation without internationalisation of the curriculum” (cited in Whitsed & Green, 2013). Others have pointed to a stronger focus on international students than on other aspects of internationalisation, such as Lunn (2008, p. 249) who concludes that most UK institutions “are hindered by competing priorities and tend to associate global perspectives almost exclusively with the recruitment of international students”. Indeed, increased commercialism and the growing predominance of economic (over socio-political or academic) rationales for internationalisation are identified as challenges in the longer term (Jones & De Wit, 2014; Marginson, 2012; Stromquist, 2007).
Despite claims that internationalisation is a process of change affecting the institution as a whole, in many contexts the ‘student’ appears to be placed (either directly or via the curriculum) at the heart of internationalisation. Although academic staff are implicitly involved with the ‘student’ aspects of higher education, this only represents one dimension of their work. As such, it may be the case that institutional approaches to internationalisation are less comprehensive than first envisaged. This study has sought to explore this claim by investigating how involved academic staff are with the various international dimensions of their work, as well as what influences their international engagement.

1.2.1. Internationalisation of Australian higher education

Australian higher education institutions were early adopters of a strategic approach to internationalisation, with survey data indicating that every Australian university had some form of internationalisation policy or strategy in place by 1995 (Back et al., 1996; De Wit, 1995). At that time, Back et al. (1996) report that Australian universities were all enrolling international students and sending students on exchange to overseas universities; the majority had strategies in place for the internationalisation of the curriculum and maintained international research links; most were involved in the provision of international technical assistance and training, and had twinning arrangements with partner institutions abroad, and a small number of Australian universities had also developed campuses abroad. Based on this report, it is clear that the internationalisation strategies of Australian universities were broad in focus twenty years ago.

Two decades later, the internationalisation of Australian higher education can be said to be a resounding success on a wide range of measures. International students now comprise 34.7 per cent of all higher education enrolments¹, with international student fee revenue at $4.7 billion in 2014, that is 17.3 per cent of total annual revenue for Australian universities (Larkins & Marshman, 2016). Not all international students study in Australia, however, with a sizeable proportion taught via transnational education.

¹ Data derived from Selected Higher Education Statistics - 2015 All Students, Table 2.10: All Students by State, Higher Education Institution, Citizenship and Residence Status, Full Year 2015 (Australian Government, 2016b).
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(29.7 per cent of all international enrolments in 2015\(^2\)). In support of their transnational education endeavours, Australian universities currently operate twelve international branch campuses (in Malaysia, Singapore, Vietnam, South Africa, the United Arab Emirates, Canada and India). Although other countries have larger numbers of branch campuses abroad, Australia’s are amongst the most successful in terms of student enrolments, with eight Australian branch campuses featuring in the top fifteen for student numbers (Lawton & Katsomitros, 2012). Beyond inbound flows of students, Australian universities have secured steady increases in the numbers of students undertaking international study experiences (14.8 per cent of domestic undergraduate completions in 2013, up from 8.8 per cent in 2009), now surpassing the US in the proportion of outbound mobility from their campuses (Olsen, 2014). In research, Australia is home to a number of leading scholars in the internationalisation of the curriculum who have presented Australian case studies in their publications (W. Green & Whitsed, 2015; Leask, 2009, 2015; Whitsed & Green, 2016). Australian academic staff are also committed to international research collaboration, with analysis of bibliometric data indicating that 45.3 per cent of publications between 2011-2015 (all disciplines combined) were co-authored with institutions in other countries\(^3\).

In many ways, internationalisation and international education can therefore be seen as a fundamental component of contemporary Australian higher education. Furthermore, internationalisation is clearly understood to be a holistic phenomenon by both the higher education sector and the Australian Government, integrating inbound and outbound student mobility with international research collaboration and a clear push to internationalize the operations and activities of the institution (Adams, Banks, & Olsen, 2011; Chaney AO, 2012). Accordingly, in formal strategies and plans, internationalisation in Australia is not only described in terms of economic benefits (derived from international student tuition fees), but also in terms of the social, cultural and intellectual benefits to individual universities, their communities and society more

\(^2\) Data derived from Selected Higher Education Statistics - 2015 Overseas Students, Table 7.5: Commencing and All Overseas Students by State, Higher Education Institution and Onshore/Offshore Status, Full Year 2015 (Australian Government, 2016c).

\(^3\) Scopus data up to 12 September 2016 drawn from www.scival.com, © 2016 Elsevier B.V.
broadly (Australian Government, 2016a; Strategic Policy and Research in Education Limited, 2009).

In line with trends in the English-speaking world, many Australian institutions refer to internationalisation as a process of change (De Wit et al., 2015; Welch & Denman, 1997). Indeed, some Australian universities have openly expressed their commitment to ‘comprehensive internationalisation’ (Hudzik, 2015). However, questions have been raised as to whether Australian universities have as strong a commitment to their broader internationalisation strategies as they do to the recruitment and management of international students (Stella & Liston, 2008 cited in Forbes et al., 2011). While little empirical evidence is available to support this claim, it is clear that the history of internationalisation in Australia has been strongly shaped by the inbound mobility of international students (Adams et al., 2011; Leask, 2003; Marginson, 2011) and the conflation of the terms ‘international education’ and ‘internationalisation’ is commonplace (De Wit et al., 2015, pp. 202–203). Whilst Australia’s transition from an aid-focused approach to international education to a view of international student mobility as an export industry (described by Meadows, 2011; Meiras, 2004) promoted the development of institutional international strategies (Poole, 2001), it has perhaps also served to skew Australian approaches to internationalisation towards the more student-focused aspects of international education.

Despite this long history of internationalisation and international education in Australia, it remains the case that little is known about the international engagement of Australian academic staff across all aspects of their work. As will be discussed in Chapter 2, prior case studies in Australia have generally focused on the teaching and curriculum aspects of academic work (Clifford, 2009; W. Green & Mertova, 2011, 2014; Leask & Beelen, 2010). These studies offer few insights into the broader international engagement of Australian academic staff, nor into the various factors which might influence their choices in relation to the international dimensions of their work.
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1.3. The study

This study investigates the engagement of Australian academic staff with the international dimensions of their work. It identifies the extent to which different aspects of international engagement have been integrated into contemporary understandings of academic work in Australia, as well as examining the factors which influence academic staff choices in relation to their international engagement. Accordingly, the study seeks to answer two principal research questions:

1) What are the international dimensions of academic work in Australia, and
2) What factors influence academic staff in the choices they make about their international engagement?

The thesis is organised in seven chapters. Having discussed what is meant by internationalisation, both internationally and in the Australian context, in this introduction, Chapter 2 presents a review of the literature focusing in particular on the various factors which influence academic staff choices in relation to their work. This review specifically highlights and discusses earlier research into the international dimensions of academic work and concludes that the international engagement of academic staff is subject to a wide range of institutional, disciplinary and environmental influences, not least the choices made by individual staff. Few scholars have sought to describe the relationships between the various contextual factors which influence academic staff in their international engagement. Furthermore, the review of the literature demonstrates that most prior studies have looked at particular aspects of academic work (generally teaching or research), rather than seeking to investigate what influences academic staff to seek international involvement more broadly.

In order to explore the nature and scope of international engagement in the context of the Australian academy, as well as the various factors which influence academic staff choices in this regard, Chapter 3 presents the methodological framework selected for the study. The study adopts an Adaptive Theory methodology (Layder, 1998) and employs qualitative methods to investigate the research questions, including document analysis
and in-depth interviews. An instrumental case study approach is adopted to investigate
the potential influence of institutional context. This takes case studies of two Australian
universities which are broadly associated with different groups of higher education
institutions. The two case study institutions are drawn, on the one hand, from the
Innovative Research Universities (IRU) network, a group of younger comprehensive
institutions with a policy commitment to excellence in teaching and learning, and on the
other, from the Group of Eight (Go8) network of older research intensive universities. La
Trobe University and the University of Melbourne were selected as the case study
institutions, and ethics approval was granted by the University of Melbourne to not de-
identify them, as the study draws on institutional documents and data which render the
institutions clearly identifiable in the Australian higher education context. As discussed
further in Chapter 3, the two case study institutions are broadly representative of one
third of the Australian university sector.

With reference to the likely influence of disciplinary and individual contexts, the study
collects qualitative data from a sample of academic staff drawn from Business and
Science disciplines at each case study institution. Given the small proportion of academic
staff interviewed, and the selection of only two disciplines from which these participants
are drawn, the findings of the study are necessarily limited in their generalisability. In
line with the predominant focus of the literature on the internationalisation of higher
education, the study is also situated in an Anglophone context. Given the global nature
of higher education and national differences in how internationalisation is understood
and enacted, this presents a further limitation to the study. Nevertheless, given that the
study aimed to conduct an in-depth investigation of a complex topic, the scope is
deliberately narrow in order to ensure the viability of the project.

Chapters 4 and 5 present detailed findings in relation to each of the two case study
institutions. Each of these chapters initially outlines the specific institutional context for
internationalisation and academic work, before discussing the particular international
dimensions of academic work relevant to participants at that institution. These chapters
then draw on key themes arising from the data to illustrate the range of influences which
guide the choices of academic staff participants about their international engagement.
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Chapters 4 and 5 illustrate that the principal focus of the international engagement of Australian academic staff participants is in research. Although supported and hindered by a wide range of factors including institutional and disciplinary context, and the influence of individual experience and external constraints, this international engagement is strongly predicated on the relevance of research to the career advancement of individual participants.

The significance of research to the international engagement of academic staff participants is demonstrated in Chapter 6 through the conceptualisation of a typology of the international dimensions of academic work. This typology outlines both the international dimensions of academic work identified in the study and their comparative significance in relation to the sample of participants. Based on this typology, the influence of a range of contextual factors is investigated, including institutional and disciplinary context, and individual and external factors. In addition, the study discusses a range of drivers and barriers to international engagement which may have implications for how institutions shape their international strategies and policies in relation to academic staff. Accordingly, whilst institutional context encourages academic staff participants to focus on their research by reinforcing the relevance of research to career advancement, disciplinary context also influences the choices which they make about their international engagement. In addition, a range of individual and external factors serve to shape how academic staff participants make choices about their work, leading to an invariably complex set of contextual factors at play.

The study presented in this thesis is distinctive in its focus and approach. It responds to a gap in the literature on the international dimensions of academic work by investigating the broader concept of international engagement. Relatively few prior studies have explored the international engagement of academic staff in relation to all aspects of their work, with the literature focusing predominantly on the internationalisation of the institution, as well as on the teaching and learning and student-focused aspects of internationalisation. However, this study shows that the international dimensions of academic work are predominantly centred on research, rather than on teaching and learning.
The findings of the study suggest that the long history of internationalisation in Australian higher education has had limited effect on the international engagement of academic staff. As such, the study has important implications for higher education institutions wishing to foster or encourage greater international engagement amongst their academic staff.
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Chapter 2 WHAT FACTORS INFLUENCE THE WORK OF ACADEMIC STAFF?

In his Godkin Lectures of 1963, Clark Kerr, then President of the University of California, claimed that “in a very real sense, the faculty is the university – its most productive element, its source of distinction” (Kerr, 1963, p. 100). Whilst few would disagree with the substance of this claim, the precise parameters of the work undertaken by academic staff are often unclear. Traditional views of academic work tend to centre around an essentially idealised (or mythologised) set of understandings about the nature and scope of what academic staff do (Tight, 2010). Nevertheless, these traditional views are commonly held (see, for example, Maslen, 2014) and the academic profession is generally seen to be conservative and resistant to change (Kerr, 2001). Yet, much of the relevant literature focuses on the changing academic profession and the changing nature of academic work (Jurgen Enders & de Weert, 2009; Kogan & Teichler, 2007; Welch, 1998). As such, it is potentially difficult to investigate the factors which influence academic work when the nature of that work itself is ostensibly in flux.

For the purposes of this study, academic staff are seen to be employed within an institutional environment (such as a university or other higher education provider) where they have responsibility for the generation, application and dissemination of new knowledge in their work (Blaxter, Hughes, & Tight, 1998). Despite changes to the academic profession, these three pillars of academic work (alternatively referred to as research, teaching and outreach/service) are still considered to constitute the core responsibilities of academic staff in their work (Boyer, Altbach, & Whitelaw, 1994; Teichler, Arimoto, & Cummings, 2013). Although individual academic staff are affiliated to a particular department or research centre, traditional understandings of academic work place significant value on the principles of academic freedom, autonomy and collegiality within the academy (Rhoades, 2007). Furthermore, academic work is typically seen to be undertaken within the framework of a particular scholarly discipline with its own norms and practices which reach beyond both the local department and institution (Becher, 1989; Becher & Trowler, 2001). In this way, this study conceptualises academic work as a professional field which is not only changing, but which, by its very nature, is subject to a wide range of influences from within and outside the institution. Furthermore, the literature presented in this chapter indicates that the nature and scope of academic work is complex, with significant potential variation in tasks and focus.
depending on institution type, discipline and seniority within the academic career structure.

In order to outline some of the key factors influencing the international dimensions of academic work, this chapter discusses the findings of a number of empirical studies which have examined the international activities of academic staff or have investigated how academic staff have responded to internationalisation. In so doing, academic staff roles are considered in relation to institutional context, the disciplines and the individual. Although academic staff are deemed to be crucial to the success of institutional internationalisation strategies in both the scholarly and practitioner literature, this chapter argues that many studies focus on particular sites of international activity (such as the institution or the discipline) or on particular activities (such as teaching and learning), rather than investigating the international dimensions of academic work comprehensively. As such, whilst prior research has investigated the international dimensions of academic work from a range of different perspectives, relatively few prior studies have explored this engagement in relation to all aspects of academic work. It is therefore difficult to discern an overall picture of exactly which factors influence the international engagement of academic staff. Similarly, due to a prevalence of definitions of internationalisation and the possible disjuncture between institutional strategy and academic work, it is hard to know how academic staff understand internationalisation in relation to their work.

In light of this complex environment, different conceptual models of the influences on academic staff behaviour across all dimensions of their work are evaluated. Building from earlier understandings of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations, these frameworks generally incorporate both personal and environmental variables, and seek to understand the behaviour of academic staff based on the interplay and intersection of these different factors. In tracing the various influences on academic work more broadly, the chapter seeks to identify the extent to which these same factors influence the international dimensions of that work.
2.1. The institution

This section investigates the role of the institution in shaping the decisions made by academic staff about their work. ‘Institution’, in this context, will be taken to encompass the physically located structure of the higher education institution and its organisational sub-structures (such as faculties and departments), as well as its leadership, strategies and policies, referred to by Tierney (1988) as components of the institution’s organisational culture. As with other sections in this chapter, this section initially examines how the institution shapes academic work in a broad sense, before considering the international dimensions of that work in particular.

Many changes to academic work are attributed to a broader set of global changes to higher education (and to its institutions), including the strengthening of corporate governance, widening student participation and internationalisation (Gordon, 2010). Indeed, Plater (2016, p. 171) alludes to the inevitability of these changes when he refers to “a profession transformed by forces it cannot resist”. Supporting the literature on the changing academic profession, a range of detailed analyses have been presented in relation to the effects of these global changes in different countries. In the Australian context, the changing nature of academic work and the role of the institution have been investigated by way of a range of studies over the last twenty years drawing on interviews, and national and international survey data (Bexley, Arkoudis, & James, 2013; Churchman, 2006; Coates, Dobson, Goedegebuure, & Meek, 2011; McInnis, 2000; Mulford, 2000).

Musselin (2013, p. 26) argues that the reforms of higher education systems have profoundly affected the relationships between academic staff and their institutions, due to the simultaneous effect of both market and bureaucratic forces on academic work. The concepts of markets and bureaucracy provide a useful framework for considering how changes at the level of the institution affect the work of academic staff.

In relation to market forces, Slaughter and Leslie’s (1997) seminal work on academic capitalism explored the increasing exposure of academics and institutions (in the USA, Canada, the UK and Australia) to markets and market-like behaviours. In the face of increasing financial autonomy from the state and influenced by globalisation,
institutions and academic staff have been encouraged to seek external funding to support their work (particularly in research), which has led to increased competition for research funding and resources (Slaughter, 1997, p. 137). In addition, an increased reliance on external funding has influenced the types of research being undertaken, with greater external funding available for applied, rather than basic, research and a shifting sense of the prestige attached to particular sources of funding (Slaughter, 1997, p. 184). These shifts have occurred not only in respect of the domestic activities of institutions and academic staff and their relations with the state (Slaughter, 2004), but also transnationally through greater integration with multinational and transnational corporations in research and development (Kauppinen & Cantwell, 2014).

Whilst these changes have influenced academics’ decisions about their work, on the one hand, they have also led to increasing bureaucratic oversight by their institutions on the other. This phenomenon, commonly referred to in the literature as managerialism, refers to the growing adoption of corporate styles of management by institutions. Scholars have investigated managerialism from a range of perspectives (Henkel, 2000; Trowler, 1998; Winter, 2009), including the effect which a more significant role for institutional authority has on academic staff and their work (Henkel, 2009, p. 90).

Perhaps the most compelling influence of the institution on the work of academic staff stems from the institution’s increasingly central role in the management of human resources (Musselin, 2007, p. 5). Academic staff are formally employed by the institution, even if their daily work is principally conducted within local departmental structures (Locke, Cummings, & Fisher, 2011, p. 3). Indeed, Krause (2009, p. 419) highlights that it is generally at the local level that institutional decisions are given effect, as “the department is typically the site of academic decision-making, career planning and performance review”. Nevertheless, regardless of the exact location of this influence on academic work, the institution clearly shapes the work of academic staff through its employment practices. These practices have led to the work of academic staff being subject to performance review based on institutional policies and criteria, with measures of performance also influenced by external stimuli, such as a national research assessment exercise (Musselin, 2013). In this way, institutional evaluation of academic staff has joined existing mechanisms for disciplinary evaluation (through peer review):
Academics are no longer evaluated only by their peers, but also by their own institution or by national measures developed by public authorities to control, rank, and benchmark academic activity (Musselin, 2007, p. 6).

The findings of a study of US and European research universities illustrate that faculty identity is increasingly influenced by institutional context (Leisyte & Dee, 2012). Indeed, academic staff appear to draw inferences about what institutions value through the outcomes of human resourcing decisions around them, whether related to promotion, tenure or salary (Fairweather, 2002, p. 97).

Although academic staff are subject to a set of institutional influencing factors in their work by virtue of their employment, the role of the institution as employer sits in conflict with the concepts of autonomy and academic freedom which are commonly associated with the academic profession (Rhoades, 2007, p. 121). To what extent can academic staff truly be free to pursue their academic interests, if their ongoing employment is contingent on institutional patronage? Based on international survey data from 1992 and 2007, one analysis suggests that academics have responded to this dilemma by distancing themselves from their departmental and institutional affiliations (but not from their disciplinary affiliation) (Locke et al., 2011, p. 3). Alternatively, Musselin (2013, p. 34) argues that the transformation of the academic profession can be seen from two contradictory perspectives, viewed on the one hand as a trend towards organisational careers (which depend on the institution) and on the other, as a trend towards careers with fewer boundaries (where the institution is less significant). This dichotomy underlines one of the key tensions in how the influence of the institution should be interpreted in relation to academic work.

Nevertheless, the removal of formal academic tenure in some countries and a general trend to increased casualisation of the academic workforce reinforce the changing nature of the employment relationship between academic staff and their institutions (Bexley et al., 2013; Krause, 2009). Similarly, growing diversification in the working roles of academic staff has led to new hybrid forms of academic work (beyond teaching and research) which incorporate both professional and academic activities (Kehm, 2015; Whitchurch, 2012) and various degrees of specialisation depending on seniority (Musselin, 2007). Rather than detracting from the potential influence of the institution,
these aspects of the changing academic profession instead hint at the increasing relevance of the institution (and its concerns) to the work of academic staff.

2.1.1. International dimensions and the institution

As outlined in Chapter 1, many higher education institutions have formally adopted internationalisation (or, more simply, international) strategies focused on change and supported by dedicated leadership staff and policy frameworks. In line with moves to a stronger bureaucratic role for the institution, the management of internationalisation has been shown to be an area of increased institutional focus (Taylor, 2010a). Similarly, internationalisation is proposed as one of a broader set of global changes to higher education which have influenced academic work (Gordon, 2010). It is therefore reasonable to suggest that the international dimensions of academic work are influenced by institutional approaches to internationalisation (and by the management of those approaches), in addition to broader organisational factors such as employment policies and access to resources.

Prior research into internationalisation and academic staff has generally been framed from an institutional perspective. Accordingly, it has sought to examine how internationalisation (as an institutional construct) has been implemented and what role various groups have played, including senior leaders, academic staff and students (see, for example, Childress, 2010; Friesen, 2013; Mertova, 2014). Whilst this research provides an indication of what the international dimensions of academic work are, it does not generally approach this work from the perspective of the individual academic, but rather from the perspective of the institution and its international strategy (see, for example, Agnew, 2013; Jiang & Carpenter, 2013a; Warwick & Moogan, 2013). In this context, institutions certainly see their academic community as crucial to the success of their international strategies. Indeed, the involvement of academic staff has been identified as one of the cornerstones of institutional internationalisation. In the words of Knight (1999, p. 222), "the engine of internationalization at the institutional level is clearly the faculty and staff" and there is widespread consensus among scholars and practitioners that the support and involvement of a critical mass of academic staff is crucial to the internationalisation of the institution (Childress, 2010; Hudzik, 2011; Knight & De Wit, 1995; Leask & Beelen, 2010; Merkz & Nolan, 2015; Rudzki, 1995; Stohl, 2007). In order to
secure successful internationalisation outcomes, studies have also shown that the active involvement of academic staff is a necessary complement to an institution’s business models, leadership and management structures, and resources (Cummings, Bain, Postiglione, & Jung, 2014).

In support of this position, international education associations in a range of countries have committed to programs which promote greater international involvement by academic staff. According to the American Council on Education (ACE), "faculty engagement drives successful internationalization" and institutions should commit to “a constantly widening circle of engaged faculty” (M. F. Green & Olson, 2003, pp. 69 & 78). In this vein, the US-based Institute of International Education (IIE) and ACE have both released dedicated publications on faculty engagement with internationalisation (Helms & Asfaw, 2013a, 2013b; Institute of International Education, 2012), as well as detailed reports on particular aspects of this engagement, such as the international aspects of academic staff tenure and promotion policies (Helms, 2015). Similarly, the International Education Association of Australia (IEAA) and the European Association for International Education (EAIE) have published a report which identifies the effective engagement of academic staff in the process of internationalisation as a key challenge to international higher education leadership in Australia and Europe (Murray, Goedegebuure, van Liempd, & Vermeulen, 2014). The findings of this report concur with the results from global surveys undertaken by the International Association of Universities (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2010, 2014; Knight, 2006), which highlight a lack of faculty interest, expertise and involvement as major obstacles to implementing internationalisation.

Regardless of these exhortations from institutions and international education associations, earlier studies have documented a range of different responses to internationalisation by academic staff, encompassing everything from unquestioning adoption to outright refusal. Green and Mertova (2013, p. 670), for example, offer a categorisation of academic staff as “enthusiasts, fence-sitters and sceptics”, whilst others distinguish academic staff approaches on a continuum, from champion and advocate at one end of the scale through to sceptic and opponent at the other (Childress, 2010). The literature also points to a limited shared understanding amongst academic staff about
just what ‘internationalisation’ is, noting that different groups of people on-campus hold a range of varying definitions (Friesen, 2013; Schoorman, 1999). Based on such a wide variety of academic staff perspectives, it is possible that internationalisation itself may have only a limited bearing on the international dimensions of academic work.

For one group of academic staff, however, this is not the case, as those who take on leadership roles in their local environment or more broadly within the institution necessarily have greater exposure to institutional strategy in their work. As such, they are likely to be subject to a different range of influences in relation to this aspect of their work. Indeed, a body of earlier internationalisation research has focused on the executive or academic leadership roles taken on by individual staff in support of an institution’s international strategy. These international leadership roles stem from a move towards greater institutional coordination of international activities (Middlehurst & Woodfield, 2007). Whilst internationalisation strategies necessarily vary between institutions, a clear need for leadership in international matters is recognised in terms of institutional planning (Hill & Helms, 2013; James & Nef, 2002). As such, in the local context, Australian universities have created a range of academic senior leadership roles, such as Deputy or Pro Vice-Chancellor International positions, to satisfy the internal and external leadership requirements of their international strategy.

Senior international leadership has further been distinguished as a key influencing factor for academic staff, both in providing clarity on academic involvement and roles (Dewey & Duff, 2009) and in framing an overarching level of support for internationalisation within the institution (Agnew & VanBalkom, 2009). Indeed, the importance of senior international leaders in higher education is reinforced by research findings from the UK which demonstrate that management practice is the key differentiator between those institutions making more or less progress towards their international goals:

Where institutions were perceived to have made progress, it resulted from the consistent, visible and active leadership of at least one PVC-level senior academic member of staff (Warwick & Moogan, 2013, p. 115).

In line with definitions of internationalisation as a process of change, a crucial aspect of the international leadership role is understood to be the ability to lead transformational
change within the institution (M. F. Green & Olson, 2003). Van der Wende (1999, p. 13) proposes that internationalisation responsibilities, regardless of where they sit, carry a requirement to be "an innovation manager (a change agent) who focuses on internal processes". Change agents appear to be essential in terms of facilitating internationalisation and motivating others to action, particularly in terms of encouraging greater international involvement by academic staff. Indeed, this call has been echoed in terms of specific disciplines such as business (Cavusgil, 1993), specific international activities such as study abroad (Nolan, 2009), and broader international leadership and management (Heyl, Thullen, & Brownell, 2007; Thullen, Heyl, & Brownell, 2002). In terms of successful strategies for promoting greater participation in study abroad in the US, for example, Gore (2009, p. 297) explains that "effective initiatives all move outside the international education community and engage others in the academy in dialogue about study abroad".

As such, it seems that a key role for international leaders in higher education is to reach out to academic staff and to influence attitudes towards internationalisation within the institution. In a recent UK study, Warwick and Moogan (2013) reinforce the need to engage a broader range of academic staff in international initiatives above and beyond the enthusiasts, having found little evidence of any discussion about internationalisation strategy amongst academic staff at a departmental level. A second recent UK study highlights the importance of senior leaders communicating the rationales for internationalisation within the institution:

> Presenting a more multi-faceted rationale for internationalization is a key task for senior university staff in order to counter the perception that economics is the sole or overwhelmingly dominant economic rationale (Willis & Taylor, 2014, pp. 160–161).

As with other areas of leadership in higher education, senior international leaders rarely act in isolation but operate in an environment where distributed leadership roles are shared vertically and horizontally between central and faculty staff (Bolden, Petrov, & Gosling, 2009). In this context, the leadership of international matters is expressed at different levels of the institution, including academic leaders in faculties and departments (frequently referred to in the Australian context as Associate Deans).
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International), professional service leaders (such as the Director of an International Office) or informal leadership groups comprised of staff and/or students (Middlehurst, 2008).

Despite the influence exerted by leaders (either in senior roles or in distributed positions throughout an institution), various case studies have outlined a gap between priority and practice in terms of the implementation of international strategy and the involvement of academic staff. Savishinsky (2012, p. iii) refers to this as a gap between “the rhetorical support of institutions for internationalization, and the many institutional realities that inhibit the work of faculty members abroad”. Many of these obstacles can be framed in terms of institutional support for the international dimensions of academic work. In this regard, earlier research has identified barriers in relation to the nature of academic employment policies and incentives for staff involvement (Ellingboe, 1998), workload and time management issues (Bond, Qian, & Huang, 2003; Jiang & Carpenter, 2013a), limited funding and lack of support personnel (Criswell & Zhu, 2015; Dewey & Duff, 2009; Ellingboe, 1998), and the availability of relevant professional development for staff (Barker, Hibbins, & Farrelly, 2011; W. Green & Mertova, 2014; Ray & Solem, 2009). Based on case study findings, certain scholars make recommendations on how to secure greater engagement with internationalisation by academic staff in support of an institution’s internationalisation strategy (Childress, 2010), for example by tailoring internationalisation approaches to suit different faculties or departments (Jiang & Carpenter, 2013b).

As such, whilst an institution’s leadership is important in setting and communicating international strategy, a range of other institutional factors may influence academic staff in relation to the international dimensions of their work, including the availability of resources and appropriate policy incentives. Although it is not clear from the literature to what extent institutional strategy influences the international dimensions of academic work, it is reasonable to conclude that the institution (broadly defined) has some role in this regard. Academic staff are certainly seen to be crucially important to the successful internationalisation of an institution, with prior research pointing to leadership roles (formal and informal) as one key way in which a subset of academic staff secures involvement with institutional strategies for internationalisation.
2.2. Disciplinarity

In his seminal work on the organisation of higher education systems, Clark (1983) proposed that the academic discipline is central to the working life of academic staff. Over a quarter century later, this view is still shared by many scholars, who deduce that the pervasive nature of the disciplines exerts a strong influence on the various dimensions of academic work (Kreber, 2010, p. 19). Others argue that the disciplines are the central source of identity for faculty, serving a unifying function and providing a 'home' or shared space for new and experienced disciplinary scholars (Krause, 2012; Trowler, 2012). Indeed, research has shown that many academic staff view their disciplinary affiliation in this way (Trowler, 2012, p. 21).

Particularly influential in this regard has been the anthropological metaphor of academic tribes and territories, which has been widely adopted (Manathunga & Brew, 2012, p. 44) and appears to now be firmly entrenched as a theoretical framework in higher education research (Tight, 2015, p. 289). Initially proposed by Becher (1989), this metaphor argues that the behaviour and values of academics (constituted in separate academic cultures or tribes) are strongly conditioned or even determined by the knowledge structures of the disciplines (the academic territories). Building on the earlier work of Biglan (1973a, 1973b) and Kolb (1981), Becher (1989) sought to classify the knowledge structure of the disciplines in relation to both their cognitive dimension (hard/soft and pure/applied) and their social dimension (convergent/divergent and urban/rural). In doing so, he proposed a complex typology of the disciplines based on two four-by-four cell matrices and drew on empirical data to classify disciplines against this typology. In this typology, Engineering, for example, is deemed to be hard, applied, convergent and urban, whilst Sociology is soft, pure, divergent and rural (examples drawn from Trowler, 2010, p. 183).

Whilst Becher’s (1989) initial typology mapped particular characteristics to each discipline, and determined that the culture, beliefs and practices of academic tribes play a strong role in inculcating academic staff into disciplinary norms and practices, the subsequent re-working of the model by Becher and Trowler (2001) recognised that the disciplines might be more appropriately viewed on a continuum. Moving away from this more static view of disciplinary structures is defended on epistemological grounds, in that “a focus on disciplines as distinct tribes tends to bleach out the complexity and
variety of different ways of thinking about knowledge" (Manathunga & Brew, 2012, p. 46). However, it has also allowed the tribes and territories metaphor to respond in a more agile fashion to the increasing adoption of interdisciplinarity as a guiding principle in higher education. Interdisciplinary approaches are now more common in both teaching and research, with the growing adoption of modular degree course structures and the identification of research problems which cannot be addressed from the perspective of an individual discipline (Manathunga & Brew, 2012, p. 45). As such, the boundaries between the individual disciplines may no longer be as rigid as was once claimed in relation to the teaching and research work of academic staff.

Similarly, research into the disciplinary affiliations of academic staff has shown that many academics identify as belonging to more than one discipline (Brew, 2008), thereby further questioning the land-based metaphor of academic tribes and territories. Critical of the colonial connotations of the term 'tribe', which might refer to primitivism on the one hand and external control on the other, alternative water-based metaphors have been proposed to describe academic staff and the disciplines. For example, taking forward the proposal that the disciplines should be viewed on a continuum, Manathunga and Brew (2012) propose and elaborate an alternative set of metaphors based on 'oceans of knowledge', thereby recognising that many academics describe their work as being at the confluence of two or more disciplines (Manathunga & Brew, 2012, p. 51).

Regardless of the choice of metaphor, there is nevertheless broad agreement amongst scholars that the disciplines have an important influence on academic work (Krause, 2012; Kreber, 2010; Trowler, 2012). A key question remains, however, as to whether disciplinary culture alone can explain academic behaviour. Krause (2012) argues that "disciplinary tribes and territories are but one way of understanding the complexity that characterises academic work and identities" (Krause, 2012, p. 194). To what extent, therefore, do the disciplines influence academic staff in relation to their work?

The nexus between institutional and disciplinary influences on academic work appears to be important and to have remained so over time. This nexus was attested in early international surveys of the academic profession (Boyer et al., 1994, p. 11) and it is still argued today that the institution and the disciplines form the primary matrix of differentiation for academic staff in their work (Bentley, 2015, p. 26). Lee (2007) draws on
theories of organisational culture to examine the intersection between the discipline and the academic department (as an institutional substructure). Whilst recognising that discipline and department are not analogous (indeed, one department may house several disciplines), Lee analyses data from a 1998 national survey of over 55,000 US academic staff to illustrate empirically that, in some respects, the institution has a more influential role than the discipline in shaping the academic department (and by extension, its academic staff) (Lee, 2007, pp. 49–50). These findings are supported by a UK study which identifies significant variance in research practices within the same discipline across different institutions (Spurling, 2012). This variance is explained by the different departmental and institutional research strategies in place and, in particular, by the mediating effect of these strategies on the accumulation of economic capital by individual academics and their departments. As such, academic staff in a departmental context where funding is principally derived from research are subject to different influences to those whose department is principally funded through teaching (Spurling, 2012, p. 86).

In summary, it appears that disciplinarity exerts a crucial influence on academic staff in relation to their work, although the disciplines do not act in isolation in this regard. As outlined at section 2.1, institutional structures have also been shown to be important. In addition to departmental or institutional (that is, organisational) influences and disciplinary influences, Becher and Trowler (2001, p. 181) propose that academic communities are also subject to influence from wider society. Other scholars have described the importance of personal and professional identity in shaping how academic staff perceive of their work (Churchman, 2006; Gordon & Whitchurch, 2010; Henkel, 2000). Individual ideological and pedagogical beliefs and values are shown to exercise a powerful influence on academic work (Krause, 2009, p. 420), although there is general acknowledgment that the disciplines continue to be dominant in the formation of academic identity (Clifford, 2012; Henkel, 2000).

The influence of personal and individual factors on academic work will be investigated in more detail at section 2.3 below. The next section, however, will first review the literature to understand the influence of disciplinarity in shaping the international dimensions of academic work.
2.2.1. International dimensions and the disciplines

By their very nature, the disciplines can be considered to be an international construct. While institutions are generally established within a specific national context, the disciplines are in essence supra-institutional and supra-national, that is, their reach stretches beyond the boundaries of any one institution (Trowler, 2012, p. 7) and they are unconstrained by national borders (Clark, 1983, pp. 30–31). Indeed, the international nature of the disciplines traces its origins to the early days of the medieval university and the tradition of the ‘wandering’ scholar, when the research and enquiry-based work of academic staff began to be conducted in an international context (Welch & Denman, 1997). The fundamental rationale for this international engagement in research stemmed from the commonly-held understanding that research should be recognised as internationally relevant, a concept which is retained today as one of the basic tenets of scholarly peer review. As a consequence, contemporary knowledge production is understood to be borderless in nature and a certain degree of geographic flexibility is commonplace in academia (Richardson, 2009).

Survey data point to the continued importance of research in the work of academic staff, as witnessed by both the multinational Changing Academic Profession (CAP) survey of 2007 (Teichler et al., 2013) and the 2010 Australian Academic Profession in Transition survey (Bexley, James, & Arkoudis, 2011). Furthermore, broader changes to higher education and to the academic profession have served to reinforce the value of international research collaboration in terms of productivity – to the institution, to the discipline and to individual academic staff. Analysis of survey data from eleven European countries has shown that international research collaboration is strongly correlated with greater research productivity (in terms of higher publishing rates and citations) across disciplines (Kwiek, 2015). Similar increases in research output have been recorded in relation to international collaboration between Australian academics and international co-authors (Matthews, 2010). Patterns of academic migration have also been shown to contribute to research productivity, with those academic staff who do not move internationally “more likely to publish in journals of lower “prestige”” (OECD, 2015, p. 128). Conversely, academic migration has been shown to lead to greater research outputs for UK academic staff who have spent extended periods of time working abroad.
(Department for Business, Innovation & Skills, UK, 2011). As such, the international dimensions of research (whether in collaboration between academic staff or in their mobility from one country to another) are clearly associated with greater levels of research output. Research productivity in this context is closely tied to the managerial notions of performance review for academic staff discussed in section 2.1.

Given these findings, it is not surprising that the growing importance of international research has been referenced with increasing frequency in the higher education media in recent years (Fischer, 2014; Jump, 2015; Marginson, 2014). Similarly, bibliometric data are readily available to highlight the growth of international collaboration in research, for example, at a national level (OECD, 2015, pp. 130–131) or in relation to specific disciplines (Kato & Ando, 2013). However, despite the increasing importance attached to international research collaboration and academic migration in terms of research productivity, as well as the significance of international research in the eyes of individual researchers (let alone their institutions and national/regional governments), few studies have specifically investigated the international dimensions of this aspect of academic work.

What is more, very few scholars have investigated the research aspect of academic work from the perspective of the disciplines, with more detailed analysis proposed in relation to institutional and personal factors. In this light, institutional prerogatives have been shown to be an important influence in some cases (Larner, 2015), whilst others conclude that institutional internationalisation strategies do not exert a strong influence on academic staff in relation to their research behaviour (Trondal, 2010). In parallel, a US study exploring the factors which push US academic staff to internationalise their research, in terms of both its content and collaborative networks, found that the personal knowledge of academic staff plays a powerful role in shaping their research (as opposed to institutional incentives, for example) (Finkelstein, Walker, & Chen, 2013).

In contrast to the dearth of empirical research on academic staff and the international dimensions of their research, the vast majority of earlier research in this area has instead focused on teaching and learning and the internationalisation of the curriculum. It is in this context that disciplinary influence is most frequently described, with case studies outlining a range of factors which influence the international involvement of academic
staff, either positively or negatively, in their teaching, including their disciplinary affiliation.

A national Canadian study into the internationalisation of the undergraduate curriculum demonstrated that disciplinary affiliation significantly shapes academic staff opinions and approaches in this area (Bond et al., 2003, pp. 9–10). A similar conclusion was drawn in a US study which found that the international orientation of a given discipline was a key background factor for the internationalisation of learning outcomes (M. F. Green & Shoenberg, 2006, pp. 5–6). Differences in disciplinary approach may also be influenced by the effect of external drivers, such as the availability of funding for disciplines which support national priorities (for example, in the hard disciplines) or the greater value ascribed to experiential learning in the soft disciplines (Agnew, 2013). Although most prior research in this area has been conducted in a North American context, similar findings have been described in relation to Australia. In a study which adopted Becher’s (1989) four-fold classification of the disciplines into hard pure, hard applied, soft pure and soft applied groups, Clifford (2009) demonstrates that academic staff views of curriculum internationalisation in Australia are shaped by disciplinary allegiances.

The nature of the disciplines has also been described as a barrier to the international dimensions of teaching and learning, based on the understanding that disciplinary cultures are prone to resist change, particularly if it is perceived to be driven from outside the discipline (Clark, 1983; Clifford, 2012; Turner & Robson, 2008). This disciplinary resistance to change is cited as a barrier to the involvement of academic staff with the internationalisation of teaching and learning, particularly in relation to the hard pure disciplines (Clifford, 2009, p. 141). It also raises the question of whether the internationalisation of the curriculum is best approached from within the context of the academic disciplines or from outside (Clifford, 2012, p. 204).

Beyond the individual disciplines themselves, a group of scholars advocates for discipline-specific approaches to internationalisation to be complemented by interdisciplinary perspectives. In this vein, Brewer (2010; 2009) and Leask (2013) conclude that academic staff should dialogue and discuss internationalisation across the disciplines (as well as within), with the latter paying significant attention to the place of ‘imagining’ in the internationalisation of the curriculum. Childress (2010) recommends...
that interdisciplinarity provide a foundation for the incorporation of diverse perspectives into both teaching and research. As such, these scholars suggest that the individual disciplines cannot fully inform the international dimensions of teaching and learning, with cross-disciplinary perspectives needed to fully understand this aspect of academic work.

In summary, prior research shows that disciplinary context has an influence (either positive or negative) on the engagement of academic staff with the international dimensions of their work, although this may vary between research and teaching. Different disciplines may also foster or encourage the international work of academic staff in different ways. As such, disciplinary affiliation is important in shaping how academic staff understand internationalisation. With a limited common understanding of what internationalisation is (as discussed in Chapter 1 and at section 2.1.1) and a range of disciplinary cultures within any institution, it is unsurprising to find that alternative definitions of internationalisation exist between academic staff in the different disciplines (Stohl, 2007). Not only do the disciplines represent an alternative source of definitions and rationales for internationalisation (in addition to the institution), but they also shape academic staff involvement with the international dimensions of their work, whether in research or in teaching and learning.

Nevertheless, earlier empirical studies which have focused on teaching and learning (and to a lesser extent on research) reveal little about the broader set of factors which influence academic staff in relation to all of the international dimensions of their work. Whilst recognising the significance of institutional and disciplinary factors, the literature also highlights the importance of individual and personal factors on academic decisions about their work (Henkel, 2009). As discussed in the following section, this suggests that one of the key influences on the international dimensions of academic work may relate to the self, rather than to the discipline or to the institution.

2.3. Individual factors

The personal background and prior experiences of academic staff were once considered to be the least important part of academic culture (Clark (1987) cited in Trowler, 2010, p. 182). As such, it is not surprising that the seminal work on academic tribes and
teritories did not ask respondents about the private lives of respondents, a fact which Becher and Trowler (2001, p. 147) have subsequently acknowledged as a limitation of their study. Today, however, many scholars consider individual identity to be a key influence on academic work:

> Whilst institutional and disciplinary context are still important, scholars seem to be moving away from these notions as the only or most significant contexts of academic work, and toward an emphasis on the identity of the scholar informed by many contexts (Pifer & Baker, 2013, p. 120).

In this context, much of the literature on the changing academic profession focuses on what the broader changes to higher education have meant for the formation and development of professional identity within the academy (Henkel, 2000; Krause, 2009). It is argued that corporate managerialism in higher education has led to a schism in academic identity between personal and organisational values (Winter, 2009). Whilst people are attracted to academic work by the values of scholarly and intellectual activity, as witnessed by the results of an Australian survey (Bexley et al., 2013, p. 389), changes to the institution have reinforced corporate values (as described at section 2.1). In parallel, a blurring between academic and administrative work has challenged academic staff in their understandings of what it means to be an academic (Kehm, 2015; Whitchurch, 2012). Although it is claimed that the formation of academic identity is influenced by both personal and organisational factors (Pifer & Baker, 2013), others argue that the changing nature of academic work has reinforced the role of the individual in developing academic identity:

> Individual choices might now be guided not so much by a clear hierarchy of esteem, established by dominant epistemic communities and centred upon achievements in scholarship and research, but by an evolving individual sense of value and aspirational priorities (Henkel, 2009, p. 91).

Questions arise, though, as to whether the concept of ‘academic identity’ is able to describe the individual priorities of academic staff on its own. Experiences of class and gender, as well as the significance of family, have also been shown to contribute to the complex make-up of an individual academic (Clegg, 2008). Similarly, the literature shows
that the international dimensions of academic work are influenced by a wide range of personal factors, including prior international experience and the ability to speak a foreign language (Bond et al., 2003). In addition, as highlighted in sections 2.1 and 2.2, academic staff make choices about their work within the context of the institutional and disciplinary structure in place.

In the face of this complex work environment for academic staff, explanations for academic staff choices in relation to their work have often been sought by way of motivation theories, most commonly in terms of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations and rewards. As such, whilst certain studies claim that academic staff draw more motivation from their intrinsic interests than from material rewards (as is the case in Australia according to McInnis (2010)), other scholars propose that earlier work on academic motivations has paid too much attention to external or extrinsic factors (such as the institution and its staff productivity measures) to the detriment of internal or individual variables (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995). In response, more recent research suggests that intrinsic and extrinsic motivations operate in parallel with other factors, such as achievement motivation and hedonism (Meyer & Evans, 2003) or personal motivational factors including self-determination, self-efficacy and self-regulation (Hardré, Beesley, Miller, & Pace, 2011; Lechuga & Lechuga, 2012). Nevertheless, a key question relates to how various personal and organisational variables (or intrinsic and extrinsic motivations) intersect to influence the behaviour of academic staff.

In developing a theoretical framework for motivations in academic work, Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) propose an answer to this question by mapping out a set of complex relations of influence between sets of individual and institutional characteristics which they identify as impacting on academic staff behaviour. Drawing on empirical evidence from a quantitative study, the theoretical model put forward by Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) identifies four individual and three environmental properties or variables which influence academic behaviour. Importantly, Blackburn and Lawrence (1995, p. 288) propose that faculty behaviour is principally determined by the interaction between self-knowledge (an understanding of the self, personal attitudes and values, self-image, self-assessed competence, ambition and persistence) and social knowledge (which refers to
an understanding of the environment, how others expect you to behave, and an awareness of collegial support).

Acknowledging that a range of personal factors may shape and influence the choices which academic staff make about their work, the next section will review the literature to understand how individual factors shape the international dimensions of that work.

2.3.1. International dimensions and the academic self

The literature shows that academic staff have different responses to internationalisation (as outlined at section 2.1.1) and one view places internationalisation on a continuum, moving from the internationalisation of the self (both personal and transformative) at the individual level to the more symbolic internationalisation of the institution (Turner & Robson, 2007).

At the level of the individual, personal beliefs and values are seen to be important influencing factors for academic staff in terms of their involvement with the international dimensions of their work. Earlier studies have reported the significance of cosmopolitan attitudes (Sanderson, 2008), prior personal and professional experience in an international context, such as the ability to read or speak other languages (Bond et al., 2003; Lemke, 2012; Mertova, 2014; Schwietz, 2006; Willis & Taylor, 2014), and personal history and a person’s broad political perspective (De Haan, 2014). Similarly, in exploring professional and individual identity construction through sensemaking, Lemke (2012) notes that lecturers at an individual level mainly make sense of internationalisation by "giving meaning to their personal norms, values, rules and ideas" (Lemke, 2012, p. 96).

In many cases, individual values or intrinsic rewards have been found to represent the key influence for academic staff in relation to their international work, far outweighing any extrinsic or organisational reward:

Academic behavior is disproportionately shaped by deeply ingrained individual values and predilections and amenable only at the margins to the shaping influence of institutions (Finkelstein 1988) and academic fields (Finkelstein et al., 2013, p. 338).
Accordingly, in a case study looking at individual rationales for internationalisation in the UK, Willis and Taylor (2014) conclude that “the interests and concerns of local actors at the level of individual staff will influence the internationalization trajectory” (Willis & Taylor, 2014, p. 154). In so doing, they draw a connection between personal motivations and institutional rationales for internationalisation. Alignment on this personal-institutional axis has been shown to be important in securing the active engagement of academic staff with internationalisation (Friesen, 2011). In a similar vein, Willis and Taylor (2014) propose that academic staff are more likely to be involved in international work when rationales for internationalisation are focused on the ‘greater good’, that is, they are closely aligned to the personal motivations of academics rather than solely tied to economic factors.

One of the key questions in relation to personal beliefs and values is the extent to which internationalisation should be seen as a process of individual transformation, rather than simply as a process of institutional change. Marginson (2000, p. 5) suggests that globalisation has given rise to transformative encounters where identity is influenced by seeing the world through the eyes of others. Other scholars propose that a personal and professional transformation may be required in the way academic staff go about their work (Leask & Beelen, 2010; Lemke, 2012), however challenging that may be to implement given the cultural influences on their beliefs and perceptions (Brewer & Leask, 2012). In relation to this potential transformation of the individual, the transmission of knowledge to students is frequently proposed as the key avenue for the internationalisation of academic staff, thereby reinforcing the focus in the literature on the teaching and learning dimensions of academic work described at section 2.2.1. In this vein, through his elaboration of a conceptual framework for the internationalisation of the academic Self, Sanderson (2008) draws a clear parallel between the development of intercultural knowledge and skills (or a cosmopolitan outlook) amongst academic staff and the acquisition of global citizenship skills amongst students. Mirroring a call to “reconfigure university teachers as international and intercultural learners alongside their students” (Turner & Robson, 2008, p. 130), Leask and Beelen (2010) also paint academic staff as central to the task of international and intercultural learning in the classroom.
Whether or not academic staff are open to opportunities for personal transformation by way of internationalisation, prior research has identified a range of individual resistance factors to their involvement with the international dimensions of their work. These include a fear of the future or a hesitancy to collaborate internationally (Ellingboe, 1998), and an unwillingness to question the dominant international paradigms of a particular discipline for fear of censorship by colleagues (Clifford, 2009). Opportunities for academic staff to develop ‘cognitive competence’ in relation to internationalisation have also been shown to be crucial, through self-reflection, discussion with their peers or other forms of intellectual enquiry (Barker et al., 2011; Bond et al., 2003; Warwick, 2014).

However, earlier case studies argue that the most common barrier to the international dimensions of academic work derives from variable understandings and definitions of internationalisation, both amongst academic staff and between academics and their institutions, as outlined at section 2.1.1. In the UK, for example, significant divergence was found between the motivations and rationales for engagement in internationalisation initiatives of faculty members and institutional administration (Turner & Robson, 2007). Similarly, the fluidity in how individuals understand and make sense of internationalisation has been found to be an impediment to the international involvement of academic staff in Canada:

The different definitions of internationalization at the institutional and individual levels appear to be a key point of determining engagement of individual faculty members in the institutional internationalization process (Friesen, 2013, p. 13).

Given that institutional and disciplinary definitions of internationalisation are likely to vary, it is not surprising to find wide variations in academic staff understandings of the international dimensions of their work. As such, for an individual academic, the various possible interpretations of internationalisation encompass both the old and the new (from the historical focus on international research to the more recent advent of international education and mass student mobility), as well as external and internal loci of influence (from the possible effects of globalisation to the adoption of targeted institutional strategies).
Nevertheless, personal background, beliefs and values have been shown to be important influences on the work of academic staff in relation to the international dimensions of both their teaching and their research. A recent study of academic staff in Australia, the UK and the Czech Republic has examined the importance of critical events (that is, events which have a significant impact on professional practice) in shaping academic responses to internationalisation (Mertova, 2014). This study showed that critical events of a personal nature (such as the experience of living overseas) are more important than those experienced professionally. Similarly, in a Canadian study which investigated the role of academic staff in the internationalisation of the curriculum, Bond et al. (2003, p. 8) concluded that academic staff resist attempts to internationalise the curriculum when they are motivated from external sources, rather than from internal beliefs and commitments. In a US study, Finkelstein et al. (2013) also found that the personal knowledge of academic staff plays a powerful role in shaping the international dimensions of their research (as opposed to institutional incentives, for example). This study cites ‘adult years spent abroad’ as one of the key predictors of whether US academic staff would be involved with the international aspects of research (Finkelstein et al., 2013, p. 338). The importance of time spent abroad is mirrored in the findings of research into the labour mobility of academic staff and the effects of this mobility on their subsequent work (Equeter & Hellemans, 2016; Probst & Goastellec, 2013).

Although these studies have pointed to the importance of a range of personal factors in influencing the international dimensions of academic work, the choices made by academic staff appear to be influenced by both personal and organisational factors, or indeed some intersection between the two (Cooper & Mitsunaga, 2010; Finkelstein et al., 2013; Li & Tu, 2016). For example, through analysis of survey data from the 2007 CAP survey, a US study sought to investigate the relative importance of personal background, personal and professional factors, and institutional factors in shaping the decisions that academic staff make about the international dimensions of their research, in terms of both its content and collaborative networks (Finkelstein et al., 2013). This study applied the theoretical model proposed by Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) and concluded that the personal knowledge of academic staff (that is, the perceptual variables of self-knowledge and social knowledge) were more important in determining academic involvement with the international aspects of research than objective variables (such as
WHAT FACTORS INFLUENCE THE WORK OF ACADEMIC STAFF?

institution type). A recent study in China has made similar findings in relation to the intersection between personal and environmental motivations (Li & Tu, 2016).

Whilst earlier studies have underscored the relative importance of prior international work experience (Ray & Solem, 2009; Savishinsky, 2012) and length of professional service (Finkelstein et al., 2013) as influence factors on the international work of academic staff, they also highlight the power exerted by disciplinary and institutional expectations and how these are understood by academic staff (Agnew, 2013; Finkelstein et al., 2013). Whilst “it is clear that institutionally channelled pressures to internationalize are not likely to drive faculty” (Finkelstein et al., 2013, p. 338, italics in original), this does not mean that institutional and disciplinary values do not exert an influence on the work choices made by academic staff.

Regardless of the particular combination of influences on academic staff, scholars have suggested that the international dimensions of academic work are influenced differently based on level of employment and exposure to management responsibilities (Taylor, 2010b), as well as type of activity (Dewey & Duff, 2009; Finkelstein et al., 2013). It is perhaps unsurprising to find that prior research has therefore generally focused on a particular aspect of academic work, such as teaching and learning (Agnew, 2013; Savishinsky, 2012) or research (Finkelstein et al., 2013). Building on earlier research and case studies, a wide range of recommendations have been made about how to ensure greater involvement by academic staff with the international dimensions of their work, whether in support of an institution’s internationalisation strategy (Childress, 2010) or linked to their personal and professional development (Van der Werf, 2012).

Highlighting the complex interplay between the factors which influence this work, some of these recommendations focus on institutional initiatives, such as recognition in reward and tenure systems (Helms, 2015; Stohl, 2007), whilst others centre on the discipline (Ray & Solem, 2009) or on the individual (Mertova, 2013).

In relation to this study, this section has shown that personal background, beliefs and values exert an important influence on the involvement of academic staff with the international dimensions of their work. Whilst some argue that internationalisation should be construed as a personal transformation, rather than simply as an institutional process of change, the key personal barrier to academic staff involvement with
internationalisation remains individual understandings, rationales and motivations. Various frameworks have been proposed to understand the choices made by academic staff in relation to the international dimensions of their work. Whilst most scholars agree that personal variables play a strong role in this regard, environmental expectations (in relation to the discipline and the institution) have been shown to influence these personal variables.

2.4. Summary

This chapter has argued that academic work is not a fixed historical construct, but a changing and complex professional field subject to a wide range of personal, institutional and external influences. In this complexity, academic staff choices in relation to their work are influenced in many different ways. Both personal and environmental influences have been recognised in relation to the international dimensions of academic work, with academic staff decisions also shaped by institutional and disciplinary contexts.

Although various conceptual models have been proposed in relation to faculty behaviour in general and the motivations of academic staff, few of these have been applied to the international dimensions of academic work. As such, the literature offers few insights into what influences academic staff to seek international involvement across the various different aspects of their work. Acknowledging that academic staff are “complex individuals engaged in complex social relations in complex environments” (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995, p. 281), it may be impossible to describe the various influences on academic work through the simple vectors of the institution, the discipline, or a range of personal factors. Indeed, Henkel (2000) proposes that it is the combination of individual, disciplinary, departmental and institutional influences which shapes academic identities, with the precise combination varying between individuals (Henkel, 2000, p. 148). Others highlight the mediating role which personal choice plays in relation to structural factors, such as the discipline (Trowler, 2010, p. 185).

Adding to this complexity is the wide scope of tasks undertaken by individual academic staff in their daily work, as well as in the particular level (or levels) of their engagement within their local team, department, faculty or institution. As such, whilst academic work may include research, teaching, and leadership roles, depending on the context it
could equally be circumscribed to a ‘research only’ focus or to a ‘teaching specialist’ focus. Drawing on Enders (2007), Bentley (2015, p. 33) also proposes an axis of differentiation in academic work according to internal stratification, that is the hierarchy of the academic career structure. The level of seniority within this structure is also likely to shape the particular factors which influence academic work, recognising that access to resources and the choices made by academic staff in relation to their work may vary with seniority.

From the literature reviewed for this thesis, it is also unclear precisely what constitutes international engagement in relation to academic work. Many earlier studies have looked at the international dimensions of particular aspects of that work, but have not considered international engagement more holistically. Accordingly, recent studies in this area have called for additional research into the international engagement of academic staff (Criswell & Zhu, 2015; Finkelstein et al., 2013). This gap in the literature, as well as the various structural factors and loci of potential influence outlined above, were important considerations in the design of this study, as discussed in the following chapter.
Chapter 3  RESEARCH DESIGN

The analysis of the available research in the previous chapters suggests that the active involvement of academic staff is crucial to the successful internationalisation of a higher education institution. However, little is known about what influences academic staff to seek international involvement across the various different aspects of their work. Having provided an overview of the context and theoretical framework for this study in the previous chapters, this chapter outlines the chosen methodological framework and presents the rationale for the research design, including the choice of institutions for the case study, participant selection, and the methods of data collection and analysis.

3.1. Research approach

Building on the premise that the internationalisation of Australian higher education requires academic staff engagement in some way, this study has sought to answer two principal research questions: what are the international dimensions of academic work in Australia, and what factors influence academic staff in the choices they make about their international engagement? Accordingly, the study was designed in such a way as to identify those aspects of academic work in Australia which are considered to be international (both from an institutional perspective and from the perspective of individual members of academic staff) and then to investigate the various factors which influence Australian academic staff to engage with the international dimensions of their work.

As discussed in the first chapter, interpretations and conceptualisations of internationalisation in higher education remain fluid. As such, this study employed qualitative methods to explore individual understandings of the international dimensions of academic work. The decision to adopt a qualitative approach to this study was based on the understanding that this would best support an in-depth exploration of the complex personal and environmental factors influencing the involvement of individual academic staff participants with international activities in their work and the perceived drivers and barriers to this international engagement.

Adopting a social constructivist perspective, individuals are taken to construct subjective meanings of their experiences as they engage with the world, making sense of their
environment through the lenses of social and historical perspectives (Crotty, 1998). Given the varying individual experiences of academic staff, this approach recognised that individual perspectives might shape the choices which individual academics make about their work. Social constructivist orientation also supports an analysis informed by multiple individual meanings which are negotiated socially and historically. Interpretation of these meanings through the identification of patterns is intended to enable the generation of theory, in line with the proposed outcomes of the study (Creswell, 2014).

Beyond this initial choice of a qualitative approach, the study also adopted an instrumental case study methodology. Designed to explore and understand a specific issue in the context of one or more bounded cases (Stake, 1995), the choice of this approach acknowledged the findings of earlier research which highlight the importance of both institution and discipline to the international engagement of academic staff. Creswell (2013, pp. 98–99) argues that a good qualitative case study presents an in-depth understanding of a case through the collection and analysis of a range of qualitative data, the presentation of a description of the case, and the identification of themes or issues raised by the case in the context of the research question. Accordingly, a case study approach was adopted to facilitate the gaining of an in-depth comparative understanding of the research question across a small number of cases with clearly identifiable boundaries.

Although case study research is an accepted approach in qualitative studies (Creswell, 2013; Stake, 1995; Yin, 2009, 2011), mixed opinions are expressed about whether it constitutes a methodology in its own right. Tight (2003), for example, excludes case studies from his proposed classification of key methods and methodologies in social and educational research. However, the intricacies of this definitional debate have little bearing on the broader suitability of a case study approach for this study. Not only did this approach offer an effective means of collecting in-depth data from comparable bounded systems (in this instance, two contrasting institutions and two contrasting discipline groups), but it also enabled this study to test the findings of earlier research on the international engagement of academic staff which demonstrate the importance of institutional and disciplinary context.
3.2. Methodological framework

3.2.1. Philosophical assumptions

Given its aim to explore individual understandings of the international dimensions of academic work and recognising that academic work is undertaken within disciplinary and institutional constructs, this study located individuals within the broader collective context of their profession and the social world. As such, drawing on social constructivist/interpretivist understandings of social theory, the study acknowledged that individuals show agency through purposeful action towards the structures which frame their work, represented variously by their discipline, department and institution (Giddens, 1984). In line with understandings of academic autonomy and the disparate nature of the academic profession (as outlined in Chapter 2), this study also framed the interrelation between agency and structure as contextual:

The critical relationships within which academic identities are pursued are (...) those between individual, discipline, department and institution, although the balance of importance as between these relationships varies between individuals (Henkel, 2000, p. 148).

In this way, the study understood that the views of individual academic staff in relation to the international dimensions of their work would likely be shaped by a range of factors, not least their disciplinary affiliation, local department and broader institution. In addition to these professional contexts, prior research has shown that personal/historical factors also influence the actions of individuals in relation to international engagement. In line with a qualitative case study approach, these philosophical assumptions shaped the choice of methodological framework and methods for the conduct of the study.

3.2.2. Methodological approach

Although a range of theories have been proposed to describe academic identity and the motivations and drivers of academic work, the international dimensions of this work remain under-theorised. As discussed in Chapter 2, prior research in this area has generally focused on a single aspect of academic work, such as teaching and learning
(Agnew, 2013; Savishinsky, 2012) or research (Finkelstein et al., 2013), rather than looking at the international engagement of academic staff more broadly. Similarly, whilst various theoretical frameworks have been applied to explain the influences on the international dimensions of academic work, many of these centre on particular sites of international engagement, such as the institution (Helms, 2015; Stohl, 2007), the discipline (Ray & Solem, 2009) or the individual (Mertova, 2013).

In the context of this study, where existing theoretical frameworks were available to explain certain aspects of the research questions (for example, in relation to academic staff) but did not fully address the factors influencing the international dimensions of academic work, Adaptive Theory (AT) was selected to guide the methodological approach (Layder, 1998). Specifically focused on the generation of novel theory, AT draws on both deductive and inductive processes to facilitate interchange and dialogue between prior theory (models, concepts and frameworks) and emergent theory from collected data (Layder, 1998, p. 27). By supporting the development of links between existing approaches and theories through inter-paradigm communication (Layder, 1998, p. 146), an AT approach enables the generation of new theory in an accretive fashion through the intersection of orienting concepts (drawn from existing theory and other sources) and collected data (clustered into broad themes and then to a generalised model or theory).

Accordingly, an AT approach appeared well-suited to this study, as it would support the iterative development of an explanatory model for the international engagement of academic staff, drawing on existing theoretical frameworks and informed by the data gathered by way of the study. In addition to the generation of new theory, an AT approach was suited to the broader sociological approach to the study, as it considers both social interaction and social settings/context to be real and connected features of the social world (Layder, 1998, p. 141). In line with the focus of the study, AT assumes that the social world is complex and multi-layered, and allows a focus on the complex interconnections between human agency, social activities and structures and systems (Layder, 1998, p. 133). As discussed in Chapter 2, prior research in this field (principally undertaken in other countries) has shown that the factors influencing the international engagement of academic staff are both personal and environmental, and that it is
possibly the intersection between these factors which drives academic staff decisions in relation to their work. This interplay of influencing factors further supports the choice of an AT approach, as AT is proposed to be most pertinent when it is applied to the “interweaving of system elements (setting and contexts of activity) with the micro-features (interpersonal encounters) of social life” (Layder, 1998, p. 144).

Despite appearing well-suited to the needs of the study in relation to the research questions and the analysis of prior research, AT nevertheless draws criticism for the middle path that it traces between purely empirical and purely theoretical approaches, that is its deliberate use of both prior theory and data to generate new theory. Critics highlight that the precise inter-relationship between inductive and deductive processes is unclear, as is the practical intersection between orienting concepts and data in the research process (Kristiansen & Jacobsen, 2011). However, in its defence, AT is described as an ‘approach’ rather than as a methodology (Layder, 1998), and offers sufficient methodological flexibility to draw on multiple sources of information and to determine the particular contribution of each source to the generation of new theory in relation to a particular research question. In this light, AT therefore appeared well-suited to the context of this study.

3.2.3. Research site selection

As discussed in Chapter 2, disciplinary and institutional context have been identified as key factors shaping academic engagement with internationalisation (Agnew, 2013; Clifford, 2009). However, this finding is principally based on earlier studies which have focused on multiple disciplines within an individual institution. Although a small number of case studies has sought to make institutional comparisons, it is not clear to what extent different institutional contexts serve to shape the international engagement of academic staff. Furthermore, those case studies which have looked at more than one institution have predominantly been undertaken in North America (Agnew, 2013; Childress, 2010; Criswell & Zhu, 2015; Friesen, 2013; Savishinsky, 2012; Schwietz, 2006), with the exception of one such study in the Netherlands (De Haan, 2014) and one in China (Li & Tu, 2016).
This study therefore sought to investigate the extent to which specific institutional context influences the international engagement of academic staff in Australian universities. Accordingly, two case study institutions were selected on the basis of purposeful maximal sampling (Creswell, 2012) to capture institutional cases which showed different perspectives in terms of their domestic and international profile and principal characteristics. In light of the role of discipline in shaping academic identity (Becher, 1989; Henkel, 2010), the choice of research sites was also informed by the mix of disciplines at possible case study institutions. In order to facilitate comparisons between disciplines, a sufficient level of homogeneity was also sought in the discipline mix of the nominated case study institutions (Maxwell, 1998).

In line with these sampling criteria, two higher education institutions were selected in the State of Victoria, Australia – La Trobe University and the University of Melbourne. Based on their domestic affiliation to particular networks of universities, these two case study institutions can be considered as broadly representative of the Australian university sector. However, as outlined below, they show diverse characteristics in terms of their profile, affiliation, campus location, total academic staff and student cohort sizes. Similarly, they have differentiated international profiles as witnessed by their international student population, the delivery of courses transnationally, and their inclusion or exclusion from the principal international rankings of universities.

a) La Trobe University

La Trobe University (LTU) was established in 1964 as the third university in the State of Victoria and the twelfth university in Australia. It was selected for this study, as it is representative of a group of younger comprehensive universities with a more progressive and innovative focus. LTU’s principal campus is in outer suburban Melbourne, with two other major campuses and two smaller campuses in regional Victoria. LTU undertakes research and offers courses (from Bachelors level through to PhD) in a broad range of disciplines, with schools and departments housed under two broad colleges – the College of Arts, Social Sciences and Commerce, and the College of Science, Health and Engineering. In line with its founding mission to improve access to higher education, LTU also facilitates a range of enabling and transfer programs into the university for students from the vocational education sector and other alternative pathways.
In relation to size, institutional data (available at the time LTU was chosen as a research site) show that LTU enrolled a slightly larger number of students than the average Australian university in 2013; however, within the State of Victoria, it had a small enrolment than the average Victorian university⁴. Over three quarters of LTU students were enrolled at undergraduate or sub-bachelor level, with just under 5% enrolled in research degrees⁵. In contrast to its student population, LTU employed fewer academic staff in 2014 than the national and State averages⁶.

b) The University of Melbourne

Founded in 1853, the University of Melbourne (UoM) was the first university in the State of Victoria and, at that time, the second university established in the collection of British colonial states which would later become federal Australia. It was selected for this study, as it is representative of a group of older comprehensive universities with a strong focus on research. Located on the outskirts of the City of Melbourne, UoM’s principal campus is home to the majority of the institution’s research and teaching activity. UoM also has two smaller metropolitan campuses and four other campus locations in rural Victoria. As a comprehensive doctoral university, UoM offers undergraduate, postgraduate and research training courses across ten faculties and graduate schools representing the major disciplines in the humanities, social sciences, medicine, science, engineering and technology.

When it was selected for this study, UoM was one of the largest Australian universities based on both its student and staff profile. Institutional data indicate that UoM employed just under 3,700 academic staff in 2014, making it the second largest employer of teaching and research staff in the country⁷. With a total enrolment of 52,322 students in 2013, it had the fifth largest student cohort across the Australian university sector⁸. In

---

⁴ Data derived from Selected Higher Education Statistics – 2013 Student Data, Table 2.10: All Students by State, Higher Education Institution, Citizenship and Residence Status, Full Year 2013. Calculations exclude Non-University Higher Education Institutions, University of Divinity, and Batchelor Institute of Indigenous Tertiary Education (Australian Government, 2014a).
⁵ Data derived from Selected Higher Education Statistics – 2013 Student Data, Table 2.5: All Students by State, Higher Education Institution and Broad Level of Course, Full Year, Full Year 2013. (Australian Government, 2014a)
⁶ Data derived from Selected Higher Education Statistics – 2014 Staff Data, Table 2.6: Number of Full-time and Fractional Full-time Staff by State, Higher Education Institution, Current Duties and Gender, 2014 (Australian Government, 2014c).
⁷ Data derived from Selected Higher Education Statistics – 2014 Staff Data, Table 2.6 Number of Full-time and Fractional Full-time Staff by State, Higher Education Institution, Current Duties and Gender, 2014 (Australian Government, 2014c).
⁸ Data drawn from Selected Higher Education Statistics – 2013 Student Data, Table 2.10: All Students by State, Higher Education Institution, Citizenship and Residence Status, Full Year 2013 (Australian Government, 2014a).
relation to mix of course levels, 48.8% of UoM students in 2013 were enrolled in undergraduate degrees, with the remainder enrolled at postgraduate level, in either coursework or research degrees. With over 9% of its students enrolled in research degrees, UoM had the largest enrolment of research students (at doctoral and masters level) of any Australian university in 2013.

Table 1 (see over) provides a summary of the key points of differentiation between the two case study institutions at the time they were chosen for this study in October 2014:

---

9 Data derived from Selected Higher Education Statistics – 2013 Student Data, Table 2.5: All Students by State, Higher Education Institution and Broad Level of Course, Full Year 2013 (Australian Government, 2014a).

10 Data derived from Selected Higher Education Statistics – 2013 Student Data, Table 2.5: All Students by State, Higher Education Institution and Broad Level of Course, Full Year 2013 (Australian Government, 2014a).
Despite the intention of sampling for maximum variation, it should nevertheless be noted that there is significant homogeneity in institution type across the Australian university sector (Meek, 1994). As such, in spite of their differences in profile, size and reputation, both of the chosen case study institutions are similar in a number of other respects. They are both self-accrediting higher education providers (that is, universities) listed in Table A of the Commonwealth Government *Higher Education Support Act 2003*. In line with the legislated definition of what it means to be an Australian university, both institutions are research and teaching universities offering doctoral study. Accordingly,

Table 1: Case study institutions – general and international characteristics - 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>La Trobe University</th>
<th>University of Melbourne</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Profile</strong></td>
<td>Progressive</td>
<td>Research Intensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Network affiliation</strong></td>
<td>Innovative Research Universities (IRU)</td>
<td>Group of Eight (Go8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location(s)</strong></td>
<td>Suburban &amp; regional</td>
<td>Metropolitan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic staff, 2014</strong></td>
<td>1,302</td>
<td>3,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total students, 2013</strong></td>
<td>32,895</td>
<td>52,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicative staff : student ratio</strong></td>
<td>1 : 25.3</td>
<td>1 : 14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International students, 2013</strong></td>
<td>7,642</td>
<td>14,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International proportion, 2013</strong></td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transnational education</strong></td>
<td>Yes – 1,405 students</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Ranking of World Universities (ARWU) 2014</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Times Higher Education (THE) World University Ranking 2014-2015</strong></td>
<td>No17</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 Data derived from Selected Higher Education Statistics – 2014 Staff Data, Table 2.6: Number of Full-time and Fractional Full-time Staff by State, Higher Education Institution, Current Duties and Gender, 2014 (Australian Government, 2014c).
13 Derived from 2013 total student data and 2014 academic staff data in this table.
15 Data derived from Selected Higher Education Statistics – 2013 Student Data, Table 2.10: All Students by State, Higher Education Institution, Citizenship and Residence Status, Full Year 2013 (Australian Government, 2014a).
16 Data drawn from Selected Higher Education Statistics – 2013 Student Data, Table 7.5: Commencing and All Overseas Students by State, Higher Education Institution and Onshore/Offshore Status, Full Year 2013 (Australian Government, 2014b).
17 Although not ranked in the THE World University Ranking 2014-2015, La Trobe University was listed in the THE 100 Under 50 Universities Ranking in both 2014 and 2015.
they are eligible to receive public research funding from the Commonwealth Government, as well as publicly-funded places for domestic students.

Bearing in mind this caveat, an initial analysis of the broad spread of disciplines at each institution (outlined in Table 2) identified significant overlap in terms of disciplinary mix, thereby supporting this initial choice of case study institutions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>La Trobe University</th>
<th>University of Melbourne</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allied Health</td>
<td>Architecture, Building and Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied System Biology</td>
<td>Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Arts and Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer Medicine</td>
<td>Business and Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Mathematical Sciences</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
<td>Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molecular Sciences</td>
<td>Veterinary and Agricultural Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing and Midwifery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology and Public Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Case study institutions – Faculties and Schools

In addition to institutional context, this study also sought to investigate the extent to which different disciplinary backgrounds influence the international dimensions of academic work, as earlier studies had highlighted that disciplinary perspectives were an important variable in terms of engagement with international activities (Agnew, 2013; Bell, 2004; Clifford, 2009; Schoorman, 1999). In this light, the study sought to draw participants from two discipline clusters at each institution to enable cross-case analysis between both institutions and disciplines.

Based on the current faculty and school structure at the two case study institutions (outlined in Table 2), two discipline clusters were selected on the basis of contrasting
disciplinary classifications. Using the four quadrant taxonomy put forward by Becher (1989), these disciplines were Business (a soft applied discipline) and Science (a pure hard discipline). Agnew (2013, p. 190) proposes that the four categories of discipline understand internationalisation in different ways, and the two nominated discipline clusters are maximally diverse in terms of Becher’s (1989) four quadrant classification.

In line with the departmental structure at the two case study institutions at the time of this study, Table 3 and Table 4 (see over) outline the departments which were included to represent the various Business and Science disciplines. As much as possible, similarity was sought between the relevant departments at each institution. As such, by way of example, the Department of Mathematics and Statistics at the University of Melbourne was excluded, as it had no direct counterpart in Science at La Trobe University:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>La Trobe University</th>
<th>University of Melbourne</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics and Finance</td>
<td>Business Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and Marketing</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management and Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Melbourne Business School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Case study institutions – Business disciplines
In line with common sampling criteria for qualitative research studies (Mason, 2010), a sample of 15-20 participants was sought from each institution, drawing from both discipline clusters. After receiving ethics approval from the University of Melbourne, initial advice about the study was provided to senior executive staff at each case study institution and their in principle approval was sought to recruit academic staff participants for the study. Guidance was then sought from senior international staff at each institution (where relevant, in central offices and in the nominated discipline clusters) on the most effective means of securing participation. Based on this advice, a series of targeted mail-outs was then used to recruit prospective participants from the relevant local departments. In order to encourage participation, the proposed timing of semi-structured interviews was carefully considered.

As part of their initial recruitment into a pool, potential participants were asked to complete a short online questionnaire (attached at Appendix 1). This questionnaire was designed to record a range of demographic information, including gender, position type and career stage, as well as additional information relating to a number of possible international indicators. These included whether the potential participants spoke a language other than English (LOTE), whether they were born in Australia or overseas, and whether they had lived or studied overseas at some point. Potential participants
were also asked to nominate their own perception of their level of international engagement as an academic, in comparison to other colleagues in their local department.

Purposeful sampling was then used to select interviewees representing a range of experiences from the pool of interested participants. As such, in addition to their disciplinary background, participants were selected to ensure a mix of genders and experiences. Although the size of the sample did not allow for any of the sub-groups (for example, by gender) to be considered representative, this purposeful sampling was intended to ensure that a range of academic staff perspectives was presented. Accordingly, participants were selected from different stages in the academic career cycle, as there is some evidence that patterns of international engagement vary with seniority (Cummings et al., 2014). However, in order to ensure a broad range of perspectives, participants were not specifically targeted based on their prior experience of international engagement, as had been the case in a number of other studies which focused on enthusiasts with direct experience of internationalisation in a higher education context (see, for example, Agnew, 2013; Childress, 2010; Cooper & Mitsunaga, 2010; De Haan, 2014; Friesen, 2013; W. Green & Mertova, 2014). That being said, academic leaders in international roles within the relevant disciplines (such as Associate Deans International) were encouraged to participate.

Table 5 shows the number of participants in the study from each case study institution and each discipline cluster. In total, 37 academic staff were interviewed between March and September 2015, with the final sample size determined when saturation appeared to have been reached in this component of the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>La Trobe University</th>
<th>University of Melbourne</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business disciplines</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science disciplines</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Sample of participants by case study institution and discipline cluster

More detailed information about the samples from La Trobe University and the University of Melbourne is presented in Chapters 4 and 5 respectively. In these chapters, the terms “LTU academic staff” and “UoM academic staff” are used to denote the LTU
and UoM participants in this study. In Chapter 6, the term “academic staff” (unless otherwise indicated) is used to refer to all participants in this study, rather than all academic staff in all contexts. As discussed in section 3.4, little or no generalisability is inferred given from the findings of this study given the small sample size and limited disciplinary, institutional and national context.

3.2.5. Data collection

An Adaptive Theory approach encourages the collection of data via a diverse range of methods and techniques in order to enrich the ability to describe the social world (Layder, 1994, p. 178). Accordingly, the study employed two methods to collect qualitative data from the case study institutions, drawing from documentary sources and directed interviewing (Creswell, 2014). These two methods were employed in broad sequence with some overlap between data collection phases.

a) Phase 1 – Document analysis

Document analysis is a key technique for data collection in qualitative research (Yin, 2009) and this study collected data from publicly available documents from each of the case study institutions. Documents collected for analysis included mission statements, strategic plans and other high level planning documents, international strategies and plans, annual reports, relevant university/faculty/school policies, speeches and other communications by institutional leaders, and recent news items/press releases.

The aim of the first phase was to gain a broad view of the institutional context for each case study institution, both generally and in relation to the institution’s framework and culture of internationalisation, referred to by Brandenburg and Federkeil (2007, p. 7) as the ‘internationality’ of the institution. As such, document analysis sought to assess the degree of convergence and divergence between the two case study institutions in terms of institutional approach to internationalisation and the international engagement of academic staff. It also examined the particular institutional contexts for internationalisation and whether strategies were in place to encourage or support the international dimensions of academic work. This contextual analysis regarding
institutional strategies and practices then served to inform the subsequent collection of data via in-depth interviews.

b) Phase 2 – Interviews

In-depth interviews were chosen as an appropriate method of data collection to elicit information from the interviewees’ perspectives and to provide rich information on complex understandings of the research question. A schedule of interview questions was developed (attached at Appendix 2), although the interviews were conducted in a semi-structured manner to allow more flexibility for the participants. As such, although the questions were prepared in advance to ensure the comparability of responses, the interview schedule served to guide, rather than dictate, the conduct of each face-to-face interview.

These semi-structured interviews sought to elicit contextual information about the international dimensions of academic work in the different disciplinary and institutional contexts experienced by the sample of academic staff. In addition to information on the factors influencing the international dimensions of their work, the interviews also sought to explore the nature and scope of those international dimensions. In addition, the interview questions related both to the current work of participants, as well as to other international dimensions of which they were aware, either through their discussions with colleagues or more generally.

Prior to the commencement of data collection through interviews, ethics approval was sought and granted in accordance with University of Melbourne research policy and procedures. In line with the templates issued by the University of Melbourne Office for Research Ethics and Integrity, a Plain Language Statement (attached at Appendix 3) and consent form (attached at Appendix 4) were prepared and supplied to each participant. The consent form was used to constitute an agreement between the participants and the researcher in relation to the usage, reporting and dissemination of collected data. Interviews lasted between 25 and 60 minutes and took place in the participants’ offices or a nearby meeting room. Data collection for the semi-structured interviews was in the form of recording, with recorded interviews then timed and annotated with themes and selected quotes for subsequent analysis (see sample annotation in Appendix 5).
3.2.6. Data analysis

In order to analyse data from the interviews conducted in Phase 2 of the study, a draft coding framework was initially developed in line with themes identified from the review of the literature on the internationalisation of higher education and the various key dimensions of internationalisation. Document analysis in Phase 1 of the study had also served to identify a range of themes in the various institutional documents. Accordingly, the initial coding framework drew on themes identified in both the literature and the institutional documents collected for the study (Guest, MacQueen, & Namey, 2012; Silverman, 2006).

This initial coding framework was structured into two principal sets of codes, representing different international dimensions of academic work or international activities on the one hand, and a range of potential influence factors on the other. For the purpose of analysis, each set of codes was then further categorized into nominal clusters. As such, the different types of international dimension were classified as ‘research’, ‘teaching’, ‘outreach’, ‘service’ or ‘personal’, whilst influences were classified as ‘individual’, ‘disciplinary’, ‘institutional’ or ‘external’. In the context of this study, ‘outreach’ was taken to mean external engagement or third strand activities which are undertaken outside the institution, whilst ‘service’ was understood to be within or for the institution. ‘Personal’ dimensions or activities included items such as the use of foreign languages in academic work, discussions with colleagues on international matters, and the completion of targeted professional development in relation to international work. In relation to different influences, a distinction was drawn in the coding framework between departmental, college-level and faculty influences, which were classified as ‘institutional’, and a set of ‘disciplinary’ influences which related to both the immediate work environment of participants, as well as their broader sense of affiliation to a supra-institutional academic discipline.

In line with the research question, the coding framework was designed to record both the current international dimensions of the work of participants, as well as those dimensions of which they were aware or to which they aspired in the future. The interview schedule encouraged participants to reflect on international activities with which they might engage at a subsequent point in their career as an academic. Analysis
of this information sought to highlight the range of potential international activities
available to them, as well as how they perceived the likely development of their
international engagement into the future. For indicative purposes, a range of geographic
codes was also employed, thereby enabling the study to consider the geographic
distribution of international engagement across the sample.

Following the establishment of this initial coding framework, interviews were then coded
in the qualitative data analysis software program Atlas.ti. Demographic and other
information from the short online questionnaire was also incorporated into this software
program to facilitate further analysis in relation to these additional factors for each
participant. In line with an Adaptive Theory (AT) approach, the coding framework was
modified and adjusted during the coding process in response to the interview data. As
mentioned at section 3.2.2, AT facilitates a dialogue between existing models and
frameworks (prior theory) and emergent theory from collected data. As such, an AT
approach actively supports the iterative and inductive generation of codes (Layder, 1994,
p. 174).

Collectively, the coding of themes for each of the components of the study sought to
facilitate a higher level of analysis in terms of the research question. Analysis of the
coding and demographic information was undertaken within Atlas.ti, by way of coding
analysis, word counts and code co-occurrences.

3.3. Trustworthiness

As described in section 3.2 above, the methods employed in this study were principally
qualitative. As such, in order to assess the credibility and limitations of the study, the
concept of trustworthiness first proposed by Lincoln and Guba (1985) is employed.
Trustworthiness, in this context, refers to the ability of the researcher to convince
his/her audience that “the findings of an inquiry are worth paying attention to, worth
taking account of” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 290).

One of the key threats to trustworthiness is credibility, that is, confidence in the truth of
the findings. To mitigate against this concern, the study sought data from both
institutional and individual sources, as well as interviewing a sample of academic staff
from different career stages and different departments/schools. An additional selection criterion for participants was their own perception of their level of international engagement as an academic, and the sample was chosen to reflect a range of responses in this regard. This triangulation of both methods and sources was designed to verify the consistency of the findings across the sample (Denzin, 1978; Patton, 1999).

Although criticism can be made of qualitative studies which compare the perceptions of participants, this study was framed within a critical realist view of research design where the individual voices of participants are situated within the institutional realities of their work (Harré & Moghaddam, 2003). This conceptual framework has been applied in other recent studies focused on aspects of academic engagement with international education (see, for example, Tran & Nguyen, 2015). Nevertheless, this approach remains centred on the interpretation of individual perspectives, which may lead to concerns of trustworthiness. To address these concerns, the analysis presented in the following chapters draws strongly on quotes from participants, in order to highlight the analysis of this qualitative data by the researcher and to make these interpretations transparent to the reader.

One of the other key features of a qualitative approach to research is the role of the researcher as an instrument of data collection (Creswell, 2013). Noting that experiential knowledge can provide a major source of insights, hypotheses and validity checks, but may also lead to bias (Maxwell, 1998, pp. 224–225), this study acknowledges the position of the researcher and the potential influence of his personal, cultural and historical experiences on the interpretation of data. Having previously held a professional staff position of authority in the international office at UoM, there was potential for research participants at that case study institution to withhold information or to assume prior knowledge of their circumstances. To mitigate these concerns, participants were clearly advised of the nature and purpose of the research, and participation was strictly voluntary.

A small number of cross-checks was also run to explore potential bias in the sample of academic staff selected for interview. In this context, an analysis of bibliometric data at the time of the study pointed to the LTU sample (and, in particular, the Business participants at LTU) having a slightly lower level of international collaboration in
research (as measured by the percentage of internationally co-authored publications) than the average for all LTU academic staff. This was not the case at UoM, where the sample for this study had similar levels of international co-publications to the broader UoM academic community (based on an analysis of Scopus data up to 30 May 2016 drawn from www.scival.com, © 2016 Elsevier B.V.). Another cross-check related to the proportion of the sample who were born overseas. Based on the available data on the international migration of Australian university academic staff (Hugo, 2008, p. 30), it is possible that the sample is slightly skewed towards the views of overseas-born academic staff. This was particularly the case for UoM participants and, to a lesser degree, for Business participants. In contrast, the sample of participants at LTU included far fewer overseas-born academic staff than the Australian average.

In terms of data analysis, attention was paid to avoid quasi-statistical conclusions based on quantitative analysis of qualitative data (Maxwell, 1998, p. 245). Although quantitative analysis of codes was used as the basis for identifying themes in the first instance, these themes were tested against the underlying qualitative data before framing the findings of the study.

### 3.4. Limitations of the study

This study examined the opinions of a small number of academic staff at two higher education institutions in one state of Australia. Although the two case study institutions are broadly representative of Australian universities, participants were drawn from only two discipline groups in order to limit the scope of the study and to make the project manageable. Furthermore, the study is situated solely in an Anglophone context, despite the global nature of higher education and national differences in how internationalisation is understood and enacted by individuals and by institutions. As such, the findings outlined in this thesis are limited in terms of drawing generalised empirical conclusions. However, the aim of the study was to carry out a detailed investigation of a complex phenomenon, and a broader investigation was not feasible in the context of this study.

In terms of the sample of academic staff interviewed for the study, there was potential bias towards staff with a research focus, as well as towards the views of overseas-born
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academic staff. In addition, given the voluntary nature of participation in this study, it may be the case that those academics who participated were more interested in the international aspects of their work or had more significant international engagement than their peers. Each of these instances may have led to bias in the sample, and this further obviates the opportunity to generalise the findings.

Finally, this study of international engagement is underpinned by the researcher’s conceptions and experiences as a senior professional in international higher education and as an active member of communities of professional practice in international education in Australia and overseas. This obviates against neutrality in the examination of academics’ opinions regarding their international engagement, with the researcher’s own perspectives and experiences likely to influence both the collection and interpretation of qualitative data (Lichtman, 2013, p. 16).

3.5. Summary

This chapter has outlined the research design for this study, including the rationale for the chosen methodology and the methods employed in conducting the study. To investigate the various factors which influence Australian academic staff to engage with the international dimensions of their work, the study adopted an Adaptive Theory methodology (Layder, 1998) and employed qualitative methods of data collection and analysis. Mindful of the limitations of the study in terms of sample size and generalisability, this research design was selected to explore the nature and scope of the international engagement of Australian academic staff, as well as to investigate the potential influence of institutional, disciplinary and individual contexts on that engagement. The following chapter presents an analysis of the main findings from the first of the two case study institutions, which represents a group of younger comprehensive universities with a policy focus on teaching and learning.
Chapter 4  INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENT - LA TROBE UNIVERSITY

This chapter begins by providing an overview of the institutional background for La Trobe University (LTU), particularly in relation to the perceived ‘internationality’ of the institution, that is, its broad framework and culture of internationalisation (Brandenburg & Federkeil, 2007, p. 7). Building on the brief outline in Chapter 3, further information is then presented in relation to the sample of LTU academic staff who were interviewed for the study.

Drawing on document analysis, this chapter illustrates that the institutional context at LTU is strongly supportive and encouraging of the international dimensions of academic work. However, despite the wide scope of international engagement of academic staff participants at LTU (hereinafter “LTU academic staff”), analysis of interview data indicates that most of this international activity is focused on the international dimensions of research. Discussion of four key themes arising from the data demonstrates that LTU academic staff are influenced by a complex set of intersecting factors relating to their institution, discipline and personal experience, as well as by factors beyond the institution.

4.1. Institutional background

As described in Chapter 3, La Trobe University (LTU) is a younger university with campuses in suburban Melbourne and regional Victoria. Given the significant homogeneity between universities in the Australian higher education sector (described at section 3.2.3), LTU can be seen to represent a group of younger institutions that describes their mission as either progressive or innovative.

LTU offers a wide range of courses from Bachelor to PhD level and appears to have a sizeable cohort of students in relation to the scale of its academic workforce. In relation to its international profile, LTU enrolls a substantial proportion of international students (22.5% of all enrolments in 2014)\(^{18}\). It also delivers courses transnationally, with 51.1% of

\(^{18}\) Although sizeable in an international context, this mirrors the average proportion of international students across the Australian university sector in 2014 (at 22.4%). Data derived from Selected Higher Education Statistics – 2014 Student Data, Table 2.10: All Students by State, Higher Education Institution, Citizenship and Residence Status, Full Year 2014 (Australian Government, 2015).
its total cohort of international students located offshore, that is outside Australia\(^\text{19}\). In relation to the international aspects of research, an analysis of bibliometric data on international research collaboration at the time of this study identified that 34.5\% of all LTU publications between 2011 and 2015 were co-authored with an institution in another country\(^\text{20}\) (Scopus data up to 30 May 2016 drawn from www.scival.com, © 2016 Elsevier B.V.). At the commencement of this study, LTU had not featured in either the research-focused Academic Ranking of World Universities prepared in Shanghai or the Times Higher Education (THE) World University Ranking; however, it was recognised in the THE international ranking of universities less than fifty years old in both 2014 and 2015. This position changed during the course of the study, with LTU listed for the first time in both the principal THE World University Ranking (in the 351-400 band in 2015-2016) and in the Academic Ranking of World Universities (in the 301-400 band in 2016).

Beyond this simple presentation of institutional data, a more nuanced picture of the internationality of LTU emerges through analysis of a range of publicly available institutional documents, including LTU’s strategic plan and other high level planning documents, its internationalisation plan, annual reports, relevant university policies and recent media releases. Analysis of these documents provides a further indication of the institutional context and approach to internationalisation at LTU, as well as identifying what, if any, reference is made to the international engagement of its academic staff in these documents.

### 4.1.1. Strategic planning framework

Although it is not clear to what extent the strategic planning framework of an institution directly or indirectly influences the work of academic staff (as discussed in Chapter 2), the literature suggests that the international engagement of academic staff is fostered by a strong framework of overarching support for the internationalisation of the institution (Agnew & VanBalkom, 2009; Childress, 2009). An analysis of the strategic planning framework at LTU is therefore important to this study.

\(^{19}\) Data derived from Selected Higher Education Statistics – 2014 Student Data, Table 7.5: Commencing and All Overseas Students by State, Higher Education Institution and Onshore/Offshore Status, Full Year 2014 (Australian Government, 2015).

\(^{20}\) Over the same time period, the national average for Australia was 45.4\%. 
LTU has published an integrated set of strategic planning documentation across its core functions for the five year period from 2013 to 2017. Informed by an overarching Strategic Plan (“Future Ready: Strategic Plan 2013-2017,” 2013), LTU’s strategic aspirations are principally contained in its Research Plan (“Research Plan 2013-2017,” 2013) and its Learning and Teaching Plan (“Learning and Teaching Plan 2013-2017,” 2013). Cross-referencing between these planning documents and the similar visual preparation of the various hard copy publications reinforce a sense of coherence between each of these documents and suggest that LTU has a clearly structured approach to planning at an institutional level. Furthermore, each of these plans makes specific reference to the international dimensions of the university’s mission and/or the institution’s internationalisation agenda.

When it was first published in 2013, LTU’s Strategic Plan, for example, made frequent references to international activities and global concerns (“Future Ready: Strategic Plan 2013-2017,” 2013). These references were predominantly expressed in relation to international students and institutional rankings or reputation, as well as the global challenges which the research of LTU academic staff seeks to address. Following a number of revisions in 2015, LTU’s Strategic Plan now appears to have a stronger focus on the international aspects of the institution’s research agenda. Unlike the earlier iteration, this revised Plan now includes specific reference to a competitive global marketplace for researchers and LTU’s desire to improve its research performance through the strategic recruitment and retention of talented research staff (“Future Ready: Strategic Plan 2013-2017,” 2015, p. 9). These modifications to LTU’s strategic agenda may reflect a growing push for institutional success in international rankings, which is strongly predicated on research performance. As noted above, during the course of this study, LTU has been listed in two of the leading global rankings of universities. Reflecting the significance of these rankings to the institution, LTU publicly celebrated the contribution of its academic staff to its Academic Ranking of World Universities success in a half-page statement in the local broadsheet newspaper (La Trobe University, 2016).

Whilst LTU’s strategic plan highlights its thinking about the future, the annual reports published by LTU in the last four years appear to show a decreasing focus on
international matters from one year to the next. ‘Internationalisation’ itself has not been referenced since the 2012 annual report (reflecting activities in 2011) (“Making a difference: La Trobe University Annual Report 2012,” 2013) and fewer references to international activities have subsequently been made year-on-year (“La Trobe University Annual Report 2013,” 2014; “La Trobe University Annual Report 2014,” 2015; “La Trobe University Annual Report 2015,” 2016). This reduced focus on international matters in annual reports may relate more to timing than to substance, with the 2014 annual report reflecting on the final year of implementation of LTU’s former Internationalisation Plan (“Internationalisation Plan 2010-2013,” 2011) (see section 4.1.2). Certainly, in LTU’s public positioning, there appears to be a solid focus on international matters, as witnessed by an analysis of its formal media releases in 2014. In that year, 28 out of 157 media releases (17.8%) referred to international activities of some sort, in particular in relation to public commentary on international affairs by academic staff, international reward or recognition for staff and students, or outbound student mobility.

Drawing on its Strategic Plan, LTU’s Research Plan 2013-2017 draws a clear parallel between an increase in the quality, impact and volume of research, additional research income and an enhanced international reputation for the institution (“Research Plan 2013-2017,” 2013, p. 2). The Research Plan includes targets in relation to the international quality of LTU research and the establishment of a small number of partnerships with international institutions for benchmarking and collaboration purposes. One of six goals in this plan relates to targeted action to improve LTU’s international research-based institutional ranking, with eight strategies listed to progress the achievement of that goal (“Research Plan 2013-2017,” 2013, p. 10). LTU has also identified a small number of Research Focus Areas which seek to address major issues of global importance (“Research Plan 2013-2017,” 2013, p. 1).

In a similar fashion, LTU’s Learning and Teaching Plan 2013-2017 includes targets in relation to the diversity of the student population, the provision of academic support to students from non-English speaking backgrounds and the promotion of outbound student mobility (“Learning and Teaching Plan 2013-2017,” 2013, pp. 8 & 10). During the period of this study, prominently displayed posters were present at multiple sites around

---

the principal campus encouraging students to learn a foreign language and to “make the world your campus” by undertaking a period of study abroad. LTU also identifies three essential areas of learning, which are intended to be embedded in the curriculum and designed to equip students for the workplace and beyond. One of these three essentials is Global Citizenship, and the current Learning and Teaching Plan envisages that all LTU students, as part of their studies, will reflect on the opportunities and obligations of their citizenship in a globalising world (“Learning and Teaching Plan 2013-2017,” 2013, p. 4). Furthermore, through a series of internal grants made available through LTU’s Digital Learning Strategy, academic staff are encouraged to develop collaboration in online teaching and learning with universities overseas (“2015 Digital Learning Strategy (DLS) Innovation Grants,” 2015).

This analysis has shown that international engagement in research and in teaching and learning is strongly advocated by LTU, with a range of strategies in place to foster a greater international focus in the work of academic staff. In its strategic agenda, LTU is also alert to its global reputation and to the importance of international students to both that reputation and the institution’s general academic and financial viability.

4.1.2. Internationalisation at La Trobe University

In addition to its other strategy and planning documents, LTU has an Internationalisation Plan 2014-2017 which directly references the internationally-focused goals and targets established in the current Research Plan and Learning and Teaching Plan, as well as laying out additional goals and targets in relation to the internationalisation of the university (“Internationalisation Plan 2014-2017,” 2014). Unlike the earlier 2010-2013 version of this plan (“Internationalisation Plan 2010-2013,” 2011), the current Internationalisation Plan specifically references LTU’s intention to move towards a more comprehensive internationalisation (“Internationalisation Plan 2014-2017,” 2014, p. 4) and cites a lengthy definition of what this means (drawn directly from Hudzik (2011, p. 6)). In light of this intention to support the comprehensive internationalisation of the university, the Plan identifies targets and strategies in relation to six high level goals which touch on all aspects of the university’s activities and its internal constituents. One of these goals aims to “recruit, support and reward staff for engagement and success in internationalisation within the university and overseas” (“Internationalisation Plan 2014-
Strategies in support of this goal include the inclusion of international dimensions into the recruitment and promotion criteria for academic staff, the revision of staff induction processes for all staff to incorporate advice on the university’s internationalisation, and the establishment of professional development programs for leaders and managers to improve their understanding of internationalisation. By 2017, LTU’s target is to have 50% of its staff having completed a professional development workshop related to an aspect of internationalisation.

As mentioned at section 4.1.1, the incorporation of goals targeted at staff in LTU’s planning documents may have no immediate relevance to the work of academic staff; however, in this instance, it is indicative of the institution’s broader approach to internationalisation and to the value which is placed on the involvement of academic staff by the senior leadership of the institution. A further indication of the status and support for internationalisation within LTU can be drawn from recent changes to the university’s international leadership and management structures, with the senior administrative role in charge of LTU’s international office re-cast as an executive position during the period of this study. Reporting to the Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Vice-President (Academic), management responsibility for internationalisation at LTU was previously held by a head of division (then Executive Director, International), but this role has now been re-framed as an executive role, titled Pro Vice-Chancellor (International). Although holding similar line management responsibilities, the re-framed Pro Vice-Chancellor (International) role is now part of the senior executive team at LTU and has a stronger ambassadorial mandate for the university internationally (“Pro Vice-Chancellor (International): Information for Candidates,” 2015). In addition to the direct leadership of the international office, the learning and teaching division at LTU is headed by a scholar who is widely-known internationally for her work on the internationalisation of the curriculum. Professor Betty Leask, LTU’s Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning), joined LTU in September 2013 and was awarded the International Education Association of Australia Excellence Award for Distinguished Contribution to International Education in 2015.

In summary, LTU’s strategic planning framework portrays an institution with a strong commitment to internationalisation in all areas of its activities. By way of a range of
targets which are exclusively addressed at academic staff, it is also clear that LTU is keen to encourage the active international engagement of its teaching and research community. Furthermore, LTU’s leadership and management structures reinforce a sense that internationalisation is a whole-of-university concern. As identified in earlier research, one of the key roles of international leaders in higher education is to provide clarity on the involvement of academic staff (Dewey & Duff, 2009) and LTU’s planning documents and leadership structures appear to support this. Indeed, with a formal Internationalisation Plan in place, LTU mirrors the experience of many higher education institutions which have adopted international strategies or plans to guide their international activities or approach to internationalisation (Egron-Polak & Hudson, 2014; Middlehurst & Woodfield, 2007; Taylor, 2010a). Whilst the possible influence of this strategic planning framework on the work of academic staff is explored in more detail at section 4.4, the next section firstly looks in more detail at LTU’s policy framework in relation to the recruitment, selection, promotion and professional development of academic staff.

4.1.3. Academic staff policy framework

As discussed in Chapter 2, earlier research in the US has shown that the nature of academic employment policies may constitute a barrier to the international engagement of academic staff (Ellingboe, 1998). As such, an analysis of the academic staff policy framework at LTU sought to examine the extent to which the international dimensions of academic work might be influenced by institutional policies in relation to recruitment, reward and promotion.

At LTU, the human resources policy framework appears to make very few references to the international dimensions of academic work. Although the procedure on staff recruitment, selection and appointment contains a small number of provisions relating to visas and work rights for prospective staff from other countries (“Recruitment, Selection and Appointment Procedure,” 2015), data on the nationality of LTU staff are not available and it is therefore unclear to what extent these policy provisions are enacted. It is understood that some 40% of academic staff in Australian universities were born overseas, a higher proportion than in the broader workforce (Hugo & Morriss, 2010,
pp. 46–47), so this may have a significant influence on the choices which academic staff make about their work.

More frequent references to the international dimensions of academic work are made in LTU’s policies and frameworks around academic promotion, which show that expectations of international engagement increase with seniority, in particular for promotion beyond Academic Level C (Senior Lecturer, Senior Research Fellow). The LTU Academic Promotions Evidence Matrix 2012 outlines clear expectations about the types of evidence which can be shown in relation to a wide range of academic activities, and contains frequent references to international activities in research and service/outreach (“Academic Promotions Evidence Matrix,” 2012). Nevertheless, it is only for promotion to Academic Level E (Professor, Professorial Fellow) that applicants are “expected to provide evidence of excellence in research/scholarship and/or teaching and supervision that is recognised internationally” (“Academic Promotions Policy,” 2009, p. 2). This highlights that the international dimensions of academic work are of particular relevance to promotion to full Professor, but perhaps suggests that they are less immediately relevant to promotion at other stages in the academic career cycle. That being said, formal professional development opportunities exist in LTU policy for staff to undertake an Outside Studies Program (OSP) and it is expected that OSP is undertaken at major centres of learning overseas (“Outside Studies Program for Academic Staff Policy,” 2016).

In summary, the academic staff policy framework at LTU appears to be broadly supportive of the international engagement of academic staff. However, in the Australian context, it is difficult to gauge the potential influence of these policies, as little or no analysis is available on what the staffing policy frameworks of Australian universities say about the international dimensions of academic work in this country. Nevertheless, the review of the literature shows that institutional policies and procedures governing the work of academic staff in the US can be a significant factor in facilitating, or indeed, inhibiting the international engagement of academic staff with different aspects of their work (Helms & Asfaw, 2013a).

Beyond the immediate policy framework governing the employment conditions of academic staff at LTU, the context for academic work at LTU during the period of this study appears to have been strongly affected by a large-scale academic restructure of the
university. Envisaged since late 2013, this restructure saw the merging of five existing faculties into two colleges in October 2014, as well as a reduction in the academic staff workforce by around 350 full-time positions, that is by approximately 15 percent ("La Trobe on track for reform," 2014; “La Trobe University confirms it is cutting 350 jobs as part of a restructure,” 2014). The reverberations from this restructure were commonly and repeatedly referred to at interview by LTU participants, both in relation to their employment conditions and a set of modified expectations regarding their work. Not only had the reduction in the academic workforce led to larger teaching loads at the time of the study, but it had also reinforced academic perceptions about institutional pressure in relation to increased research output. The majority of LTU participants were alert to a perceived institutional shift towards research, which appears congruent with both the revisions to the current Strategic Plan and rankings success outlined at section 4.1.1.

As such, although the broader human resources policy framework at LTU may not directly influence the international dimensions of academic work, the knock-on effects of this large-scale restructure appear to be an important contextual factor in relation to this study.

4.2. Key attributes of La Trobe University participants

This section provides an overview of the key characteristics of the sample of LTU participants. Whilst more detailed analysis of the possible significance of demographic and other attributes is presented at section 4.4, this initial outline is important, as the literature suggests that the various international dimensions of academic work are likely to be influenced by a range of demographic and other factors (Dewey & Duff, 2009; Finkelstein et al., 2013), and that level of employment and exposure to management responsibilities are possible key variables (Taylor, 2010b).

As outlined in Chapter 3, between fifteen and twenty participants were sought at each case study institution, representing two discipline clusters: Business and Science. Interested participants were initially recruited into a pool and asked to complete a short online demographic questionnaire. Purposeful sampling was then used to select a group of participants for interview who represented a range of experiences from the pool, in relation to their disciplinary background, career experience, demographic profile and
range of possible international variables. This sampling was intended to ensure that a range of academic staff perspectives was presented; however, given the size of the sample, the study does not propose that the findings are representative of any of the sub-groups.

4.2.1. Disciplinary background

This study drew interview participants from two contrasting discipline clusters in order to investigate the extent to which specific disciplinary contexts influence the international dimensions of academic work. As discussed in Chapter 2, disciplinary context has been identified as one of the key factors shaping academic engagement with internationalisation (Agnew, 2013; Clifford, 2009). As such, the LTU schools/departments included in this study were purposefully chosen to ensure disciplinary comparability between the two case study institutions.

In relation to Business, eight participants were selected, representing the three Business sub-disciplines at LTU: Management and Marketing; Accounting, and Economics and Finance. The sample of LTU academic staff in Business included the person holding the international leadership position for all Business disciplines. In relation to Science, nine participants were drawn from the schools and departments originally nominated for this study (principally Chemistry and Physics; Biochemistry and Genetics, and Ecology, Environment and Evolution). An additional Science participant was drawn from another school by virtue of her international leadership position on behalf of all Science disciplines at LTU.

4.2.2. Demographic characteristics

In addition to their disciplinary background, interview participants were chosen to represent a range of demographic profiles, including gender, position type and career stage. Previous research has indicated that patterns of international engagement vary with seniority (Cummings et al., 2014) and participants were therefore selected from different stages in the academic career cycle. Table 6 (see over) outlines the key demographic characteristics and disciplinary breakdown of the eighteen interview participants at LTU:
Four out of ten Science participants indicated that they were employed on ‘research only’ positions. As such, by virtue of position type alone, it is reasonable to assume that Science participants at LTU are more likely to be involved with research (and conversely less likely to be involved in teaching) in their academic work. This assumption is initially corroborated by an analysis of research publications for the sample of LTU participants. Whilst the eighteen LTU participants collectively published 245 publications between 2011 and 2015, 197 of these (80.4%) were published by the ten Science participants and 48 (19.6%) by the eight Business participants (Scopus data up to 30 May 2016 drawn from www.scival.com, © 2016 Elsevier B.V.).

Analysis of bibliometric data on research collaboration identifies further distinctions between the two discipline groups in relation to the international dimensions of their published research. The ten Science participants at LTU are not only more active in research (as measured by numbers of publications), but they are also more likely to collaborate in their publications with international co-authors. At the time of this study, 32.5% of publications by the ten Science participants (between 2011 and 2015) were co-authored with an institution in another country, whilst this figure was 22.9% for the eight Business participants at LTU (Scopus data up to 30 May 2016 drawn from www.scival.com, © 2016 Elsevier B.V.). Despite this disciplinary difference, LTU
participants (from both disciplines) appear to be less involved in internationally co-authored publications than the average of their peers at LTU, where 34.5% of all publications (between 2011 and 2015) were jointly authored internationally (Scopus data up to 30 May 2016 drawn from www.scival.com, © 2016 Elsevier B.V.).

4.2.3. International characteristics

Previous work has highlighted that prior experience in an international context or cosmopolitan dispositions are potentially significant influencing factors on academic staff in terms of the international dimensions of their work (Bond et al., 2003; Sanderson, 2008; Willis & Taylor, 2014). As such, additional information was sought from prospective interview participants in respect of a number of possible international indicators, including whether they spoke a language other than English (LOTE), whether they were born in Australia or overseas, and whether they had lived or studied overseas at some point. Table 7 outlines the international characteristics and disciplinary breakdown of interview participants at LTU:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of birth</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lived overseas (&lt;3 months)</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest qualification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOTE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 7: La Trobe University – interview participants – international characteristics*

Initial analysis of this information indicates that a higher proportion of Science participants has lived overseas at some point in their adult life; indeed, three out of ten Science participants studied overseas for their highest academic qualification. However, with a slightly higher proportion born overseas, Business participants are more likely to
speak a language other than English. The potential significance of these international characteristics on the work of these academic staff is explored at section 4.4.

4.3. International engagement

Where many earlier studies have focused on international ‘enthusiasts’ with prior experience of internationalisation in a higher education context (see, for example, Agnew, 2013; Childress, 2010; Cooper & Mitsunaga, 2010; De Haan, 2014; Friesen, 2013; W. Green & Mertova, 2013), participants in this study were not specifically targeted based on their earlier experience of international engagement. Indeed, with the exception of academic leaders in international roles in the relevant discipline areas, other participants in the study were selected to ensure a range of perspectives in relation to different levels of exposure to the international dimensions of academic work.

In this context, one further piece of information was sought from prospective interview participants via the short online questionnaire administered prior to the interviews in this study. This related to the participants’ own perceptions of their level of international engagement as an academic in comparison with other colleagues in their department or school. Participants were asked to rate their international engagement on a five-point scale from Very High to Very Low, as shown in Table 8:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of international engagement</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: La Trobe University – interview participants – level of international engagement

Whilst the self-assessment of participants prior to interview was indicative only (and principally intended for the purpose of participant selection), subsequent analysis of interview data paints a picture of the range of international activities undertaken by LTU participants across all aspects of their work. As suggested in Chapter 2, the various influencing factors on the international dimensions of academic work may vary.
according to the nature of the work itself, specifically between research, teaching, outreach or service.

Before investigating the factors which influence LTU academic staff in their decisions about these dimensions of their work, the next section initially sketches the landscape of the international engagement of LTU participants and seeks to understand the extent to which the international dimensions of their work are centred on research, teaching, outreach or service. Drawing on an analysis of interview data, this section highlights some of the key differences in the types of international work undertaken by academic staff at LTU, paying particular attention to disciplinary differences given the likely significance of discipline to international engagement referenced in earlier studies (Agnew, 2013; Clifford, 2009).

4.3.1. International dimensions

Based on an analysis of interview data, it is immediately clear that LTU participants have some level of international involvement with all aspects of their work, be that in research, teaching, outreach or service. As such, the spread of international engagement across the various international dimensions of their work is broad. Beyond their current work, LTU participants are also aware of, or indeed aspire to be involved in, a range of other dimensions or activities, highlighting a knowledge or understanding of international engagement beyond their direct experience.

However, in terms of their current engagement with the international dimensions of their work, LTU participants appear to be more readily engaged with the international aspects of their research than with their teaching or other activities. In this regard, all LTU participants have attended an international conference in relation to their research, and a majority of them undertake international research collaboration, have published their research overseas (either as a single author or jointly with international authors), and are involved with hosting visiting international academics and supervising international research students. By contrast, LTU participants appear to be less frequently involved with the international dimensions of teaching, with the particular focus of this engagement centring on the internationalisation of the curriculum, the teaching of international students and the oversight of outbound student mobility.
Similarly, they have lower levels of engagement still with the international dimensions of outreach and service.

Of importance to this study, disciplinary differences are evident in the types of international activities in which LTU participants engage. Whilst Business and Science participants appear to have similar levels of overall engagement with the international dimensions of their work, Science participants are predominantly involved with the international aspects of their research (as foreshadowed at section 4.2.2). Business participants, on the other hand, appear to give more equal weight to international engagement in their teaching and research. In this way, certain international dimensions appear to be fairly distinctive based on these disciplinary groupings. Five of the eight Business participants, for example, have been directly involved with transnational education (compared to only one Science participant) and only Business participants have been involved with running outbound study tours for students or in seeking international accreditation for their courses. Exclusive to Science participants, meanwhile, are involvement in the recruitment of overseas academics, as well as earlier experiences of international academic migration, where they have spent periods of time working at universities abroad. As highlighted at section 4.2.3, whilst four out of eight Business participants have lived overseas at some point, none of them undertook their highest qualification outside Australia and none of them has subsequently worked overseas.

A further disciplinary difference is noticeable in the geographic distribution of international activities for LTU participants. Whilst mainland Europe (excluding the United Kingdom) and North America are the most common sites of international engagement for LTU participants collectively (across all of the international dimensions of their work), Science participants appear to be significantly more engaged with North America than their Business counterparts. Possible rationales for these geographic differences in international engagement between the two discipline groups are explored in greater detail at section 4.4.2.

In summary, in relation to different types and sites of international engagement, LTU participants are more likely to be involved internationally in their research than in other aspects of their work. This is particularly the case in Science, where a proportion of the
participants are employed in ‘research only’ positions. Business participants show a more balanced pattern of engagement with the international dimensions of their teaching and research. These are important contextual factors for this study, as it is proposed that the nature and focus of the work undertaken by academic staff inform the factors which influence that work. The following section explores this proposal in more detail through an analysis of four key themes identified in the data.

4.4. Influencing factors

LTU participants are influenced in some way (either positively or negatively) by a range of personal, disciplinary and institutional factors, as well as by external factors beyond the institution. The intersections between these influencing factors appear to be significant and complex, as witnessed by the following vignette, which outlines the experiences of Sandra and Larry. Sandra is a Level C academic in Science at LTU, whilst Larry holds a Level B position in Business. Both Sandra and Larry are in ‘teaching and research’ positions.

As teaching and research academics, Sandra and Larry are both involved with a range of international activities across the different aspects of their work at LTU. They each consider their discipline to be fundamentally international in scope and are engaged in research collaboration with academics outside Australia, which has led to joint publications. Similarly, they have both attended international conferences in their field and have hosted visiting international academics in their local department. Sandra does this in order to keep abreast of new developments in her field and to gain access to expertise and resources. Larry, on the other hand, is particularly alert to the recent major academic restructure at LTU, which has highlighted for him the importance of research output to his job security.

Larry is more involved with the international dimensions of his teaching than Sandra. This is partially in response to the nature of his Business sub-discipline, where he has been closely involved in securing international accreditation for the courses in his department. However, it also stems from his own interests in relation to transnational education, where he is closely involved with a multinational team of staff in a development project in South Asia. Sandra herself has not taught
outside Australia, but she has recently been discussing transnational education in
detail with her Science colleagues. She has a course coordination role in her
department and she and her colleagues have been preparing to start delivery of
some of their courses in South East Asia.

Whilst Sandra and Larry were born and educated in Australia, they have both
travelled and lived overseas at different points in their life. Sandra undertook a
postdoctoral placement with a leading scientist in the UK following her PhD and
continues to collaborate with this academic in her research, although he is now
located in Asia. By virtue of this research connection, she has been invited to serve
in an internal advisory capacity in relation to LTU’s engagement with Asia.
Similarly, being a little more advanced in her career in academia than Larry,
Sandra has also recently been invited to assist in the organisation of an
international conference in her discipline. Larry, on the other hand, spent a couple
of years backpacking around the world when he was younger and then worked
overseas for short periods prior to entering academia. Larry’s passion for travel
underpins his engagement with transnational education, and has shaped his
commitment to facilitating short-term outbound mobility for his students, where
he has organised student field trips in both South East Asia and Europe.

The experiences of Sandra and Larry are indicative of the complex nature of the
international engagement of LTU participants more broadly, both in terms of the
variations in the international dimensions of their work and the different sets of
influences at play. Both the institutional climate at LTU (following a major restructure)
and the particular disciplinary affiliations of Sandra and Larry appear to be important
contextual factors. Similarly, the prior international experiences that Sandra and Larry
have gained, either within or outside academia, appear to shape their understanding of
the world and, by extension, their particular approach to the international dimensions of
their work. These and other findings are discussed in more detail in this section through
an analysis of a number of principal themes arising from the data.
4.4.1. Perceptions of academic success and desire for career advancement

A dominant theme emerging from the data relates to academic success and career advancement, with LTU participants frequently stating that their involvement with the international dimensions of their work is principally driven by a desire for success in their academic work (by way of increased research productivity, for example), or is undertaken with an eye to future promotion or to more permanent employment as an academic. For many participants, this sense of international engagement for academic success is underpinned by the belief that their discipline is fundamentally international and that international engagement is a common expectation amongst their disciplinary colleagues. Typical of this point of view is Carol, who draws a parallel between the building of international academic networks and research productivity:

If my research was going to progress and I was going to be able to get a track record that was going to enable me to move the field forward and to get grants et cetera et cetera, I needed to connect in with international areas. (Carol, Level E, Teaching & Research, Science, LTU)

Carol recognises that she cannot advance her career without international collaboration, as the leading thinkers in her discipline are located outside Australia. Carol’s view is shared by many of the Science participants, who appear to have greater involvement in the international dimensions of their research than their Business counterparts and, as a result, are more likely to attend international conferences, be involved in international research collaboration, host visiting academics and publish their work internationally.

Bearing in mind the caveat regarding the potential bias of the LTU sample towards research (outlined at section 4.2.2), Science participants also seem to be more alert to the growing influence of research metrics as a performance measure for academic work, and this appears to shape their thinking in relation to international collaboration and publication in international journals. Catherine, for example, speaks of the influence of journal rankings, which have discouraged her from publishing her work in Australian journals:
We are driven by metrics unfortunately, and that means that probably one’s highest impact work does not go looking for that (Australian) journal first.
(Catherine, Level B, Teaching & Research, Science, LTU)

In parallel to this conscious pursuit of greater outputs in relation to their research, a number of LTU participants are of the opinion that their particular discipline is inherently international in nature, and that this itself leads to a set of local and departmental understandings, and indeed expectations, about the international nature of research in that discipline. This aligns with the findings of earlier studies which have shown that academic staff in hard pure disciplines (such as Science) consider their disciplines to be inherently international in focus (Agnew, 2013). Accordingly, this view is most frequently held by Science participants at LTU, such as Dorothy who believes that research cannot be conducted within the borders of a single country:

I think science is global. Whatever you teach and whatever research you do, you’re always reading in a very, very wide sphere, so it would make no sense whatsoever for research to be narrowed to a focus on anything Australian.
(Dorothy, Level E, Research only, Science, LTU)

However, some Business academics are also influenced by the supposedly international nature of their discipline. Indicative of these views, for example, is Frank who has a clear sense of expectation that he should be internationally oriented in his work:

When I talk with colleagues, we know that we work in an international world now. Two of the three major conferences are outside Australia, so we’re expected to go to those conferences and to mix with people from overseas. (Frank, Level B, Teaching & Research, Business, LTU)

Julie, on the other hand, is sensitive to the changing nature of the external profession related to her discipline (management accounting) and indicates that the decline of the manufacturing industry in Australia has pushed her to look overseas for new research sites and collaborators. As such, whether they view their discipline as inherently international or becoming international in response to external drivers, Business
academics at LTU frequently state that their work is inherently international by virtue of its disciplinary foundation.

Earlier case studies have shown that the nature of the individual disciplines is a key determinant in shaping academic engagement with internationalisation (Agnew, 2013; Clifford, 2009). Indeed, Agnew (2013, p. 190) puts forward a classification of how different categories of discipline understand internationalisation. In this context, she proposes that pure disciplines (such as Science) perceive themselves to be borderless and inherently international, whilst soft disciplines (including Business) give more credence to the relevance of local culture. The findings of this study appear to contradict this classification in some ways, for example by indicating that academics from both pure hard and soft applied fields consider their disciplines to be fundamentally international. Furthermore, not every facet of the pure disciplines appears to be inherently international, with one LTU Science participant claiming that her particular branch of chemistry (focused on the fabrication of molecules for use by other scientists) offered little or no opportunity for international exposure. As such, this study suggests that a simple classification of the disciplines in relation to their international exposure (as per Becher (1989) and Agnew (2013)) might not provide a sufficient explanation of the complexity at play.

Expectations about what is required to become a successful academic also appear to be strong amongst the sample of scientists at LTU, many of whom have worked outside Australia for a period of six months or more at the outset of their academic career. In describing their rationales for this temporary academic migration overseas, Science participants frequently make reference to a set of unwritten expectations within their discipline, as well as to the active support and encouragement of their PhD supervisor or other academic mentors. Typical of these views is Joshua who “did the typical thing” after his PhD in Australia and took a postdoctoral fellowship in Europe for three years before working in North America for over four years. For Joshua, the eight years he spent working overseas have served as a necessary foundation for his academic career:

> Most people then within microbiology, the feeling was, if you want to be competitive for an academic job, you have to have international experience.  
> (Joshua, Level D, Teaching & Research, Science, LTU)
Steven also speaks of similar disciplinary expectations, although his own postdoctoral fellowship was cut short due to ill health:

In a physicist’s life, usually one does ones PhD in the country where you’re a citizen and then you do postdoctoral fellowships overseas and that’s when your career really takes off. (Steven, Level B, Teaching & Research, Science, LTU)

Whilst several of the Science participants have worked in academic roles overseas at some point in their career, none of the Business participants at LTU has done so. Furthermore, none of the Business participants makes any mention of being influenced in their work by the presence of international academics in their local department, whilst this is often the case for Science participants who speak frequently about the presence of visiting or permanent colleagues from overseas in their laboratories or local departments. Indicative of these views is Tony, who has actively sought to encourage the presence of international academics in his department and views this activity as beneficial to the local research environment:

Having that stream of international visitors is really healthy for a department. It’s really healthy if there can be research fellows from other places. (Tony, Level E, Research only, Science, LTU)

These findings suggest that Science academics are both more likely to be mobile themselves and to encounter the international mobility of other academics in their work. It is not clear to what extent this increased exposure to the world shapes the way Science academics approach their work, although there is some evidence that Science participants prefer opportunities for face-to-face collaboration and are keen to build and maintain their academic networks. In reflecting on their observations of other academic staff in their local area, Science participants in the earlier stages of their career also indicate that they have sought to model their own work accordingly. As such, the patterns of mobility of more senior academic staff may serve as a template for the choices made by more junior academics about their work.

It is certainly clear that disciplinary classification (as per Becher (1989) and Agnew (2013)) appears to be a distinctive marker in this instance. Where Science participants
(from pure hard disciplines) have undertaken international work experiences in order to further their career, Business participants (from soft applied disciplines) have not. Indeed, when discussing their own career advancement, Business participants are more likely to view this through the lens of their teaching practice, for example, through running outbound study tours for students. This correlates with their greater involvement with the international dimensions of teaching (as discussed at section 4.3.1).

For some LTU participants, another important factor influencing the international dimensions of their work appears to be their stage in the academic career cycle, and it is reasonable to conclude that this too is related to career advancement. Compared to their colleagues, participants at Level D (Associate Professor or Principal Research Fellow) appear to have a wider range of international engagement in their work than both their more junior colleagues and the Professors and Professorial Fellows (at Level E). As a case in point, Joshua (a Level D academic in Science) perceives that his international work stands him in good stead for building his reputation ahead of his application for promotion to Level E. Although Joshua’s foundational motivation for being internationally engaged earlier in his career related more to his passion for travel than it did to future promotion, he now recognises that his international reputation is important. Rebecca (a level D academic in Business) has a similar perspective:

To be advanced in your career, to be promoted, you need to show that you’ve got an international profile, and it’s only by doing those things and meeting those people and being involved that you can gain that. (Rebecca, Level D, Teaching & Research, Business, LTU)

As mentioned at section 4.1.3, LTU’s policy framework in relation to academic promotion makes specific reference to international recognition in research/scholarship and/or teaching and supervision for promotion to Level E (Professor, Professorial Fellow). However, fewer references are made to the international dimensions of academic work for promotion between other levels in the scale. It is perhaps the case that LTU academic staff at Level D are more aware of this policy framework (than others) and that this exerts some influence on them in relation to their work. However, as highlighted by Joshua’s comments (above), this focus on career advancement (by way of the international dimensions of academic work) may well be localized at Level D, with
earlier international engagement driven by other influencing factors. As such, these findings do not immediately lend support to the various suites of recommendations which have been proposed regarding the importance of academic employment practices to the internationalisation of academic staff (Helms, 2012, 2015; Helms & Asfaw, 2013a).

4.4.2. Geographic isolation and the tyranny of distance

The second clear theme emerging from the data relates to Australia’s distance from the rest of the world and the major influence which this has on LTU academic staff in terms of their international engagement. A sense of physical distance and intellectual isolation from other countries is cited by the majority of participants as both a potential barrier to, and driver of, the international connections in their work. Typical of these responses is the view of James:

I think in Australia, it’s very easy for somebody to vanish completely off the international radar if you’re not actively making a point not to do that. (James, Level C, Teaching & Research, Science, LTU)

This perception of distance from other major centres of academia (for example, in North America and in Europe) raises particular challenges for academics in relation to both time and money. Many participants relate distance to cost (in terms of both dollars and days and hours spent travelling) and are alert to the additional impost for Australian academics of having to secure access to sufficient travel funding. Steven, for example, reflects on the high cost for Australian academics of collaborating with the northern hemisphere and the fundamentally different nature of international research collaboration in Europe:

The airfares are too expensive to go to the northern hemisphere. It takes a long time. It’s a pain. It takes you away from your family. When I was in Europe, you’d get on a plane to France and come back the same day, if you really wanted to. (Steven, Level B, Teaching & Research, Science, LTU)

North America, Europe and the United Kingdom are certainly the most popular sites of international engagement for LTU participants, although geographic differences emerge in relation to discipline. Whilst Science participants have often worked in Europe or the
United Kingdom on a postdoctoral fellowship at an earlier stage in their career, they appear to look to North America for their current collaborations in research (possibly drawn by more ready access to North American funding to support their research). Business participants, on the other hand, appear to shun North American paradigms in relation to their discipline (which favour quantitative approaches to research), preferring instead to attend conferences and collaborate with colleagues in the United Kingdom and Europe (where qualitative approaches are more common, as they are in Australia).

Come what may, given the small size of the academic community in Australia compared to other countries, Melissa highlights the importance which she places on international conference attendance in order to be at the cutting edge of her field:

> You can learn by going to conferences in Australia, but once you get more specialised, I think you generally need to go overseas to get that more specialised conference, where there’ll be experts in exactly what you’re working on rather than just broadly. (Melissa, Level A, Research only, Science, LTU)

Steven, on the other hand, views his attendance at international conferences from the perspective of efficiency, as he is of the opinion that he can keep abreast of developments in his discipline more effectively in this way:

> A cup of coffee at a conference can be worth two or three days trawling through journal articles. (Steven, Level B, Teaching & Research, Science, LTU)

For him, face-to-face communication is important for advancing his research:

> You can find out what the latest research is by reading papers, so what is it about the conference that’s different? Partly it’s just easier to understand stuff when someone’s telling you about it. (Steven, Level B, Teaching & Research, Science, LTU)

Similarly, Joshua makes a connection between Australia’s distance from the rest of the world and the importance of face-to-face collaboration for his work:
You can email back and forth or talk on the phone, but it’s not the same as just being somewhere with people. And, it’s always that harder one, with Australia, is getting people to come here. They always think it’s the end of the earth. (Joshua, Level D, Teaching & Research, Science, LTU)

It appears that this sense of distance and geographic isolation is felt more keenly by Science participants than by their Business counterparts. It may be that these participants are more able to make direct comparisons between the situation in Australia and in other countries by virtue of their earlier professional experiences overseas (outlined at section 4.4.1). Given that a number of Science participants have worked overseas at an earlier stage in their career, this may have shaped their views on what some describe as a more fluid academic environment in other countries, where it is both easy to visit other institutions abroad and where seminars by visiting academics are more frequently held in the local department. In reflecting on their current departments at LTU, certain of the participants bemoan the fact that they host so few visiting academics, let alone the fact that their own international travel is both expensive and time-consuming.

This finding highlights the importance of contextual factors in influencing the international dimensions of academic work. With most prior research in this area conducted in North America, no reference has been made to distance as a driver or barrier to the international engagement of academic staff in the literature. However, distance and perceptions of academic isolation appear to be key factors influencing LTU academic staff, despite them being in an English-speaking country with strong historical and cultural connections to Europe and the Anglophone world more broadly.

4.4.3. Understandings of international engagement vary by type of work

A third theme emerging from the data relates to the different views of international engagement held by LTU academic staff and the extent to which they consider international activities to be part of their academic roles. In certain regards, it seems clear that international dimensions or activities are firmly embedded in academic understandings about their work. This is particularly the case in research, for example, where a number of LTU participants reflect on the inherently global nature of the
literature in their field and voice their strong belief that academic work has to be conducted across borders in order to be relevant. Typical of these views is Frank:

Of course, the other thing that is international about research is that the literature itself is by definition international. (Frank, Level B, Teaching & Research, Business, LTU)

Nevertheless, in other areas of academic work, it does not appear that international dimensions are as deeply embedded. In their teaching, for example, a number of LTU participants indicate that they are involved with the internationalisation of the curriculum, sometimes for disciplinary purposes and sometimes in relation to the development of graduate attributes such as global citizenship. However, it appears that the key factors influencing this international involvement with the curriculum are the university’s strategy (be it the international strategy or the teaching and learning strategy) and, to a lesser extent, expectations within their discipline. Rebecca highlights these two influences when she reflects on her earlier career:

When I first became an academic, there was very much a focus on internationalisation of the curriculum and so I was very much thinking that we had to move away from this Americanisation of our work. Our textbooks were often a lot of American examples. We really were provided with opportunities to think about bringing in a lot more wider views of what was happening in the world. (Rebecca, Level D, Teaching & Research, Business, LTU)

Nevertheless, for Rebecca and other Business participants, the internationalisation of the curriculum appears to be a less prevalent international dimension of their work than, for example, the teaching of international students or their involvement with transnational education. In both of these latter cases, Business participants do not appear to be directly influenced by their institution’s strategy. Science participants, on the other hand, who are comparatively less involved with the international dimensions of teaching (as discussed at section 4.3.1), indicate that they are particularly influenced by their institution’s strategy when it comes to the presence of international students in their classrooms or opportunities to teach their courses overseas. Although reasons for these differences may be varied, this finding suggests that Business academics now see the
teaching of international students (in Australia or overseas) as an intrinsic component of their work, rather than as an additional activity which is driven by their university. In this regard, a number of Business participants have undertaken some form of professional development in relation to the international dimensions of their teaching, whilst none of the Science participants make any mention of such training or development.

In light of these disciplinary differences, it is reasonable to conclude that the international dimensions of teaching are not yet seen as an intrinsic aspect of academic work across the board, with LTU academic staff drawing instead on institutional guidance (by way of strategic or policy frameworks) to frame this aspect of their work. However, access to relevant professional development by certain participants possibly highlights their growing acceptance of these activities as part of their work. This chimes with the findings of Ray and Solem (2009, pp. 115–116) who concluded that “professional development can play a significant role in the success of campus internationalization by providing faculty with the resources and support they need to collaborate internationally and incorporate global learning outcomes into (their) curricula”.

Another key variable in how LTU academic staff understand international engagement in relation to their work is found in their level of exposure to leadership roles. It is unsurprising that LTU participants who have leadership roles, either within their local department or in respect of the broader faculty or college, are generally more alert to the institution’s strategic agenda. Similarly, where those leadership roles focus specifically on international activities, there appears to be a close correlation between these leadership roles, the university’s international strategy and the factors influencing those LTU academic staff to engage internationally. Carol, for example, is in a leadership position and reflects on the growing number of international leadership roles at LTU and the increasing importance given to international engagement by her institution:

We’re encouraged to do more engagement. We have KPIs around international engagement. We have roles that are actually named ‘international’ which again ten years ago we didn’t have. (Carol, Level E, Teaching & Research, Science, LTU)
Other LTU participants in academic leadership roles (with or without a dedicated focus on international matters) appear to be alert to a broader range of potential international dimensions to their work than other participants. These include service and outreach activities, such as international student recruitment, where direct involvement is otherwise uncommon amongst LTU participants. Indeed, as shown in the literature, leadership roles appear to be a pathway for some academic staff to gain exposure to new perspectives on the international dimensions of their work (Hill & Helms, 2013; Middlehurst, 2008). Although she has never taught overseas, Sandra, for example, has been heavily involved in discussions with colleagues in her department about the delivery of their Science courses in South East Asia. Were it not for her course coordination role locally, she is unlikely to have had the same level of exposure to these discussions and to this opportunity to engage with transnational education.

Whilst only a small number of participants were exposed to a wider scope of international engagement by way of leadership positions, most LTU participants were aware of, or alert to, other possible international dimensions to their work beyond their current activities. This level of ‘awareness’ provides an indication of how LTU participants understand the range of potential international activities available to them, as well as how they perceive the likely development of their international engagement into the future. Indeed, in many cases, awareness aligned with aspiration and LTU participants spoke in different ways about how the international dimensions of their work might contribute to their career development. Typical of these views is Frank, who has developed (in conjunction with his supervisor and mentor) a clear plan to boost his academic reputation via research collaboration with North America:

You have to imagine what the future might be before you go and create it, so there’s many hurdles to cross before we get to that, but in an ideal world, three to four years from now, I’ll be writing with these North Americans. (Frank, Level B, Teaching & Research, Business, LTU)

This analysis of LTU academic staff ‘awareness’ provides further insights into how academics conceptualise the international dimensions of their work, as well as what they consider to be important and how they are influenced to make choices in this regard. As such, LTU participants sometimes become aware of other possible international
dimensions of their work through discussions with their colleagues. In other cases, however, it stems from (casual) observation of their colleagues at work or seemingly inherent understandings of what academics in their discipline do. LTU participants commonly aspire to greater involvement with international research collaboration or additional opportunities to attend international conferences. In relation to teaching, they are also alert to opportunities for involvement with outbound student mobility and transnational education. As mentioned earlier in this section, the proposed introduction of a new transnational program in South East Asia has, for example, led Science participants to be involved in various discussions with their colleagues on this topic, when they have not previously had any involvement with transnational teaching.

Despite more limited direct involvement with the international dimensions of their outreach and service activities, LTU participants are alert to the efforts of their institution to recruit international students, as well as to the definitional dilemmas of just what the international dimensions of outreach and service might be in the context of their work. In this vein, the most common topic for discussion amongst LTU participants relates to problems or issues with international students. These particular discussions focus on the academic preparation of international students for study in Australia, their English language skills or general integration into classes and the life of the university. In many cases, LTU participants confirm that they have not encountered these problems directly, rather that they form part of a broader discourse within their department. Perhaps unsurprisingly, this topic of discussion is particularly common amongst Business participants, who have greater involvement with international activities in teaching than their counterparts in Science.

These findings suggest that understandings about the international dimensions of academic work vary according to level of seniority (including exposure to leadership roles), as well as the aspect of academic work in question, be it in research, teaching, or service and outreach. Given the variety of work roles which academic staff can draw on, this adds significant layers of complexity to the range of factors which might influence academic staff in their choices about their work. Earlier research has shown that academic staff may have little shared understanding of what ‘internationalisation’ is (Friesen, 2013; Schoorman, 1999) and this too may affect how they conceptualise
international engagement in relation to their work. As such, whilst certain international dimensions or activities appear to be firmly embedded in academic understandings about their work, others are not.

### 4.4.4. Personal values inform individual choices

A further theme emerging from this study relates to the significance of personal factors in shaping how LTU academic staff make decisions about international engagement in their work. This is a common theme in the literature, which has shown that cosmopolitan attitudes and prior personal and professional experiences in an international context have an important influence on the international dimensions of academic work (Bond et al., 2003; Lemke, 2012; Sanderson, 2008; Schwietz, 2006; Willis & Taylor, 2014). Amongst LTU participants, prior international experience and a general interest in the world and world affairs are frequently cited as factors which have influenced LTU academic staff to engage with the international elements of their work. Laura, for example, draws a parallel between international experience and a global perspective, highlighting the importance of one to the development of the other:

> I do think international experience and background ... personal experience are important. Who has that global perspective? I think people who’ve been exposed to the global perspective ... People who don’t are perhaps people who’ve had less exposure, are less motivated. (Laura, Level E, Teaching & Research, Business, LTU)

In a similar vein, other participants comment on the transformative nature of their prior international experience. Steven, for example, reflects on the three years he spent in the United Kingdom as a teenager:

> The culture shock of going to such a different environment made me realise how different life can be. You don’t even have any clues what’s happening in another culture until you get there. (Steven, Level B, Teaching & Research, Science, LTU)

Rebecca, on the other hand, has a broad general interest in the world which has influenced her decisions in relation to the curriculum and her work:
I tended to see myself as part of an international community, and the curriculum was international. I developed it, very much thinking about [the discipline] not just from a Western perspective, but from an Asian or a European perspective.

(Rebecca, Level D, Teaching & Research, Business, LTU)

As shown at section 4.4.1, none of the Business participants at LTU have worked in academic roles overseas, whilst a number of Science participants have done so. As such, a disciplinary difference is evident in the way in which LTU participants have gained their prior international experience. Science participants have generally done so in relation to their professional work in academia, whilst Business participants have done so in their personal life or, in some cases, in their earlier career outside of academia. Joshua (in Science) is one of just two LTU participants who has lived overseas as a child and subsequently worked as an academic overseas. With a significant interest in the world outside Australia, as well as the multicultural nature of LTU’s campus community and the broader society in Melbourne, Joshua ascribes his interest in discovering the world to his overseas experience as a child, as well as to the fact that he grew up in a rural area and needed to move to the city to go to university in the first place:

One thing I find surprising is that there still seem to be some people in Australia who are afraid of (the international world). When I went to university, I was seventeen and I had to go and leave to go to Sydney to go to university. (Joshua, Level D, Teaching & Research, Science, LTU)

Since that time, Joshua has travelled extensively for his work and for pleasure including two postdoctoral placements outside Australia. From a different perspective, Julie (in Business) feels predisposed to international engagement in her work by virtue of her personal background, having been born in China and spent the first 23 years of her life there prior to migrating to Australia. However, she does not feel that her Chinese heritage is the principal factor influencing her decisions about the international dimensions of her work.

Interestingly, regardless of whether LTU participants were born overseas or have lived or worked overseas at some point, the scope of their international engagement does not appear to be vastly different to those participants without this personal experience of life
abroad. As such, although participants with experience of living overseas might be predisposed to greater international engagement, the findings of this study indicate that this does not necessarily translate into action. That being said, participants with an experience of living abroad are more likely to be involved with the internationalisation of the curriculum and with facilitating outbound mobility for their students, and it is reasonable to assume that their earlier personal experiences have contributed to this involvement in some way.

These findings are broadly similar to earlier studies which have shown that personal values and dispositions play a significant role in shaping the international dimensions of academic work (De Haan, 2014; Finkelstein et al., 2013; Sanderson, 2008). However, it is not clear from the current study that time spent abroad is as significant a factor. Unlike Finkelstein et al. (2013) and Bond et al. (2003), who claim that time spent abroad is a key predictor of whether academic staff will be involved with the international dimensions of their work, this study appears to suggest that participants who have lived overseas have similar levels of international engagement as those who haven’t.

4.5. Summary

This chapter has investigated the various international dimensions of academic work at the first case study institution and has sought to identify key themes from the data in relation to the factors which influence the international engagement of LTU academic staff. Whilst document analysis points to an institutional context which is broadly supportive and encouraging of the international dimensions of academic work at LTU in both research and teaching, there is some evidence that the institutional focus is currently shifting towards research. Amongst LTU participants, there was a heightened sensibility to institutional context during the period of this study given the recent academic restructure.

Analysis of LTU interview data certainly illustrates the predominance of international engagement in research, with a more limited focus on teaching and a smaller focus still on both outreach and service. The four key themes outlined in this chapter then suggest that LTU participants are influenced in some way (either positively or negatively) by a range of personal, disciplinary and institutional factors, let alone by factors beyond the
institution, such as Australia’s geographic isolation. As demonstrated in section 4.4, the intersections between these influencing factors are significant and complex. As such, whilst personal values and prior international experience might pre-dispose LTU academic staff to engage internationally in their work, their career stage and the particular focus of their work are likely to shape their understanding about what the international dimensions of that work might be. In parallel, LTU participants are alert to how the international dimensions of their work might contribute to their success as an academic and are influenced by disciplinary norms in this regard. However, they rely on both disciplinary understandings and institutional frameworks to frame career advancement opportunities and to gauge what contribution their international engagement might make to their future promotion.

Regardless of the more progressive institutional mission of LTU and its policy commitments to teaching and learning and comprehensive internationalisation, these findings show that LTU academic staff give precedence to the international dimensions of research in their work. There appears to be a strong correlation between the international dimensions of research and academic understandings of career advancement. However, LTU academic staff are influenced by a complex set of institutional and disciplinary factors, as well as by their personal experience and a number of external factors beyond the institution. Despite the predominance of research in their international engagement, LTU academic staff are also involved with a variety of different international dimensions in their teaching, outreach and service.

The following chapter presents an analysis of the main findings from the second of the two case study institutions, which represents a group of older research intensive universities.
Chapter 5  INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENT – UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE

The preceding chapter presented a summary of the main findings from La Trobe University, one of the two case study institutions chosen for this study. In a similar way, this chapter presents a summary of the principal findings for the second case study institution, the University of Melbourne (UoM). It begins by outlining the institutional context for the international dimensions of academic work at UoM and then presents a range of additional information relating to the sample of UoM academic staff who were interviewed for the study.

Drawing on document analysis, this chapter illustrates that the institutional context at UoM is predominantly focused on research and UoM appears principally to frame the international dimensions of academic work in that light. Although academic staff at UoM are involved with a wide range of international dimensions of their work, research is central to the international engagement of all UoM participants (hereinafter “UoM academic staff”). Discussion of three key themes arising from the data suggests that UoM academic staff are influenced by a complex set of institutional, disciplinary, personal and external factors.

5.1. Institutional background

As described in Chapter 3, the University of Melbourne (UoM) is a comprehensive research university in metropolitan Melbourne with among the largest cohorts of both students and teaching and research staff in Australia. In light of the homogeneity evident in the Australian university sector (described at section 3.2.3), UoM can be seen to represent a group of older research intensive institutions.

In relation to its international profile, UoM is similar to other Australian universities in its enrolment of a substantial cohort of international students. 16,159 of the university’s 55,596 students in 2014 were international, that is 29.1% of all students, a higher proportion than the average of 22.4% across the Australian universities. All but 19 of these students were enrolled onshore, as UoM has extremely limited transnational...
(offshore) delivery of its courses. According to a cross-national analysis prepared in 2013, this has led to UoM enrolling the largest single cohort of on-campus international students of any university in the world (Choudaha, 2015), a point which is elaborated further in the consideration of internationalisation at section 5.1.2.

An analysis of bibliometric data at the time of the study illustrates the strongly international focus of research at UoM, with 44.6% of all UoM publications between 2011 and 2015 co-authored with an institution in another country, and 24.7% of UoM publications in the top 10% most cited worldwide (Scopus data up to 30 May 2016 drawn from www.scival.com, © 2016 Elsevier B.V.). Amongst other criteria, the research performance of UoM has led the institution to feature in a range of international rankings of universities. UoM has been listed in each of the principal international rankings since they were established, and is currently listed 33rd in the Times Higher Education (THE) World University Ranking 2015-2016 and 40th in the 2016 Academic Ranking of World Universities prepared in Shanghai.

Beyond this simple outline of the international context for academic work at UoM, a more nuanced picture emerges through analysis of a range of institutional plans and other documents, including UoM’s strategic plan, its research and engagement plans, annual reports, relevant university policies and recent media releases. Analysis of these documents in the next section sets the context for how UoM approaches internationalisation at the institutional level and provides an indication of the relative importance of international activities and engagement to the institution’s forward-planning and formal reporting. This analysis also outlines the ways in which the university frames and supports the international dimensions of the work undertaken by its academic staff.

5.1.1. Strategic planning framework

An analysis of the strategic planning framework at UoM indicates that there is a predominant focus on research in the way that the institution describes its international activities and engagement.

---

23 Data drawn from Selected Higher Education Statistics – 2014 Student Data, Table 7.5: Commencing and All Overseas Students by State, Higher Education Institution and Onshore/Offshore Status, Full Year 2014 (Australian Government, 2015).
UoM publishes few formal planning documents beyond its five-year strategic plan. However, during the period of this study, this plan has been renewed, thereby facilitating a comparison between the 2011-2014 and 2015-2020 documents (“The University of Melbourne Strategic Plan 2015-2020: Growing Esteem,” 2015; “The University Plan 2011-2014,” 2011). Of possible relevance to this study, this comparison suggests a shift in emphasis between the two plans, with two references to internationalisation in the earlier university plan (“The University Plan 2011-2014,” 2011, p. 11), but none in the current strategic plan. Nevertheless, regardless of whether ‘internationalisation’ is directly mentioned itself, both plans contain multiple references to international activities, particularly around international collaboration and research, UoM’s status as a global institution, institutional ranking and reputation, and the enrolment of international students. In the current strategic plan, greater emphasis appears to have been placed on the international aspects of research and collaboration (“The University of Melbourne Strategic Plan 2015-2020: Growing Esteem,” 2015, pp. 17-21), with a reduced emphasis on ranking and reputation and fewer references to international students. This is reinforced in the recently-produced short printed summary of the current strategic plan, which lists key focus areas for the 2015-2020 period. In this list, the only references to international matters are in relation to UoM’s international research profile and impact, the scale and impact of its international collaborations and its ability to attract quality international graduate researchers (“Growing Esteem 2015-2010: Shared Journey, Shared Vision,” 2016).

Despite possible shifts in focus between UoM’s two most recent strategic plans, reference to international matters is given similar weight in the annual reports published between 2013 and 2015, reflecting UoM’s activities and operations from 2012 to 2014 (“The University of Melbourne 2012 Annual Report,” 2013; “The University of Melbourne Annual Report 2013,” 2014; “The University of Melbourne Annual Report 2014,” 2015). As with the planning documents, international references are embedded throughout each of these annual reports, with very few references to ‘internationalisation’ itself. However, based on an analysis of keyword counts, UoM’s most recent annual report for 2015 (published in 2016) appears to make less frequent reference to the international aspects of the university’s activities, possibly reflecting a reduced focus on international matters within the newly-crafted strategic plan launched in 2015 (“Building on Strength: The
University of Melbourne Annual Report 2015,” 2016). Yet, in its public positioning in 2014 and 2015, UoM appears to dedicate a similar volume of coverage to the international aspects of its activities in each year. An analysis of formal media releases for the two years indicates that 20.2% of media releases in 2014 referred to international activities of some sort, whilst this figure rose to 21.1% in 2015. As with UoM’s planning documents, the principal foci of this media coverage relate to international research collaboration and the global reputation and ranking of the institution, as well as international recognition for academic staff.

Other than its strategic plan, UoM’s principal planning document appears to be a long-term plan for research (“Research at Melbourne: Ensuring excellence and impact to 2025,” 2012). Focused on achievements through until 2025, this research plan makes a number of references to international partnerships and collaboration, as well as to the international reputation of UoM and to the international experience which it offers to its graduate research students. In order to achieve UoM’s aspirations for 2025, the plan includes goals in relation to the recruitment and retention of the best academic staff from around the world, and the development and/or continued support of international research collaborations with regions of strategic importance, including Europe, North America, China, India and Latin America (“Research at Melbourne: Ensuring excellence and impact to 2025,” 2012, pp. 17–19). Tied to the research plan, an International Research & Research Training Fund is available to facilitate research collaboration with Brazil, Chile, China, Germany and India, as well as to attract graduate and postdoctoral researchers from those countries (The University of Melbourne, 2014).

In relation to other areas of institutional strategy, UoM published an engagement plan tied to its strategic plan during the course of this study (“Engagement at Melbourne 2015-2020,” 2015). Although this plan makes reference to the global environment in which UoM operates and to the global engagement of the university community, the majority of the targets contained within the plan relate to domestic activities and the relevance of UoM to local and national communities. In terms of teaching and learning (the other major strand of university activity in UoM’s ‘triple helix’ of research, teaching and engagement), UoM has not published a formal Learning and Teaching Plan since

2010, with the university’s key objectives in this area incorporated into its strategic plan. As highlighted above, UoM’s current strategic plan makes more frequent references to the international aspects of research than it does to engagement or teaching and learning. However, the strategic plan does include targets (actions) in relation to expanded opportunities for students to gain an international mobility experience (“The University of Melbourne Strategic Plan 2015-2020: Growing Esteem,” 2015, p. 16). No direct reference is made in this plan to the international nature of the curriculum or to specific international or global attributes which UoM might expect of its graduates. However, guidance on these topics is available through UoM’s statement of teaching and learning principles, which encourages the need to foster an international and culturally diverse learning environment (Farrell, Devlin, & James, 2007, p. 9), as well as through a statement of graduate attributes, which indicates that graduates will engage with global issues, develop a broad outlook and be attuned to cultural diversity (“Melbourne graduates,” 2015).

This analysis of the strategic planning framework points to the centrality of research to the international activities and engagement of UoM. This focus is particularly aligned with UoM’s international reputation and ranking, which are closely tied to its attractiveness to staff and students. Although UoM appears to have moved away from using the term ‘internationalisation’ in its public documents, this has not reduced the institution’s focus on the international dimensions of its strategy, with frequent references to international collaboration in research.

5.1.2. Internationalisation at the University of Melbourne

As outlined above, UoM makes little or no reference to internationalisation per se in its strategic planning documents. Whilst the earlier 2011-2014 plan contained a full-page statement on “Internationalisation” detailing UoM’s international vision (“The University Plan 2011-2014,” 2011, p. 11), the current strategic plan makes no mention of internationalisation, but incorporates references throughout the document to the international dimensions of research, teaching and engagement (“The University of Melbourne Strategic Plan 2015-2020: Growing Esteem,” 2015). That being said, the 2015-2020 plan does briefly outline UoM’s aspirations in terms of its ‘international engagement’, with a particular focus on global impact and influence. In this regard, UoM
is currently seeking to increase its international outreach through online learning and the expansion of university partnerships, as well as via the establishment of international joint research centres (“The University of Melbourne Strategic Plan 2015-2020: Growing Esteem,” 2015, pp. 25–26).

Statements by university leaders at UoM frequently focus on the intersection between the institution’s international activities and its research performance, as witnessed by email correspondence to all staff by various members of the university’s executive. As such, certain of the monthly email bulletins from the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Graduate and International Research) have underlined the importance of international graduate research students to Australia’s future academic staffing needs (Strugnell, 2015) and celebrated the fact that half of all commencing research students in Semester 1, 2016 were international (Strugnell, 2016). Recent correspondence to all staff by the Vice-Chancellor contains congratulations on UoM becoming the first Australian university to be ranked in the top 40 universities globally in the Academic Ranking of World Universities (G. Davis, 2016a). A similarly targeted message focuses on the international exchange of scholars and highlights three significant international conferences/meetings being hosted across the institution (G. Davis, 2016b). Perhaps unsurprisingly for a research intensive institution, this focus on research in relation to the international aspects of UoM’s activity is mirrored domestically, with similar messages of congratulations sent to all staff by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) on the announcement of national research funding outcomes (McCluskey, 2015).

What is perhaps more interesting, though, is the fact that very few direct references are made to international students in UoM’s formal planning documents. For an institution with such a large international student population (in both Australian and international terms), this could perhaps suggest that international students are seamlessly integrated into UoM, to the point where there is no longer a need to make separate reference to domestic and international students. Alternatively, it could point to a certain level of discomfort in UoM’s public positioning in relation to the financial and quality implications of large-scale international education. In his public statements on the funding of Australian higher education, Professor Glyn Davis, UoM Vice-Chancellor, has indicated that "(t)he university is completely dependent on international flows, we could
not open the doors without them” (Matchett, 2016). As such, when concerns about the quality of international students in Australian universities were aired on national television, the Vice-Chancellor was quick to mount a public defence of UoM’s academic standards and of its international student community (G. Davis, 2015).

Regardless of the focus of internationalisation at UoM, the institution has appointed a large cadre of senior leadership staff with responsibility for various aspects of internationalisation. Executive responsibility for UoM’s international engagement is held by a Deputy Vice-Chancellor (International), with support from a Pro Vice-Chancellor (International). In addition, an Executive Director, International is responsible for strategic and business development in international education. In addition, two other Pro Vice-Chancellors have formal oversight of international developments in their portfolios, one in relation to research and graduate research, and the other in relation to campus developments. Although UoM appears to have a predominant focus on the international aspects of its research, only one of these five senior executive staff – a Pro Vice-Chancellor (Graduate & International Research) – has direct responsibility in this area.

In summary, whilst UoM’s approach to the international aspects of its mandate are not formalised in a stand-alone written plan or strategy, it appears clear that internationalisation is viewed principally through the lens of the institution’s research and research performance. International reputation and ranking are important to UoM and the institution communicates this in its public messaging. However, with a very large enrolment of international students, international education is obviously important to UoM too, even though this cannot immediately be discerned through UoM’s forward-planning documents or public statements. Before considering the possible influence of this institutional positioning on the work of UoM academic staff at section 5.4, the next section first examines the policy framework governing the recruitment, development and promotion of academic staff at UoM.

5.1.3. Academic staff policy framework

The human resources policy framework at UoM and the university’s broader human resources strategy make relatively few references to the international dimensions of
academic work at the institution. However, in the context of UoM’s broader positioning as a research focused university (outlined above), it is perhaps unsurprising that the human resources strategy has a greater focus on global competition (for staff) and the global reputation of the university, than it does directly on the attraction of international staff or on the international dimensions of work at UoM (“The University of Melbourne People Strategy 2015-2020,” 2015). That being said, this strategy does include a provision to increase the international diversity of staff in line with the diversity of the Australian community and UoM’s student cohort (“The University of Melbourne People Strategy 2015-2020,” 2015, pp. 4 & 13). To this end, data from 2013 suggest that a greater proportion of academic staff at UoM were born outside Australia than in the broader Victorian community. Of the 66% of academic staff at UoM who had recorded their country of birth in 2013, 29% were born overseas (in one of over a hundred countries), compared to an average of 24% in wider population of the State of Victoria (“The University of Melbourne Social Inclusion Barometer 2014,” 2015, p. 25).

Further references to the international dimensions of academic work at UoM are included in the policies governing the recruitment, appointment, performance and promotion of staff. These policies clearly outline UoM’s expectations in relation to the reputation of its academic staff, with all staff holding positions classified as ‘teaching and research’ and ‘research focused’ expected to demonstrate “institutional, national or international reputations” for expanding (or contributing to expanding) knowledge within their disciplines (“Recruitment and Appointment Policy,” 2016). For academic staff holding positions classified as ‘teaching specialist’, a similar condition only applies at Level D (Associate Professor; Principal Research Fellow) and Level E (Professor; Professorial Fellow). Reinforcing this focus on academic reputation, policy provisions also exist for the streamlined appointment of honorary or adjust professors (at Level E) who are from institutions ranked in the top 100 institutions in the Academic Ranking of World Universities or who are members of learned academies in the UK or the US (“Academic Appointment, Performance and Promotion Policy,” 2016).

For advancement within the academy at UoM, it is only for promotion to full Professor (Level E) that academic staff need to be able to demonstrate “outstanding performance and pre-eminence as a scholar of international standing”, with promotion to Level D
(Associate Professor; Principal Research Fellow) still feasible based on a national profile and achievements. In this light, little or no emphasis is placed on how international work might be used as evidence for academic promotion, except for promotion from Levels D to E (“Academic Appointment, Performance and Promotion Policy: Schedule A - Academic Career Benchmarks and Indicators,” 2016). In terms of staff development, opportunities exist for academic staff to undertake international exchange and special studies programs overseas, with some funding available to support the latter (“Academic Appointment, Performance and Promotion Policy,” 2016; “Staff Development, Education and Performance Policy,” 2013).

In summary, whilst UoM’s strategy and policies in relation to human resources contain limited provisions for the international diversity of staff, they do outline the clear expectation that all staff on ‘teaching and research’ and ‘research focused’ positions (that is, the vast majority of full-time academic staff) will have an institutional, national or international reputation. The use of the word ‘or’ in this context is significant, as it enables (in policy) the international aspects of academic work to be optional rather than compulsory. On this topic, prior research in the US has pointed to the deliberate use of inclusive language in tenure codes (rather than the use of ‘or’ or ‘and/or’ phrases) as a key consideration for institutions seeking to encourage greater international engagement amongst their academic staff (Helms, 2015, pp. 36–37). For UoM, however, it is possible (although perhaps unlikely) to be promoted to Level D (Associate Professor; Principal Research Fellow) on the basis of a significant national, rather than international, profile. In line with UoM’s current policy framework, it is only for promotion to full Professor (Level E) that an international reputation is a prerequisite.

Having drawn an early picture of the institutional context of UoM from this document analysis, the next section presents a range of additional information relating to the sample of UoM academic staff who were interviewed for the study. Subsequent discussion of participant responses at interview (at sections 5.3.1 and 5.4) then identifies the international dimensions of academic work at UoM, and investigates the various factors which influence the international engagement of UoM academic staff, including institutional context.
5.2. Key attributes of University of Melbourne participants

As in Chapter 4, this section first provides an overview of the key characteristics of the sample of UoM participants, before considering the scope of the international engagement of this sample of academic staff. Based on the participant recruitment methodology outlined in Chapter 3, purposeful sampling was used to select a group of nineteen UoM participants for interview, drawn from Business and Science disciplines, who were indicative of a range of experiences in relation to their career experience, demographic profile and a range of possible international variables.

5.2.1. Disciplinary background

This study drew interview participants from two contrasting discipline clusters in order to investigate the extent to which specific disciplinary contexts influence the international dimensions of academic work. Accordingly, the UoM schools/departments included in this study were purposefully chosen to ensure disciplinary comparability between the two case study institutions.

In relation to Business disciplines, nine participants were selected, representing three of the Business departments at UoM: Management and Marketing, Accounting, and Economics. In relation to Science, ten participants were drawn from the schools nominated for the study (principally Chemistry, Earth Sciences, BioSciences, and Ecosystem and Forest Sciences). The sample of UoM academic staff included the people holding the international leadership positions on behalf of both the Faculty of Business and Economics and the Faculty of Science.

5.2.2. Demographic characteristics

In addition to their disciplinary background, interview participants were chosen to represent a range of demographic profiles, including gender, position type and career stage. Table 9 (see over) outlines the key demographic characteristics and disciplinary breakdown of the nineteen interview participants at UoM:
Table 9: University of Melbourne – interview participants – demographic characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level A (Tutor; Research Fellow)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level B (Lecturer; Research Fellow)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level C (Senior Lecturer; Senior Research Fellow)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level D (Associate Professor; Principal Research Fellow)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level E (Professor; Professorial Fellow)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching &amp; Research</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research only</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three out of ten Science participants indicated that they were employed on ‘research only’ positions, with one Business participant employed on a ‘teaching only’ position. As such, by virtue of position type alone, it is reasonable to assume that some participants at UoM are likely to have more or less involvement with the international dimensions of their research. An analysis of research publications for the UoM sample certainly supports this initial assumption, with Science participants seemingly more actively engaged in their research (as witnessed by publications and research output) than their Business counterparts. Of the total 377 publications attributed to the nineteen UoM participants between 2011 and 2015, 334 (88.6%) were published by the ten Science participants, with the remaining 43 publications (11.4%) authored by the nine Business participants (Scopus data up to 30 May 2016 drawn from www.scival.com, © 2016 Elsevier B.V.).

However, despite this difference in quantum, the two discipline samples have similar levels of international collaboration in relation to their published research. 44.6% of publications by the ten Science participants (between 2011 and 2015) were co-authored with an institution in another country, whilst this figure was 44.2% for the nine Business participants at UoM (Scopus data up to 30 May 2016 drawn from www.scival.com, © 2016 Elsevier B.V.). These levels of involvement in internationally co-authored publications by
the UoM sample almost exactly mirror the average level of international co-authoring for the university more broadly (at 44.6% over the same time period). In this respect, the two disciplines samples can be considered to be broadly representative of the population of academic staff at UoM.

5.2.3. International characteristics

As outlined at section 4.2.3 in the previous chapter, additional information was sought from prospective interview participants in respect of a number of possible international indicators, including whether they spoke a language other than English (LOTE), whether they were born in Australia or overseas, and whether they had lived or studied overseas at some point. Table 10 outlines the international characteristics and disciplinary breakdown of interview participants at UoM:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place of birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived overseas (&lt;3 months)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 10: University of Melbourne – interview participants – international characteristics*

Initial analysis of this information suggests that the UoM sample has had fairly significant exposure to the world beyond their life in academia. Over half of the sample was born overseas (seven in Europe, three in Asia and one in North America), with close to half being able to speak a language other than English. In addition, seventeen out of nineteen UoM participants have lived overseas at some point in their adult life (that is, subsequent to any time spent abroad as a child). These prior experiences may predispose the UoM sample to greater involvement with the international dimensions of their work,
and the likely significance of these international characteristics is therefore explored at section 5.4.

### 5.3. International engagement

As described in the previous chapter at section 4.2.4, participants in this study were not specifically targeted based on their earlier experience of international engagement. However, prospective interview participants were asked to rate their international engagement on a five-point scale in order to record their own perception of their level of international engagement as an academic in comparison to their colleagues. The responses recorded by UoM participants are shown in Table 11:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of international engagement</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 11: University of Melbourne – interview participants – level of international engagement*

Although prospective interview participants had no way of measuring their own level of international engagement in relation to their peers, this information does suggest that Science participants consider themselves to be more internationally focused in their work than their Business counterparts. One indication of the veracity of this claim is provided through an initial analysis of UoM interview data (outlined below) highlighting the different types of international work undertaken by UoM participants across the various aspects of their work in research, teaching, outreach and service.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, this analysis is potentially crucial to this study, as the literature has shown that the different international dimensions of academic work are likely to be influenced by different sets of factors (Dewey & Duff, 2009; Finkelstein et al., 2013). Whilst these influencing factors are explored in greater detail at section 5.4, the next section first draws on an analysis of interview data to outline the international nature of the academic work undertaken by UoM participants. It also seeks to draw some
early conclusions about the possible intersections between different patterns of international engagement and demographic factors.

5.3.1. International dimensions

Based on an analysis of interview data, UoM participants generally have some level of involvement with the international dimensions of their work in at least three of the four main clusters of activity, that is, in research, teaching, outreach and service. However, the distribution of these international activities/dimensions varies significantly depending on discipline, seniority, position type and other factors.

Nevertheless, regardless of this wide spread of international engagement, the international dimensions of work at UoM are predominantly research-based, with UoM participants speaking much more frequently about the international dimensions of their research than about any other aspect of their work. Indeed, the only two international activities which are common to all UoM participants in this study (international research collaboration and attendance at an international conference) are both research-focused. Beyond research, there is no other cluster of activity where all UoM participants have international involvement, despite a sizeable majority having some engagement with the international dimensions of their teaching and outreach. Indeed, this predominant focus on research appears to be reinforced in two ways beyond the direct involvement of UoM academic staff. Both in the discussions with their colleagues about the international dimensions of their work, and in relation to their future aspirations and awareness, UoM participants are principally focused on international engagement in their research.

Of importance to this study, position type and career stage contribute to shaping the international engagement of UoM participants. While it is not surprising to find that each of the three participants on ‘research only’ positions (all in junior academic positions at either Level A or Level B) is very strongly focused on the international dimensions of research, it is interesting that the same is true of the one ‘teaching only’ participant in the study. As a very new academic, this ‘teaching only’ participant did not make a single reference to the international dimensions of teaching at interview, but spoke solely about the international aspects of research. This may relate to the fact that early career academics in this sample, although less internationally engaged overall,
appear to be comparatively more involved with the international dimensions of their research than their more senior colleagues. In contrast, UoM participants in more senior positions have greater involvement with the international aspects of outreach and service, suggesting that they shift some of their focus from other activities to outreach and service as they progress in their careers. In terms of teaching, participants on ‘teaching & research’ positions become more involved with the international dimensions of their teaching (such as the internationalisation of the curriculum or involvement with outbound student mobility) as they progress from Levels A to C.

As suggested at section 4.2.3, the international characteristics of UoM participants may also shape how they engage with the international dimensions of their work, and this appears to be the case with participants born overseas. Not only are these UoM academic staff involved in a larger number of international activities than their locally-born counterparts, but they also appear to engage in a broader range of activities across teaching and research, with particular involvement and interest in outbound student mobility, opportunities to teach transnationally, international research collaboration and industry engagement overseas. Further discussion in relation to overseas born UoM participants is presented at section 5.4.3.

Also of relevance to this study is a range of disciplinary differences in the types of international work in which UoM participants engage. Science participants appear to be involved with a smaller number of international activities than their Business counterparts, but with a higher frequency of engagement in research activities (as foreshadowed at section 4.2.2), including international research collaboration, hosting visiting academics, visiting overseas universities and research supervision. Business participants, on the other hand, are more likely to be involved in publishing their work internationally or in collecting international data for their research. They are also more frequently involved with the international aspects of teaching, in particular, teaching international students and outbound student mobility.

In summary, UoM participants are significantly more likely to be involved with the international dimensions of their research than with other aspects of their work, particularly in Science. This is also the case for those UoM academic staff employed in specialist positions (whether ‘research only’ or ‘teaching only’) and for those in more
junior positions. Despite this dominant focus on research, Business participants and those born overseas appear to have a slightly more balanced approach to the various international aspects of their work across clusters of activity. These early findings suggest that institutional context, discipline and demographic factors all affect the international engagement of academic staff at UoM. The following section explores these findings in greater detail through an analysis of three main themes identified in the data.

### 5.4. Influencing factors

The international engagement of UoM participants is strongly influenced by a range of disciplinary and institutional factors, as well as by their prior experience and other personal factors. In outlining the experiences of Debra and Dan, the following vignette provides an indication of some of the influences at play in shaping the international engagement of academic staff at UoM. Debra is a Level D academic in Business at UoM, whilst Dan holds a Level B position in Science. Both Debra and Dan are in ‘teaching and research’ positions.

Although employed as teaching and research academics, Debra and Dan have significantly more involvement with the international dimensions of their research than with their teaching, outreach or service. This is particularly the case for Dan, who considers his science discipline to be fundamentally international and actively seeks international collaborators for his work. He does this to access new or innovative scientific techniques, but also out of fear of being scooped, where similar research to his own will be published by others first. Debra, on the other hand, considers her business sub-discipline to be comparatively less international than other disciplines in her faculty. However, her research has led her to collect data internationally and to undertake comparative international studies in her field. She has also been heavily involved in teaching international students during her career.

At the outset of their academic careers, Dan and Debra were both encouraged to attend international conferences by their PhD supervisors. They consciously did this to build their networks and to make connections which would lead to collaborations and, more importantly, to publications. Inspired by her supervisor, Debra (who was born in Australia) also applied for jobs overseas on completion of
her PhD, but then opted against migrating to the northern hemisphere at the outset of her career. She did this out of fear that she might not be able to return to Australia later, but also because she rejected the dominant assumption in her discipline that she would need to work in either the US or the UK as a foundation for her career. Dan, on the other hand, was born in the UK, migrated to Australia in his mid-twenties and completed his PhD here. Neither he nor Debra has worked as an academic overseas.

Although at different career stages, Debra (at Level D) and Dan (at Level B) now have reservations about the merits of conference attendance for their work. For Dan, this relates to workload pressures, as he is the most senior person in his laboratory and it can be hard to secure time away. His current supervisor is supportive of international work if it leads to measurable outcomes, so Dan weighs up all of his international engagement against the likelihood that it will lead to a publication. Debra, meanwhile, has a medical condition which prevents her from travelling and this has led her to question the general assumptions and expectations about mobility in academic work. She has invested time and energy into forms of international engagement which do not require travel, and is now on the editorial board of a leading international journal in her field, having previously held more junior editorial roles.

Whilst the foundations of Debra and Dan’s international engagement were laid early in their careers thanks to supportive PhD supervisors, their current international work is shaped by disciplinary expectations, workload pressures and personal factors. The broader research climate of their institution also appears to have a significant influence on the choices which Debra and Dan make about where, and how, to focus their attention in relation to the international dimensions of their work. This finding and others are discussed in more detail in this section through an analysis of a number of key themes arising from the data.

5.4.1. Building academic reputation through international research

Document analysis has underscored the importance of research to the institutional reputation and ranking of UoM (as outlined at section 5.1). In this context, it is perhaps
not surprising that the predominant theme emerging from interview data relates to the efforts of UoM participants to build their individual academic reputation through the international dimensions of their research. All UoM participants indicated that they were influenced by a desire to build and maintain international networks to support their research, and one of the key rationales for this relates to a view that their particular disciplines are inherently international. Typical of these views is Anna, who describes some of the research-focused activities which stem from the international nature of her discipline:

The chemistry is, of course, international. So that means you go to international conferences, you’re invited to speak at international conferences, you interact just scientifically with people internationally. It is really international. (Anna, Level D, Teaching & Research, Science, UoM)

Anna’s view is shared by many of the other Science participants, for whom international engagement in their research is a necessary and fundamental component of their academic work. In some cases, this is related to the use of global data sets to analyse worldwide phenomena, such as climate change. For example, Jessica (Level E, Teaching & Research, Science, UoM) points out that “if you’re going to work on climate change, you can’t just look at Melbourne”. These findings appear to support the disciplinary classifications put forward in earlier research which suggests that the international engagement of academic staff is shaped by the nature of the disciplines themselves (Agnew, 2013).

Nevertheless, for participants who are earlier in their career, other factors also appear to be at play, such as a desire for international recognition in their field:

Obviously, my field is an international research area, so just getting that recognition from people from overseas is pretty important. (Ian, Level A, Research only, Science, UoM)

Fear of competition within the global community of scientific researchers also pushes Science participants to collaborate internationally, in order to ensure the relevance of their work and to protect (in advance) their capacity to publish their findings. Dan
highlights these concerns when he indicates that he seeks to collaborate with international researchers who might be working on similar topics:

Given that our discipline is so international, you’re hard-pressed to find someone who isn’t actually working on something that you’re working on and you don’t want to get scooped, then quite often you collaborate with them. (Dan, Level B, Teaching & Research, Science, UoM)

Although more prevalent in Science, this sense that academic work is necessarily undertaken in a global context is also felt by some Business participants, such as Alice, a ‘teaching only’ academic who spoke almost exclusively about her research at interview:

Academia itself is borderless, so we don’t exist as an Australian academic. I exist as an academic and my community is global, so I wouldn’t even use the word ‘international’. (Alice, Level A, Teaching only, Business, UoM)

These findings suggest that a simple classification of the disciplines in relation to internationalisation (as per Becher (1989) and Agnew (2013)) may not sufficiently describe the complexity of the factors influencing academic staff in relation to their international engagement. Indeed, beyond the inherent nature of their discipline or academia more broadly, many UoM participants draw a clear correlation between the international dimensions of their research and future career advancement. For Science participants in particular, there appears to be a clear sense of the need to be internationally recognised in order to be successful, as outlined by Judith in relation to her sub-discipline of chemistry:

In science, it’s assumed that you have to be recognised not just at a national level but at an international level, so for an Australian scientist or an Australian chemist to be successful, you have to achieve international recognition. (Judith, Level C, Teaching & Research, Science, UoM)

What this means for many Science participants is that they need to disseminate their research effectively and to ensure that people know about them and about their work. International conference attendance and international research collaboration appear to
be key vectors for this network building and communication, and Amanda outlines the importance of learning the skill of self-promotion early in your career:

Starting at the postdoc level, the more people who know about you and your work, the easier it is to then progress the work through. So, it’s nearly a marketing tool that needs to be learnt very early on. (Amanda, Level D, Teaching & Research, Science, UoM)

Business participants also recognise the value of presenting their research at international conferences. Typical of these views is Eric who makes a direct correlation between conference presentations and career advancement:

In terms of career advancement and so on, you need to be presenting at the best international conferences. (Eric, Level E, Teaching & Research, Business, UoM)

For other Business participants, however, their interest in the international dimensions of their research is not simply driven by a desire for career advancement or for individual reputational gain, but also by an innate interest in the world or a passion for their particular research interest. Linda, for example, highlights a combination of personal interest and a desire for reputational gain as drivers for her international research:

The motivation always has been to understand things in an international context, but at the same time knowing that I want to have an international career. I want to build for myself an international researcher reputation. (Linda, Level B, Teaching & Research, Business, UoM)

Other Business participants simply find their research more interesting when it is conducted internationally, or indeed they self-identify as an international scholar in their work:

I certainly put greater effort on research, because that’s my passion. That’s how I see myself. I never position myself as an Australian scholar, or just want to be known in Australia. (Amy, Level C, Teaching & Research, Business, UoM)
Beyond UoM academic staff understandings about the international nature of their discipline and a range of personal factors which might influence them in relation to their work, many UoM participants are keenly aware of departmental or institutional expectations about their research. Whether these are directly voiced by their supervisors or colleagues, or derive from academics' observations of the behaviour of their peers, these expectations clearly exercise a strong influence on the decisions which UoM participants make about the international aspects of their work. Indeed, these expectations appear to reinforce the role of international research as a key vector for the development of an academic's reputation.

In this light, a junior researcher such as Mark, who works in a laboratory led by a professor who is originally from Germany, suggests that international engagement in research is an expectation in his local environment:

> Every project, research group that I've worked in has always encouraged strong international engagement and getting your science out there to the community and aim as high as you can, because the objective is to reach the widest audience and publish the best quality science we can. (Mark, Level B, Research only, Science, UoM)

Other UoM participants, such as Amanda, are keen observers of their local environment and have identified the behaviours which lead to research success through their observations of other academics:

> As I matured as a researcher, I saw the connections other people were making and saw the importance of that, attending conferences, speaking to people, building up that network. (Amanda, Level D, Teaching & Research, Science, UoM)

In other cases, PhD supervisors have clearly outlined what steps are required to establish an academic career in the relevant discipline, for example, by undertaking postdoctoral placements in targeted locations overseas. Some UoM participants, such as Judith, have then willingly followed this locally-imparted advice:
My PhD supervisor gave me some good advice. He said, look, if you want to be an academic, which is what I wanted, you go and do two postdocs. Do one postdoc in North America and do a second postdoc in Europe or the UK, and that’s basically what I did. (Judith, Level C, Teaching & Research, Science, UoM)

Beyond the local environment, however, it appears that UoM staff are further influenced by a range of institutional expectations about the international dimensions of their research. These may stem from the predominant focus on research in UoM’s strategic positioning (as discussed at section 5.1.1) or from the need for UoM academic staff to show proof of their external reputation and international standing for promotion to the highest rank of the academy (as outlined at section 5.1.3). Whatever the case, it is clear that UoM participants have an understanding of the role of international work as a marker of status within their institution. Typical of these views are Eric and Jerry, both full professors in their respective disciplines:

Particularly at this university, being international as an academic is really really important, and if I look at the people I know across pretty much all the disciplines here, of course we all do stuff locally and consider that important, but we’re all really internationally engaged. (Eric, Level E, Teaching & Research, Business, UoM)

If you are in a big institution like Melbourne Uni, you need to show that you’re internationally recognised. That’s one of the major factors. (Jerry, Level E, Teaching & Research, Science, UoM)

In Science in particular, international collaboration in research is seen as a *sine qua non* in relation to an academic’s status:

People around here who don’t have an international collaboration, it’s almost like a status thing. A research international collaboration is well-regarded. (Judith, Level C, Teaching & Research, Science, UoM)
Furthermore, in some cases the incentive to engage internationally in research is clearly driven by institutional strategy, where there is an overt push to publish in international journals in certain sub-disciplines:

    We’re an Economics department, so the strategy there is to target the top international journals. There are no rewards for publishing in Australian journals. (Tim, Level E, Teaching & Research, Business, UoM)

Eric (Level E, Teaching & Research, Business, UoM) perhaps summarizes this best when he says that UoM has strong institutional incentives to be international in research, if not in any other area of academic activity.

In this light, it appears clear that UoM’s positioning and reputation as a research intensive institution exert a strong influence on the decisions which individual academics make about the international dimensions of their work. These findings suggest that expectations as to what UoM academics do are shaped by local disciplinary communities, as well as by institutional norms and policies, and a range of personal factors. As outlined at section 5.1.2, internationalisation at UoM is viewed principally through a research lens, and it appears to be principally through this lens that internationalisation itself has an influence on the work of UoM academic staff. Trondal (2010) argues that the research behaviour of academic staff is only weakly associated with institutional internationalisation strategies. However, this may not be the case for institutions like UoM where the institutional internationalisation strategy is principally embodied in its research agenda.

5.4.2. Drivers and barriers beyond the institution

The second clear theme emerging from the data relates to a series of drivers and barriers to the international engagement of UoM participants which lie outside the institution itself. In Business, this principally relates to the influence of the external professions with which the Business disciplines are closely related. However, in Science, there appears to be a wider range of external influences, including the availability of national or international funding. For both disciplinary groups, however, Australia’s distance from
the rest of the world (but particularly from North America and Europe) is seen as a key barrier which UoM academics have to overcome.

Building on the need to foster an international reputation for their research (as outlined in the previous section), many UoM participants reflect on the particular challenges that Australian academics face due to Australia’s geographic isolation and the restricted size of the local academic community. Typical of these views is Tim, who migrated to Australia from the UK to take up an academic position early in his career:

Coming to Australia, you view travel as important, because generally people are not passing through Australia, whereas in other places (in Europe, in North America) people might be fairly close by and they would just come and visit. (Tim, Level E, Teaching & Research, Business, UoM)

For those participants who have spent a period of time working in the northern hemisphere, Australia’s isolation and its smaller academic community are at the forefront of their minds. Judith, for example, undertook back-to-back postdoctoral placements in North America and Europe following her PhD and now misses the ease with which she was able to meet and collaborate with other academics:

Because Australia is such a small place, our communities are small and we’re far away. It’s just a very different experience to being in big, top international universities. (Judith, Level C, Teaching & Research, Science, UoM)

Similarly, UoM participants who were born overseas are acutely aware of the additional difficulty involved in undertaking their research from an Australian base. Grace (Level B, Teaching & Research, Business, UoM), who was born in Canada and did her PhD in the UK, summarizes this succinctly when she says, “It’s just so damned difficult to get to see people”. George, who was born in Europe and migrated to Australia to do his PhD, also draws a connection between Australia’s distance from the rest of the world and the additional cost of international collaboration:
The distance is also connected with the money problem, because then travel is so expensive, so you have to apply for more. (George, Level A, Research only, Science, UoM)

Nevertheless, on the positive side, Australians are described as being inherently more outward-looking by virtue of the country’s smaller population size:

American and UK researchers, they tend not to be as outward-looking, I think, because they don’t have to be, whereas Canadians and Australians, we’re forced to be, if we want to broaden our base of contacts, because we’re small countries. (Grace, Level B, Teaching & Research, Business, UoM)

As mentioned in the previous chapter at section 4.4.2., earlier research into the international dimensions of academic work has made no reference to distance as either a driver or barrier to the international engagement of academic staff. These findings therefore suggest that this is particular to the Australian context. Australia’s distance from other countries may also be of particular relevance to UoM participants in their quest to build their academic reputation in research, as it isolates them from the dominant global hubs of academia in North America and Europe. Twelve of the nineteen UoM participants have previously worked as an academic in the UK or continental Europe, and there is a clear geographical concentration of interest in the current work of all UoM participants in Europe (including the UK) and North America.

Beyond Australia’s geographic isolation, Business participants are influenced by the external professions which are served by their courses, particularly in relation to accounting. This potentially leads them to have greater involvement with the international aspects of their teaching, including quality assurance and consideration of the internationally-focused graduate attributes required of their students. For example, Robert (Level C, Teaching & Research, Business, UoM) has a strong focus on teaching in his work and is acutely aware of the requirements of the external body in Australia which accredits the courses he teaches. Nevertheless, he is also aware of the changing aspirations of his students and of the fact that domestic accreditation is increasingly portable between countries. In this light, he says, “We would say we are preparing students for the international market”.
For Science participants, access to sources of external funding (whether national or international) appears to be an important driver of their international research collaboration. For the last three years, for example, Dan (Level B, Teaching & Research, Science, UoM) has been working on an Australian-Indian research project funded by the Australian Government. Despite a number of frustrations with the project and its outcomes to date, it is clear that Dan would not be involved in this international project had it not been for the external funding:

You don’t just suddenly jump up and say, I’m going to collaborate with an Indian scientist or a Chinese scientist without giving it a bit of thought. There has to be a very compelling reason to do it. One compelling reason is the Government’s going to throw money at you. That’s a pretty good carrot. (Dan, Level B, Teaching & Research, Science, UoM)

These findings in relation to external drivers and barriers are interesting, as they highlight that contextual factors beyond the institution and the discipline have an influence on the decisions made by individual UoM academic staff about the international dimensions of their work. Although prior research has argued that individual values have a far more significant influence on the international work of academic staff than their institutions or academic fields (Finkelstein et al., 2013), the literature does not necessarily point to the importance of external factors such as those described in this section.

5.4.3. Personal heritage shapes approach and attitudes

The third theme emerging from the data relates to the personal heritage of UoM participants and the potential importance of place of birth in shaping individual approaches and attitudes towards international engagement in academic work. As outlined in section 5.3, the eleven UoM participants born overseas have a greater scale of involvement in the international dimensions of their work than their Australian-born counterparts. In addition, they also show a tendency to be engaged in a broader range of international activities in both teaching and research, which suggests that they may have a more holistic approach to international engagement in their work.
Naturally, in a small study of this nature, it is difficult to isolate particular characteristics of individual participants and point to them as being distinctive influencing factors in relation to the choices that academic staff make about their work. To do so would certainly fly in the face of the proposal that the international dimensions of academic work are influenced by a complex interplay of contextual and personal factors (as outlined in Chapter 2). Nevertheless, analysis of UoM interview data suggests that place of birth is a key determinant (no doubt in conjunction with other characteristics or experiences) and this proposal is supported by comments from UoM participants at interview. Certainly, UoM academic staff who were born overseas have a direct personal experience of international migration and this appears to make them more alert to the aspirations and needs of the international students in their courses and the international researchers in their departments. This view is clearly expressed by Martha, who was born in Poland and migrated to Australia nearly 30 years ago:

I probably understand more and know how difficult it is, because when I came to Australia, it was difficult. (Martha, Level D, Teaching & Research, Science, UoM)

Other participants, such as Ian, reflect on the fact that overseas-born leaders of research groups tend to attract international students for supervision, thereby serving to concentrate populations of internationally-minded students and staff in given departments:

A lot of the international students relate more to him and that’s why a lot of them prefer to have him as a supervisor. (Ian, Level A, Research only, Science, UoM)

Whilst the eleven overseas-born participants at UoM share a number of other international characteristics (for example, nine of them can speak a language other than English), other professional and demographic markers do not appear to be distinctive. In this context, the group of overseas-born UoM participants includes near equal representation of gender (five women and six men) and discipline (five Business and six Science), and is distributed across a range of different academic levels (two at Level A, three at Level B, one at Level C, two at Level D and three at Level E). As highlighted at section 5.2.3, the vast majority of UoM participants (seventeen out of nineteen) have
spent a period of time in their adult life living or working overseas, including all but one of those born overseas. However, it appears to be those who were born overseas who have a tendency to be more strongly engaged with the international dimensions of their work. This is particularly marked in relation to some international activities in teaching and outreach, where Australian-born UoM academic staff have very limited or indeed no involvement, unlike their overseas-born counterparts. Such is the case for direct involvement with and interest in outbound student mobility (including the organisation of study tours and field trips) and opportunities to teach transnationally, as well as business or industry engagement overseas. Overseas-born UoM participants are also far more likely to discuss the international dimensions of their work with their colleagues.

One possible explanation for the greater scale of international engagement amongst overseas-born participants relates to their more ready opportunity to build and maintain networks in more than one country. Born in Canada, Grace lived and worked there until she undertook a mid-career PhD in the UK, but has maintained her network in Canada throughout:

> If you find yourself as a foreigner in a country, I think your default is that you’re going to look back home for things, because you will have the network. I left twenty years of professional network behind in Canada, so it was sort of a natural thing that I would keep engaged with that. (Grace, Level B, Teaching & Research, Business, UoM)

In addition to this ongoing connection to her country of birth, Grace also maintains strong connections with the UK institution where she undertook her PhD, teaching summer courses there each year in addition to her full-time ‘teaching and research’ position at UoM. In this sense, it appears that the personal heritage of UoM participants may be an important influencing factor in determining not only whether they engage internationally in their work, but also in shaping the choices they make in how and where to engage.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, though, not all overseas-born participants display the same enthusiasm for international engagement in their work. Anna, for example, states that her personality type obviates against international collaboration in her research:
Some people, they like to work in large teams and contribute to large teams, and my personality is more... I like teamwork but I like to actually collaborate with people who I see every day. (Anna, Level D, Teaching & Research, Science, UoM)

This serves to reinforce the premise that it is the intersection between multiple variables – be they personal, disciplinary or institutional – which encourages or discourages academic staff in relation to the international dimensions of their work.

Certainly, this finding in relation to personal heritage supports the proposal in the literature that personal history and personal experience in an international context exert an important influence on the international dimensions of academic work (Bond et al., 2003; De Haan, 2014; Schwietz, 2006). Although it is highly probable that UoM academic staff are influenced by a range of different factors in confluence, the findings of this study appear to suggest that it is more significant to have been born outside Australia than to have simply lived or worked overseas.

5.5. Summary

This chapter has investigated the various international dimensions of academic work at the second case study institution and has sought to identify key themes from the data in relation to the factors which influence the international engagement of UoM academic staff. In this context, document analysis points to an institution which is predominantly focused on research in relation to its international engagement and which pays close attention to its global reputation. Although less visible in UoM’s formal strategies and public statements, another significant aspect of the institutional context at UoM is its enrolment of a sizeable cohort of international students by both Australian and international standards.

Analysis of interview data reinforces the predominance of research in the international dimensions of academic work at UoM. Despite disciplinary differences in the choices which UoM academic staff make about how to engage internationally in their research, international engagement in research remains central to all UoM participants regardless of career stage or position type. The three principal themes outlined in this chapter suggest that institutional, disciplinary, personal and external factors all influence
academic staff in this aspect of their work, and these various factors appear to operate collectively in complex ways. As such, whilst UoM participants nominate institutional encouragement and disciplinary expectations as key drivers of their international engagement in research, they also draw on their personal experience to make choices in relation to their work which might privilege their career advancement and personal reputational gain. Personal heritage appears to shape attitudes towards the international dimensions of academic work, with those participants born overseas having a greater level of international engagement than other staff. However, UoM participants identify a range of barriers beyond the institution itself, including Australia’s geographic isolation and access to funding to facilitate international collaboration.

In line with the research intensive focus of UoM, these findings indicate that UoM academic staff favour the international dimensions of their research over international engagement in other aspects of their work. Although this is not surprising in an institution with a strong public profile and reputation for research excellence, it suggests that the major program of international education at UoM has limited influence on the work of its academic staff. Rather, the choices about international engagement made by UoM academic staff are influenced by their desire for reputational gain (tied to career advancement), disciplinary context and personal heritage.

In order to understand the scope of international engagement in Australian higher education, the following chapter draws on data analysis from the two case study institutions to conceptualise a typology of the international dimensions of academic work. Based on this typology, the influence of a range of contextual factors is investigated in further detail, including institutional and disciplinary context, and individual and external factors.
Chapter 6  INTERNATIONAL DIMENSIONS OF ACADEMIC WORK IN AUSTRALIA

Drawing on cross-case analysis between the two case study institutions, this chapter discusses how the findings of this study provide insights into the principal research questions outlined in the first chapter: what are the international dimensions of academic work in Australia, and what factors influence academic staff in the choices they make about their international engagement? The central theme to emerge from the findings is the predominance of research activities in the international engagement of academic staff participants (hereinafter “academic staff”), which suggests that there is a disconnect between the importance attached to internationalisation by institutions and the international work undertaken by academic staff. This chapter conceptualises a typology of the international dimensions of academic work and then explores the complex set of contextual factors which influence the choices made by academic staff in relation to their international engagement, including institutional, disciplinary, personal and external influences. It is followed by a final chapter which discusses potential implications for policy and practice and recommends further research.

6.1. Typology of international engagement

Drawing on the coding framework and coded interviews for this study, a typology of the international dimensions of academic work has been developed. This typology of international engagement conceptualises both the different international dimensions of academic work identified in the study and their comparative importance across the sample of participants.

The international dimensions listed in the typology were derived from the coding framework for the study. As described in Chapter 3, this framework was initially developed in line with themes identified from the review of the literature and then modified and adjusted in response to the interview data. To ensure its accuracy, the typology was developed based on the current work of the academic staff interviewed for the study, and therefore excludes those international dimensions of which participants were simply aware or to which they possibly aspired in the future. Furthermore, it excludes those international dimensions which formed the basis of discussions between
academic colleagues, as these did not relate to the direct international engagement of participants.

In terms of the importance of each international dimension in the typology, this was determined based on both the scale (that is, volume) of references to it in the interviews, as well as the frequency (or distribution) of those references across the participants in the sample. Accordingly, the scale and frequency of each international dimension were categorised as Very High, High, Moderate or Low, as per the descriptions in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale &amp; frequency</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>Predominant focus with over 130 coded mentions, and involving all or nearly all participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Significant focus with 30-70 coded mentions, and/or involving more than half of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Medium focus with 15-40 coded mentions, and/or involving between a quarter and a half of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Limited focus with less than 15 coded mentions, and involving under a quarter of participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 12: Definitions of scale and frequency - typology of international engagement*

The typology of international engagement conceptualised in this study is presented in Table 13 (see over). In this table, the typology categorises the international dimensions of academic work into clusters (‘Research’, ‘Teaching’, ‘Outreach’, ‘Service’, and ‘Other’), with the clusters listed in descending order of scale and frequency. The international dimensions within each cluster are then also listed in descending order of scale and frequency.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>International dimension</th>
<th>Scale &amp; frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>international research collaboration</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>international conference attendance</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>publishing internationally</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hosting visiting academics</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>joint publications with international authors</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>research supervision (international students)</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>visiting overseas universities</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outbound staff mobility (short-term)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>peer review for international journals</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>public lectures overseas</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>international data collection</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>teaching international students</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teaching abroad (transnational education)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>curriculum internationalisation</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>supporting outbound student mobility (general)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>international graduate attributes</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>organising overseas study tours/field trips for students</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quality assurance for transnational education</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teaching inbound exchange students</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>course accreditation (international)</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>industry or business connections/projects (international)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>editing international journals</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conference organisation (international)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>membership of international academy or expert panel</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other outreach activity (e.g. international alumni)</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>international development projects</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>public commentary</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>establishing/running international networks</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>international student recruitment</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>international profiling and partnerships</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quality assurance for international activities</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>international leadership role</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recruitment of overseas academics</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13: Typology of international engagement

As outlined above, the typology seeks to present an accurate representation of how participants in this study conceptualised the international dimensions of their work. In this light, seeming duplication in the typology reflects the lived experience of the participants. For example, ‘teaching international students’ and ‘teaching inbound exchange students’ were nominated as distinct dimensions by certain participants. Similarly, in relation to their curriculum, some participants focused on internationalisation for broad disciplinary purposes (labelled ‘curriculum internationalisation’), whilst others had sought to incorporate change to their curriculum centred on a range of internationally-oriented graduate attributes (labelled ‘international graduate attributes’).

In terms of categorisation, some international dimensions could have been allocated to more than one cluster; however, their placement in the typology was guided by the data collected at interview. Accordingly, ‘editing international journals’ was categorised under the outreach cluster (rather than under research), as it was frequently referenced in this context by relevant participants. In a similar fashion, ‘quality assurance for transnational education’ was listed under the teaching cluster, as participants described this as a strongly academic activity, whilst ‘quality assurance for international activities’ was classified as service due to its principal focus on the oversight of administrative processes.

6.1.1. Scale and focus

Based on this typology, initial analysis illustrates the predominance of research-focused international engagement in this study. Although international dimensions were identified across all areas of academic work and there is evidence of some activity across each of these individual dimensions, the international dimensions of teaching, outreach and service (as well as other international dimensions classified as ‘other’) were all less prevalent. Indeed, of the eight international dimensions classified as Very High or High in terms of scale and frequency across the full typology, the majority related to research.
As shown in Table 14, ‘international research collaboration’ and ‘international conference attendance’ were the only two international dimensions in the typology which were classified as Very High and which were nominated by all or nearly all of the participants as a focus of their work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>International dimension</th>
<th>Scale &amp; frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>international research collaboration</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>international conference attendance</td>
<td>Very High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>publishing internationally</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hosting visiting academics</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>joint publications with international authors</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>research supervision (international students)</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>visiting overseas universities</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>teaching international students</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Extract from typology – dimensions with Very High/High scale and frequency

By contrast, the international dimensions classified as Low in the typology predominantly relate to teaching and other clusters of activity, as previously indicated in Table 13.

6.1.2. Frequency and distribution

Further analysis reveals the patterns of distribution of the international dimensions across the sample of thirty-seven participants. Irrespective of the scale of their involvement with any given international dimension, Table 15 shows the total number of participants who engaged in activities in each cluster:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: Typology of international engagement – number of participants by cluster
This analysis illustrates that research is the only cluster where all participants had some form of engagement. Indeed, across the whole typology, only ‘international conference attendance’ (within the research cluster) was common to all participants.

Beyond research, most participants had some involvement with the international dimensions of teaching and outreach. Involvement with the international dimensions of service was more limited, with only eleven participants at each case study institution indicating that their international work touched on service to their institution. These participants generally held leadership roles, either within their local department or more broadly for their school or faculty. Participation in other activities (including targeted international professional development and the receipt of international awards/prizes or other recognition) was more limited, with only a quarter of all participants involved.

In summary, the findings of this study support the conclusions drawn by Mertova (2013) about the broad scope of international engagement of Australian academics (compared to those in the Czech Republic). However, despite this involvement with international dimensions across different clusters of activity, the typology conceptualised in this study clearly underlines the predominance of research in the international dimensions of academic work. Indeed, the ubiquity of research-focused international engagement is underscored by the fact that no other area of international activity or engagement was common to all participants in the study.

6.2. Institutional context

Drawing on the typology of international engagement advanced in the previous section, this study shows that the particular context of each institution plays an important role in relation to the choices which academic staff make about their work. Based on the literature, this is not a controversial claim, as both institutional and disciplinary context have been shown to influence academic work and the international dimensions of that work. However, this study proposes that different institutional contexts influence the international dimensions of academic work by shaping the broader environment for the work and employment of academic staff. Academic performance and promotion criteria form a key part of this institutional environment, and aspirations for career advancement appear to influence the decisions which academic staff make about their work.
This study has sought to identify the drivers and barriers to the international engagement of Australian academic staff and to determine the various factors which influence academic staff choices about the international dimensions of their work. On the basis of the findings of this study, it appears that institutional internationalisation has had limited direct influence on the nature of academic work. However, it is highly feasible that internationalisation has influenced the institutional context at the two case study institutions, both in terms of their research focus and the growing importance of global rankings as markers of institutional reputation and prestige.

### 6.2.1. Institutional differences in international engagement

Institutional context has an important role in shaping the types of international engagement with which academic staff are involved. Accordingly, whilst a focus on research was predominant for all participants, UoM academic staff had stronger engagement with research than their counterparts at LTU. Conversely, LTU academic staff had a higher level of engagement with the international dimensions of their teaching. Figure 1 shows the proportion of international dimensions in each cluster at each case study institution:

*Figure 1: Proportion of international dimensions by cluster – institutional comparison*

At a more granular level of analysis, UoM academic staff appear to have a greater level of engagement with the supervision of international research students and with visiting overseas universities, whilst their counterparts at LTU have more involvement with the
internationalisation of the curriculum and the quality assurance of that institution’s transnational education programs.

As outlined in Chapter 5, the research intensive context of UoM appears to be a significant influencing factor on the choices made by UoM academic staff, both broadly and in relation to the international dimensions of their work. This research-focused context is reinforced through multiple channels at UoM, whether through its strategic planning, through its broader public positioning as a leading and globally ranked research university (see, for example, G. Davis, 2016a) or through the internal conversations which take place between academic staff. Research was the principal focus of discussions when UoM academic staff talked with disciplinary colleagues about both the international dimensions of their current work and their future aspirations for greater international engagement. Collectively, these factors create a compelling narrative about the research-focused internal and external reputation of UoM, and this institutional context appears to shape the decisions which individual academics make about their work, and the international dimensions of that work.

Similarly, in relation to LTU, a range of contextual factors is evident in terms of the international dimensions of academic work, not least the major academic restructure of the institution shortly before the period of this study. As discussed in Chapter 4, the knock-on effects of this restructure were mentioned by almost all LTU participants, both in terms of additional workload (due to a reduction in the overall size of the LTU academic workforce) and the barriers that their workload presented to expanding their international engagement. A number of LTU participants had seen their teaching load increase considerably in 2015 and, in parallel, felt under growing pressure to produce tangible outputs in relation to their research. Despite this pressure, LTU participants were involved with a wider range of teaching dimensions than their UoM counterparts, including transnational education.

That being said, it could be argued that the institutional context at LTU is shifting away from teaching towards research. In many ways, the recent academic restructure at LTU had seeded new understandings about the institution’s expectations of its academic staff, as witnessed by Larry (Level B, Teaching & Research Business, LTU) who said, “It’s not publish or perish any more. It’s publish in high-ranking international journals” when
reflecting on the effects of the restructure on his work. A further indication of a shifting
focus towards research impact at LTU during the period of this study can be seen in the
placement of a prominent half-page promotional insert by LTU into the weekend
newspaper in Melbourne immediately after the launch of the 2016 Academic Ranking of
World Universities (La Trobe University, 2016). Framed as a congratulatory message to
LTU’s world-class researchers, this public statement served to acknowledge LTU’s
highest ever world ranking, thereby reinforcing the value of both research and public
recognition (through rankings) to LTU staff and students, and the broader community.

In summary, it is unsurprising that UoM participants in this study were far more likely to
engage with the international dimensions of their research, than with their teaching. The
principally research-focused institutional context at UoM clearly influences academic
work choices in this regard. At LTU, on the other hand, despite a possible shift in
institutional focus towards research, the underlying context appears to have broader
foundations, as witnessed by the strong focus on both research and teaching in LTU’s
strategic planning and its comprehensive approach to internationalisation.

6.2.2. Academic interpretations of institutional context

In what ways, then, is institutional context understood and interpreted by academic
staff? Given the strong influence of academic reputation and success on the international
dimensions of academic work at both case study institutions, perhaps the most
significant means by which institutional context is interpreted is through academic
performance and promotion criteria.

Earlier research has shown that academic staff draw inferences about what is valued by
their institutions through the outcomes of promotion, tenure and salary decisions
around them (Fairweather, 2002). Beyond disciplinary norms and expectations,
institutional criteria for promotion and performance determine whether academic staff
qualify to advance in their career (or indeed to maintain their substantive position). As
such, it is not surprising that interview participants at both institutions were alert to the
internal requirements for promotion and, in some cases, to the particular value of the
international dimensions of their work in that regard. In the latter instance, for example,
Science participants at both case study institutions spoke about the value to their
academic career of an early period of work outside Australia. This is not to say that career advancement always has a direct influence on the international engagement of academic staff, but simply that career advancement influences the decisions which academic staff make about their work more broadly. Performance and promotion criteria clearly form part of an institutional context for academic employment, sitting alongside other measurements of academic performance, such as disciplinary evaluation through peer review.

Institutional context can therefore be seen to either encourage or hamper the international engagement of academic staff, depending on the particular parameters at play. Given a tendency for Australian institutions to focus increasing attention on research performance and output (as witnessed at UoM and, increasingly, at LTU), perhaps institutional context also has the potential to act as a barrier to academic staff engaging with a wider range of international dimensions in their work outside of the research paradigm. Certainly, in this study, the principal avenue for the international engagement of academic staff was via their research. This appears to sit in contrast to the majority of earlier research on the international engagement of academic staff, which has strongly focused on teaching and learning and the internationalisation of the curriculum, rather than on the international dimensions of research.

Whilst overall levels of international engagement amongst the participants in this study were high and the majority of participants were involved in a wide range of international dimensions across each of the different aspects of their work, institutional context appears to shape the principal focus of that engagement, that is, a focus on research rather than a focus on outreach or teaching. In this way, the understandings which academic staff have about the institution in which they work are no doubt more influential on their international engagement than a designated institutional strategy or internationalisation plan. This resonates with the findings of Leisyte and Dee (2012) who concluded that faculty identity in US and European universities was increasingly influenced by institutional context, particularly in relation to academic capitalism. It also supports the findings of those studies which have illustrated a clear gap between international strategy and practice in relation to academic staff (for example Savishinsky, 2012; Warwick & Moogan, 2013).
6.3. Disciplinary context

Having shown that institutional context contributes to shaping the principal focus of international engagement in the previous section, this section will argue that disciplinary affiliation influences academic staff in two ways. Not only does it influence the focus of international engagement in a similar way to institutional context, but it also shapes how academic staff become involved in the international dimensions of their work by encouraging or discouraging particular international activities. As mentioned at section 6.2, the influence of disciplinary context on academic work and on the international dimensions of that work has been well-documented. However, this study questions the accuracy of Agnew’s (2013) proposal that the four categories of discipline (proposed by Becher (1989)) understand internationalisation in different ways based on the subjective-objective and applied-pure qualities of the disciplines. Participants in this study did not necessarily display the disciplinary understandings of internationalisation ascribed in Agnew’s (2013) model.

6.3.1. Disciplinary differences in international engagement

Disciplinary context has an important role in shaping the international dimensions of academic work, both in relation to the broad focus of that work and the choices which academic staff make about the particular international activities in which they engage. Although the principal focus of international engagement for both broad discipline groups in this study was research, Business participants also had significant involvement in the international dimensions of teaching, whilst Science participants gave preference to outreach dimensions over teaching. As shown in Figure 2 (see over), the balance of international dimensions between clusters of activity varies significantly by discipline:
Beyond their engagement in the most common international dimensions of their research (including ‘international research collaboration’ and ‘international conference attendance’), the two disciplines appear to give preference to different individual international activities in their work in many cases, suggesting that disciplinary context influences not only the broad focus of international engagement but the ways in which it is realised. As such, Business participants had significantly greater involvement with teaching international students, both in their classrooms in Australia and via transnational education abroad. In contrast, Science participants had stronger involvement with some of the international dimensions of their research, including the supervision of international research students and the reciprocal movement of visiting scholars between institutions.

Beyond those international dimensions classified as Very High or High in either discipline, the typology of international engagement conceptualised in this study shows involvement in a wide range of international activities across both groups of disciplinary participants. In only two instances are there international dimensions which feature in one discipline but not in the other, and in both cases these dimensions were referenced by Business participants. Is it therefore the case that these two international dimensions are specific to that discipline? In the case of the first such dimension ‘establishing/running international networks’, this could feasibly relate to any discipline and may simply not have been mentioned by any of the Science participants in the study. It could reasonably be argued that this is a niche activity in academic work. On the other
hand, ‘course accreditation (international)’ is more likely to be a discipline-specific international dimension, given that many Business faculties now seek external accreditation of their courses from international bodies, such as the US-based AACSB accreditation (Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business) or its European counterpart EQUIS (EFMD Quality Improvement System). Science faculties do not typically secure external accreditation for their courses in this way.

In summary, it is not surprising that both Business and Science participants in this study have greater engagement with the international dimensions of their research than with other areas of their work. As outlined in section 6.2, the institutional context at both case study universities has a strong influence in this regard. More interesting, though, is the significantly stronger focus on teaching by Business participants, which potentially relates to the greater exposure of those academic staff to the international student programs of their universities.

6.3.2. Differences in disciplinary context

Based on the findings of this study, the large-scale presence of international students on university campuses appears to have influenced the work of academic staff in Business more so than in Science. As in other countries with large programs of international education, the majority of international students enrolled in Australia have been shown to enrol in courses in management and commerce (Banks & Olsen, 2011, p. 98). Indeed, analysis of recent enrolment data indicates that close to half of all international enrolments in Australian higher education in the 2015 academic year were in the ‘Management and Commerce’ Broad Field of Education (49.7%), with only 5.1% in ‘Natural and Physical Sciences’. It is therefore not surprising that the presence of international students has influenced academic staff in Business disciplines to have greater engagement with the international dimensions of their teaching. Indeed, Business participants in this study were also more likely to have re-thought their curriculum in an international context or to have encouraged their students to consider short-term outbound mobility. In a small number of other cases, close academic involvement with international students also appears to have stimulated a greater

25 Data derived from Selected Higher Education Statistics – 2015 Student Data, Table 7.2: All Overseas Students by Level of Course and Broad Field of Education, Full Year 2015 (Australian Government, 2016c).
awareness of international engagement more broadly. This was the case for those Business participants who had been involved in transnational education early in their careers, thereby teaching their courses to groups of predominantly international students in an offshore setting. This experience had been transformational for some participants, causing them to reflect on their own curriculum and values, and encouraging them to think about their work in a broader international context. On the other hand, though, a number of Business participants appeared to regret the fundamental changes to their classrooms which the growing presence of international students had brought. In their eyes, this had led to a lack of cultural diversity in their classrooms, with a vast majority of their students originally from China.

Meanwhile, academic staff in Science disciplines appear to have had less exposure to the large-scale international education programs of their institutions. Many Science participants made little or no mention of international students in relation to their work, other than to refer to their presence in class or in their laboratories, or to describe some of the problems or issues which their institution faces by virtue of its international student population. Furthermore, Science participants appeared to draw no direct connection between the international education programs of their institution, or the presence of international students in their classes or laboratories, and their own international engagement. This aligns in part with the findings of an earlier study by Clifford (2009) which suggested that academic staff in hard-pure disciplines (such as Science) were less aware of cultural differences among their students and less likely to advocate for the inclusion of global perspectives in their curriculum.

Many of the Science participants, on the other hand, had lived and worked as an academic overseas for a period of time, often at an early stage in their career. As outlined in Chapter 4, the rationales for this permanent or semi-permanent migration frequently related to disciplinary expectations, often framed by PhD supervisors or other academic mentors. Certainly, these international experiences were principally related to research, rather than to teaching, thereby potentially reinforcing a disciplinary approach to international engagement focused predominantly on research.

In the context of this study, the distinction between Business and Science approaches to international engagement in Australia is an interesting finding. It points to the fact that
different disciplines may have experienced the presence of international students in different ways. Indeed, if the particular disciplinary context does not encourage academic staff to engage with the international dimensions of their teaching (as appears to be the case in Science), then it appears that there is no compelling rationale for them to do so. As such, despite the large-scale presence of international students on Australian campuses, many academic staff are more heavily focused on their research than on their teaching. Although this aligns with the analysis of the changing academic profession in Chapter 2 and the predominant research focus of institutional contexts outlined above, it appears to sit in opposition to one of the major pillars of internationalisation as a process of institutional change.

Earlier research has sought to categorise disciplinary approaches to internationalisation; however, as shown in Chapter 2, much of this research focuses on the international aspects of teaching, rather than considering academic work in a broader context. As such, these categorisations may offer only limited insight into the broader international engagement of academic staff. Agnew (2013), for example, proposes that internationalisation manifests itself in different ways based on the subjective-objective and applied-pure qualities of the disciplines. Drawing on the findings of a study in North America, Agnew (2013, p. 190) employs Becher’s (1989) four-quadrant categorisation of the disciplines to describe the following characteristics for hard-pure disciplines (such as Science) and soft-applied disciplines (such as Business):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hard-Pure</th>
<th>Soft-Applied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline is borderless</td>
<td>Value of reflective practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal language</td>
<td>Relevance of local culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcends cultural context</td>
<td>Challenge beliefs, values, assumptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value-free; impersonal</td>
<td>Value human experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of the scientific process (data)</td>
<td>Application of learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized curricula</td>
<td>Multiple ways of knowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as the global language/homogenization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16: Extract – Summary of Internationalization in the Context of Disciplinary Categories (Agnew, 2013)
Certain elements of this categorisation are supported by the findings of this study, particularly in relation to Science where many participants spoke about the borderless and inherently international nature of research and teaching in their discipline. However, Agnew’s (2013) study related principally to the internationalisation of the curriculum and, as such, the categorisation proposed in her model does not accurately describe how Business participants in this study understand or engage with the international dimensions of their research. Business participants in the current study also spoke about the borderless nature of their discipline, the growing standardisation of curricula (encouraged by international accreditation of business courses) and the homogenising effect of English as the dominant language of their discipline. Although the current study reinforces the importance of disciplinary context to the international engagement of academic staff, it also suggests that models or categorisations of disciplinary influence based on one aspect of academic work (in this instance, teaching and the curriculum) may not be readily adapted to describe all aspects of that work.

In summary, whilst institutional context appears to shape the broad choices which academic staff make about the focus of their international engagement (in research or in teaching, for example), this study argues that disciplinary context also has a significant influence on the international dimensions of academic work. Not only does disciplinary affiliation influence the broad focus of international engagement, but it also shapes how academic staff make choices about the particular international activities in which they engage. This resonates with the findings of a number of earlier studies, which have shown that internationalisation is viewed and conceptualised differently from one discipline to the next (Agnew, 2013; Clifford, 2009; Jiang & Carpenter, 2013b). Nevertheless, where these earlier studies have principally considered internationalisation through the lens of teaching, this study points to the broader conceptualisation of this finding across all international dimensions of academic work.

6.4. Individual factors

The previous two sections have outlined the importance of institutional and disciplinary context to the international engagement of academic staff. Yet, this study shows that a range of other personal and individual factors also influences academic staff in the choices which they make about their work. These include prior international experience
and seniority in the academic career structure, which appear to have the strongest correlation with higher levels of international engagement for academic staff.

As outlined in Chapters 4 and 5, personal and demographic factors influenced the international dimensions of academic work for participants at both case study institutions. These findings resonate with a number of earlier studies which have shown that personal beliefs and values are important influencing factors for academic staff in terms of their international engagement (as discussed in Chapter 2). However, these factors do not appear to operate in isolation, but combine with institutional and disciplinary influences to form part of a complex set of contextual factors which influence the focus and types of international engagement chosen by academic staff. As such, the typology of international engagement conceptualised in this study is potentially subject to a complex set of influencing factors which vary from person to person, as much as they do from discipline to discipline, and from institution to institution.

### 6.4.1. Prior international experience

In this study, prior international experience of some type appears to strongly shape participants’ understandings of the world and to predispose them to greater international engagement in their work. As outlined in Chapter 4, this was particularly the case for those LTU participants who had lived and worked abroad or travelled overseas for other purposes. At UoM, on the other hand (as discussed in Chapter 5), it was those participants who were born outside Australia and spoke a language other than English who drew particular encouragement in their current work from their prior international experience. Looking at the sample as a whole, two thirds of participants indicated that they were influenced in some way by their prior international experiences, particularly where those were career-related. This aligns with earlier research which has pointed to the significance of prior international experience to the international engagement of academic staff, drawing both from their personal life (Mertova, 2014; Willis & Taylor, 2014) as well as their professional experience (Ray & Solem, 2009; Savishinsky, 2012).
Looking in particular at those participants in the sample who were both most and least internationally engaged, further data analysis supports this finding about the important influence of prior international experience. Of the seven most engaged participants, six of them had spent a period of time living and working overseas, whilst only two of the seven least engaged participants had done so. In tandem, the most internationally engaged participants were more likely to be influenced by their active interest in the world and world affairs. They were also motivated by the enjoyment that they derived from the international aspects of their work, including a desire to travel internationally. These findings align with prior research which has demonstrated the important influence on international engagement of periods of time spent living and work abroad (Bond et al., 2003) and individual values derived from past experiences (Finkelstein et al., 2013; Lemke, 2012).

The least internationally engaged participants, on the other hand, indicated that they had a lower level of general interest in the world. They did not speak about the international dimensions of their work with any passion, and certain of them perceived that their family commitments represented a barrier to their international engagement. This may partly explain why the seven least engaged participants were all women, whilst the most engaged participants were a mix of men and women. Although it is difficult to draw conclusions about the influence of gender based on the small sample size in this study, gender and family commitments may be an important factor for some people, as suggested in the broader body of research on academic work (see, for example, Clegg, 2008).

6.4.1. Career stage and seniority

More significant, however, is the role of career stage in the international engagement of academic staff. Of the seven most engaged participants, six are at Level D (Associate Professor) or Level E (Professor) with one at Level B (Lecturer). However, for the seven least engaged participants, four are at Level A (Tutor) or Level B (Lecturer) with the others at Level C (Senior Lecturer) and Level D (Associate Professor). Although career stage cannot therefore completely describe the choices made by academic staff about their work, this finding strongly implies that international engagement grows with seniority. Indeed, in many of these cases, it was the leadership roles which accompanied
that seniority which led to greater international engagement. Five of the seven most engaged participants held or had previously held a leadership role which provided exposure to a broader range of international dimensions in their work, as well as leading to a greater understanding of their institution’s international strategic agenda and how that was interpreted at the local level. Conversely, none of the least engaged participants held a leadership position, in some cases because of their more junior status in the academic career structure. These findings resonate with the numerous earlier studies which have focused on academic staff with higher levels of international engagement (including Agnew, 2013; Childress, 2010; Cooper & Mitsunaga, 2010; W. Green & Mertova, 2014). They also lend support to the proposal advanced by Schwietz (2006, p. iv) that higher levels of international experience lead to higher levels of international engagement by academic staff.

In many ways, seniority in the academic career cycle can be seen to reinforce the earlier international professional experience of academic staff, whereby time spent working in academia is in itself an influencing factor on the international dimensions of academic work. As outlined above, other significant elements of prior international experience include earlier periods of time living and working abroad, and a broader set of cosmopolitan attitudes and values which might predispose academic staff to greater international engagement. In a quantitative study in the US, Finkelstein et al (2009, p. 130) suggest that “faculty members who have spent some time abroad are 3- to 5-times more likely to have a research agenda which is international in orientation than those who have not spent time abroad”. Similarly, they conclude that ‘years spent abroad post-baccalaureate degree’ is a strong predictive variable in relation to academic choices about the internationalisation of the curriculum (Finkelstein et al., 2009, p. 132).

Although it is difficult to determine the particular significance of earlier international experience against other likely factors influencing the choices made by academic staff in their work, the findings of this study clearly chime with this earlier research.

What remains difficult to determine, however, is the potential cumulative effect of exposure to international engagement over the course of an academic career. As discussed in Chapter 4, certain participants (particularly in Science) had spent periods of time working in universities overseas at the outset of their career. This early professional
experience abroad appears to have facilitated the development of networks of future collaborators for academic staff who have now returned to Australia, and those staff now draw on these networks to seed their international research collaboration. In other cases, academic staff (generally in Business) had taken up the opportunity to teach their courses transnationally early in their career, and this had helped to shape their reflections on the suitability of their curriculum for international students. For some participants, this prior exposure was transformational to their attitudes towards international education and has led them to consider new opportunities for international engagement in their work, such as staff exchange or new research collaborations.

As discussed in Chapter 2, Blackburn and Lawrence (1995, p. 281) understand academic staff to be “complex individuals engaged in complex social relations in complex environments”. Given the variety of personal factors involved and the complex and disparate nature of academic work, it is not surprising that clear patterns of international engagement are hard to discern across the small sample for this study in the same way as they were for institutional and disciplinary context. However, it appears clear that the prior international experiences of individual staff, as well as their length of professional experience, shape their approach to international engagement in their work.

### 6.5. External context

Another factor which clearly appears to shape the international engagement of Australian academic staff is the unique geographic context of their country. As outlined in Chapters 4 and 5, Australia’s distance from the rest of the world has an important influence as both a driver of, and barrier to, the international dimensions of academic work at the two case study institutions. Although this factor has not previously been referenced in the literature on academic work or on the international engagement of academic staff, it appears to be important for academic staff in Australia.

Many participants saw Australia’s geographic isolation as a driver of their international engagement and were motivated to collaborate internationally in order to mitigate a sense of distance and remoteness. This relates closely to academic understandings about the borderless nature of knowledge generation and a range of personal, disciplinary and institutional expectations about how academic work is to be undertaken. However,
Australia’s distance from the rest of the world, and in particular from the global hubs of academic research in North America and Europe, was also seen as a barrier to the international dimensions of academic work. This distance imposes additional costs on Australian academic staff in terms of their time and their budgets, and underscores a gap between their expectations as members of an international knowledge community and the realities of effective international collaboration. For LTU participants in particular, the time cost imposed by Australia’s distance from the rest of the world was felt keenly in relation to their broader concerns about increased workloads. For UoM academic staff, on the other hand, Australia’s distance from the rest of the world appeared to be a less significant barrier to the international dimensions of their work and was only referenced by a small number of UoM participants.

Why do participants at the two case study institutions not see Australia’s geographic isolation in the same way? This could be explained by the fact that a large proportion of the UoM participants in this study had prior experience of working in academic positions outside Australia and/or were born overseas. These personal factors may well mitigate the potential sense of isolation and distance amongst this cohort. However, geographic isolation and distance are immutable in many ways. Despite significant advances in the length of time required to travel to and from Australia, Australia is still a long way from the rest of the world in comparative terms and the relative cost of travel to and from Australia is high. In relation to funding, UoM participants were more likely to indicate that they were influenced to engage in the international dimensions of their work because of their access to external funding (that is, funding from government or non-government sources outside the institution). Conversely, LTU participants referenced the lack of availability of external funding as a negative influence on their international work. In this light, it is possible that access to external funding serves to defray the additional cost of Australia’s distance from the rest of the world, thereby reducing distance as a barrier for the international engagement of academic staff.

As highlighted in Chapters 4 and 5, no specific reference has been made in the literature to geographic isolation or distance as an influence on the international dimensions of academic work. Yet, these appear to be important contextual factors for academic staff in Australia, which are potentially mitigated by access to funding. This finding suggests
that national context – in this instance, Australia’s geographic isolation – plays an important role in influencing the international dimensions of academic work.

6.6. Summary

The typology of international engagement conceptualised by this study has shown that academic staff engage in a wide range of international dimensions as part of their work, across their research, teaching, outreach and service. Yet, engagement with the international dimensions of research is predominant and this appears to be driven by the intersection of a complex set of contextual factors. Institutional context in both case study institutions encourages academic staff to focus on their research by reinforcing the relevance of research to career advancement. Although this is possibly to be expected in research intensive institutions such as UoM, it is perhaps less obvious that this would be the case at institutions with a more progressive mission and a clear focus on teaching and learning, such as LTU.

Beyond the influence of the institution, disciplinary context also shapes the choices which academic staff make about their international engagement. Accordingly, Science participants gave significant preference to the international dimensions of their research, whilst participants in Business had far stronger involvement in teaching. In a small number of cases, discipline-specific approaches to international engagement were also identified. In addition, individual and external factors also serve to influence how academic staff make choices about their work, leading to an invariably complex intersection of contextual factors. Importantly, the prior international experiences of individual academic staff appear to shape their approach to their work, although the parameters established for this study did not allow for the development of a more detailed framework for how these personal experiences intersect with other influencing factors.

Whilst the literature on institutional internationalisation points to a comprehensive focus touching on all aspects of an institution’s activities, the international dimensions of academic work appear to be predominantly centred on research. Similarly, whilst the focus of many earlier studies on the international engagement of academic staff has been on teaching and learning, this study has argued that the teaching dimensions of
academic work are significantly less dominant than academic staff engagement in the international aspects of research. In this light, the findings of this study indicate that the long history of internationalisation in Australian higher education has had limited effect on the international engagement of academic staff. This may have important implications for higher education institutions wishing to foster or encourage greater international engagement amongst their academic staff. This, and other implications of this study, will be discussed in the following chapter, as well as possible future directions for research and practice.
Chapter 7 MOVING BEYOND INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENT AS RESEARCH

Based on the importance attached to internationalisation by Australian universities and the assumption that institutional internationalisation is predicated on academic involvement, this study proposed that it was important to understand how academic staff engage with the international dimensions of their work. Yet, the findings of the study point to a disconnect between the significance attached to internationalisation by institutions and the international work undertaken by academic staff. This disconnect implies that the long history of internationalisation in Australian higher education, and the significant cohort of international students which this has given rise to, have had limited effect on the international engagement of academic staff. Indeed, the findings of the study suggest that institutional strategies in relation to internationalisation may not have led to the desired outcomes in relation to international engagement beyond research. Although Australian higher education institutions claim to value a wide range of international activities in their strategic plans and public statements, including the importance of global citizenship for students and opportunities for academic staff to develop industry engagement overseas, there appears to be limited involvement with these activities by academic staff.

7.1. Overview

For the academic staff participants in this study, the international dimensions of research were predominant, regardless of institution or discipline. As such, although it was reasonable to assume that academic staff had high levels of engagement with the international dimensions of their teaching based on the institutional strategies in place, this was not the case. This suggests that internationalisation (as an institutional strategy) has failed to penetrate in any significant way beyond the research aspects of academic work. In this respect, this study supports findings in the literature which show that international strategies have limited influence on the work of academic staff (Savishinsky, 2012; Warwick & Moogan, 2013).

In many ways, however, academic choices about the focus of their work can be seen as an inherent response to the broader effects of internationalisation on their institutions. Although global rankings of universities are increasingly crucial for attracting international students, one of their impacts on academic staff has been an increasing
focus on a competitive international context focused on measurable research output and institutional rankings. As highlighted in a recent study into institutional rationales for internationalisation, “being embedded in a globally competitive arena for status spurs a conception of internationalization as instrumental to prestige” (Seeber, Cattaneo, Huisman, & Paleari, 2016, p. 698). This competitive international focus at institutional level appears to have encouraged academic staff to focus attention on their research, rather than on their teaching. Furthermore, as shown in this study, promotion and career advancement opportunities for academic staff are still largely framed in terms of research, thereby reinforcing academic rationales for choosing research over teaching in relation to their international engagement.

The findings from this study also suggest that the international dimensions of academic work are frequently understood as being concrete activities which involve international travel. It is in this context that participants in the study expressed their concerns about Australia’s geographic isolation and the costs inherent in international engagement. Yet, many of the international dimensions of teaching can be undertaken locally, for example, in relation to the internationalisation of the curriculum or the teaching of international students. Furthermore, the multicultural nature of Australian society ideally lends itself to internationalisation at home. Perhaps, however, those international dimensions which can be undertaken locally are considered to be less prestigious in academic communities precisely because they do not involve international travel. If this is the case, then it may be that the very nature of the international dimensions of teaching obviates against greater involvement by academic staff, in addition to other factors related to career advancement or institutional and disciplinary expectations regarding research output.

Many earlier studies into the international engagement of academic staff take as their starting point the role or influence of international strategy on the international activities of an institution, its staff and students. However, this study chose to approach the international dimensions of academic work from the perspective of academic staff themselves. As outlined above, this thesis has argued that institutional international strategy per se is not a significant influence on the international engagement of academic staff. Indeed, in some instances, it appears that academic understandings of their
institution’s international strategy directly encourage them to distance themselves from what they consider to be the principal focus of their institution, that is, the recruitment of fee-paying international students and an increased financial dependency on the revenue secured by this activity. In this context, many participants in this study expressed concerns about their institution’s international strategy and the flow-on effects in relation to their teaching and the diversity of the student body. For some participants, this represented another ‘push’ factor away from international engagement in teaching, although others were more ready to accept the changes to their campus communities brought by the large-scale presence of international students and saw this as an opportunity to review and revise their teaching practice.

Academic responses to international education may also be shaped by disciplinary affiliation and influenced by the types of international students to which the different disciplines are exposed. In this study, for example, it was more common for Science participants to supervise international research students, many of whom were directly contributing to the research output of their supervisors in laboratory environments. For Business participants, on the other hand, their principal involvement with international students was in large undergraduate classroom settings and these students had little or no formal role in the participants’ own research agendas.

While the recent research literature has focused largely on the internationalisation of the curriculum, the findings from this study indicate that there is little focus on this aspect of international engagement amongst the participants. This raises questions about why earlier research has focused on an aspect of academic work which appears to be less prevalent in the lived experience of academic staff. Could this relate to an assumption that the international dimensions of research are firmly embedded in understandings of academic work, given strong connections with disciplinary norms and expectations, as well as institutional performance and promotion criteria? Although this study did not set out to explore this question, it encourages reflection on the likely connections and correspondence between the various international dimensions of academic work. Is it the case, for example, that academic staff are more likely to engage in the international dimensions of their teaching if they already have involvement internationally in their research? In considering this issue, it was clear that some connection existed between
international engagement in different clusters of academic work. Two early career participants in this study indicated that their departments would only support the international aspects of their teaching (for example, involvement in transnational education or the development and delivery of an overseas study tour for students) if these did not stand in the way of their research or, indeed, if they had potential to lead to tangible collaborations which would support their research. This further reinforces the predominance of research as the foundational paradigm for the international engagement of academic staff.

7.2. Implications for Policy and Practice

The findings of this study have implications for how institutions shape their international strategies and policies in relation to academic staff. Should institutions wish to foster or encourage a broader range of international engagement amongst their academic staff, this study argues that they should first recognise the complex and interweaving nature of the factors which influence academic staff in relation to the international dimensions of their work. Individual institutions may wish to consider targeted policy responses to this confluence of influencing factors based on their own local environment. However, the following proposals may be of broad relevance to any institution.

Recognising the important influence of aspirations for future career advancement on the participants in this study, one suggestion is for institutions to review their academic promotion frameworks and other incentives to ensure that they align with institutional goals in relation to internationalisation. A recent US report looks at the ways in which institutional policies are being used to promote a more globally focused faculty (Helms, 2015). Despite the different national context, this report may offer a number of insights for policy and practice at Australian institutions, particularly in the deliberate use of inclusive language in promotion criteria. In this context, promotion criteria which stipulate that academic staff should have a “national and international” focus in their teaching, for example, are likely to foster greater international engagement than those which refer to a “national or international” focus or indeed a “national and/or international” focus (Helms, 2015, pp. 36–37).
Acknowledging that institutional strategies do not directly influence the international engagement of academic staff, institutions could also review the role of leadership at the local level in fostering greater international engagement beyond research. Whilst international leadership at the level of the faculty or college (such as an Associate Dean International) may serve a useful purpose in representing the views of the faculty/college to the institution itself, very few participants in this study were influenced by that leadership role in their work. By contrast, leadership at the level of the department (or the laboratory) and discussions with local colleagues were more influential on individual academic staff. In this light, local disciplinary leaders may play a crucial role in shaping understandings about the international dimensions of academic work in their local environment.

Beyond local leadership, institutions should also reconsider the availability of funding, or indeed technology, to mitigate the geographic barrier to the international engagement of Australian academic staff. The more ready availability of funding at one of the case study institutions certainly appeared to mitigate the effect of Australia’s distance from the rest of the world. Although not mentioned in this study, there is also potentially a role for the greater use of videoconferencing and other technologies to reduce the impost of Australia’s geographic isolation. Despite these technologies being readily available today, the predominant focus of the participant responses in this study related to international engagement by way of international travel and opportunities for face-to-face collaboration. As mentioned above, this is no doubt the dominant paradigm for how academic staff perceive of the international aspects of their work, and prior international experience is an important influencing factor in this regard. As such, institutions may not wish to shift the balance radically between travel and technology. They could, however, reflect on the duration and purpose of the travel undertaken by their academic staff. Finkelstein et al (2013, p. 338) conclude that the best way to ensure the internationalisation of US academic staff is to give them an opportunity to receive a sustained international experience over several weeks or months. This highlights an opportunity for Australian institutions to review their policies and funding allocations for longer term international experiences, such as outside studies programs or staff exchange.
7.3. Recommendations for Further Research

The findings from the study highlight the need for further investigation into the full range of international engagement by academic staff and, in particular, into the connections which may exist between the international dimensions of research and the international dimensions of other aspects of academic work. Whilst the drivers of international engagement in research appear to be fairly clear, little is known about what drives international engagement in teaching and outreach, nor about the possible correlations between international engagement in different clusters of academic work.

Given the predominant focus of earlier studies into the experiences of more senior and more internationally engaged academic staff, this study also points to the need for more detailed exploration of the international engagement of early career academics. Similarly, with growing casualisation of the academic workforce in Australia, recently estimated at 50-70% of the undergraduate teaching workforce (Andrews et al., 2016, p. 13), it would be beneficial to understand in more detail how academic staff in contingent employment engage with the international dimensions of their work.

One of the novel findings from this study relates to the influence of Australia’s geographic isolation, and it is possible that this contextual factor of distance is felt even more strongly in non-English-speaking countries without the same historical connections to the major centres of academia in Europe and North America. Further research into the applicability of this finding in other national contexts may provide additional insights.

Finally, this study was undertaken at two universities in a single Anglophone country, and further research investigating whether these findings may be repeated in other national and international contexts would add to our understanding of the topic.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1 - Participant recruitment questionnaire

[See over]
This questionnaire forms part of a PhD study conducted by Douglas Proctor under the supervision of Associate Professor Sophie Arkoudis and Dr Chi Baik at the Melbourne Centre for the Study of Higher Education, The University of Melbourne.

The aim of the study is to investigate the factors which influence the international engagement of academic staff in Australian universities. "International engagement" is defined as the collective set of international activities undertaken by academic staff across all dimensions of their professional work in higher education.

A Plain Language Statement regarding the study is available here.

This questionnaire is intended to collect simple demographic information, as well as background on your employment and experience in higher education. It will also gather information about your personal/professional international experience. I appreciate the demands on your time and estimate that the questionnaire should take around 5 minutes to complete.

Based on the questionnaire data, a sample of questionnaire respondents will be invited for a 45-60 minute interview. This interview will focus on the international aspects of your work and the international activities in which you engage as an academic.

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary and questionnaire/interview responses will remain anonymous. If you have any concerns about any aspect of your participation in the project, you can contact the Manager, Human Research Ethics, Office for Research Ethics and Integrity, University of Melbourne, at 03 8344 2073 quoting the ID number 1443254.1.

If you are willing to participate in this project, please click NEXT below. Thank you in advance for your support of this project.

* 1. Where were you born?
   - [ ] Australia
   - [ ] Overseas
2. If you were born overseas:
In which country were you born? 

How many years have you lived in Australia?

* 3. Please nominate your University:
- [ ] La Trobe University
- [ ] The University of Melbourne

Academic staff and international engagement
About your work at La Trobe University

4. Which College are you affiliated with at La Trobe University?
- [ ] College of Arts, Social Sciences and Commerce (ASSC)
- [ ] College of Science, Health and Engineering (SHE)

Academic staff and international engagement
About your work at the College of Arts, Social Sciences and Commerce

5. Please indicate your principal Department
- [ ] Department of Accounting
- [ ] Department of Management and Marketing
- [ ] Department of Economics and Finance

Note: This study is targeted at academic staff in business/economics disciplines, that is, in the La Trobe Business School within the College of Arts, Social Sciences and Commerce (ASSC).
6. Please indicate your principal Department

- Department of Animal, Plant and Soil Sciences (School of Life Sciences)
- Department of Ecology, Environment and Evolution (School of Life Sciences)
- Department of Physiology, Anatomy and Microbiology (School of Life Sciences)
- Murray Darling Freshwater Research Centre (School of Life Sciences)
- Department of Biochemistry and Genetics (School of Molecular Sciences)
- Department of Chemistry and Physics (School of Molecular Sciences)
- Department of Pharmacy and Applied Science (School of Molecular Sciences)

Note: This study is targeted at academic staff in science disciplines, in particular in the Schools of Life Sciences and Molecular Sciences within the College of Science, Health and Engineering (SHE).

7. Which Faculty are you affiliated with at the University of Melbourne?

- Faculty of Business and Economics / Melbourne Business School
- Faculty of Science

Note: This study is targeted at academic staff in business/economics and science disciplines only.
8. Please indicate your principal Department/School

- Department of Accounting
- Department of Business Administration
- Department of Economics
- Department of Finance
- Department of Management and Marketing
- Melbourne Business School
- Melbourne Institute of Applied Economic and Social Research

9. Please indicate your principal School

- School of BioSciences
- School of Chemistry
- School of Earth Sciences
- School of Ecosystem and Forest Sciences
- School of Geography
- School of Physics
- Office for Environmental Programs
- Bio21 Molecular Science and Biotechnology Institute

**Note:** This study is targeted at academic staff in a range of science disciplines, as listed above. However, for the purposes of the case study, responses are not sought from academic staff in the School of Mathematics and Statistics.
10. What is your level of employment?
- Level E (Professor; Professorial Fellow)
- Level D (Associate Professor; Principal Research Fellow)
- Level C (Senior Lecturer; Senior Research Fellow)
- Level B (Lecturer; Research Fellow)
- Level A (Tutor; Research Fellow)

11. In which year were you first appointed at this level?

12. What best describes your current position?

13. Experience in higher education
   How many years have you worked in higher education?
   How many years have you been in your current position?

14. Highest qualification
- PhD
- Masters
- Other postgraduate
- Bachelors

15. Where was this qualification obtained?
About your international experience

* 16. Do you speak a language other than English?

☐ 

17. If yes, what other language(s) do you speak?

☐ 

* 18. Have you ever lived in another country for an extended period?

☐ 

19. If yes, in which country/ies and for how many months/years did you live there?

☐ 

* 20. Reflecting on your work as an academic, how would you rate your level of international engagement in relation to other colleagues in your Department/School?

☐ Very low

☐ Low

☐ Moderate

☐ High

☐ Very high

Prev Next
Academic staff and international engagement

About you

* 21. Contact information
Name

Email Address

* 22. What is your age?

- 18 to 24
- 25 to 34
- 35 to 44
- 45 to 54
- 55 to 64
- 65 to 74
- 75 or older

* 23. What is your gender?

- Female
- Male

Academic staff and international engagement

Thank you

To finalise the questionnaire, please click DONE below. Based on the responses to this questionnaire, a sample of respondents will be approached to participate in an interview. Confirmation will be provided to all questionnaire respondents on their selection or otherwise for interview.

Thank you once again for your support of this project.
Appendix 2 - Interview schedule

Thank you for your willingness to participate in this project and to be interviewed today. As you will have seen, I’m studying the international engagement of academic staff in Australian universities and am taking a case study of two institutions in Victoria.

By “international engagement”, I’m referring to all of the international activities and international involvement of staff in all aspects of their work as academics, be it in teaching, research or service and outreach.

Purpose of interview is to provide empirical data for a PhD study. A short set of questions - interview to take between 45 mins and an hour.

Before we begin - consent form (to sign and return) and copy of Plain Language Statement (to keep)

- Approval to record
- Responses will be kept confidential, but may be possible to identify based on small number of people being interviewed

I’ll also just quickly confirm the demographic and other information you provided in the online questionnaire

- Any corrections/clarifications?

During the interview, I may take some brief notes. However, I'll try to keep this to a minimum.

After the interview, the recording will be transcribed. I'll be using pseudonyms to refer to respondents in my writing, but will come back to you for your permission if I choose to directly quote from what you’ve said.
So, I have seven broad questions to ask about the international aspects of your work. Before we finish the interview, I’ll also make sure that you have an opportunity to bring up any other matters, or to ask questions of me.

If we’re OK to proceed, let me turn on the recording and ask you an initial question:

1) Thinking about all aspects of your work as an academic, can you tell me about the various international activities that you engage in?
   • [For staff in international leadership positions] Roughly what proportion of your international activity is spent on your international leadership role, as opposed to the other international dimensions of your work?

2) In your opinion, what has motivated you to become involved with the international aspects of your work?

3) What types of international engagement are likely to become more important to you as you progress in your career?

4) In your mind, what are the positives and negatives of internationalisation in higher education today?

5) What value do your academic colleagues place on international engagement and different international activities?

6) To what extent do you think that your university’s international strategy drives the international engagement of academic staff in your department?
   • or Faculty/Departmental strategy?

7) Where do you see barriers for you and your colleagues to engage with the international aspects of your work?

I have no further questions. Is there anything else you would like to bring up, or ask about, before we finish the interview?
Appendix 3 - Plain Language Statement

[See over]
PLAIN LANGUAGE STATEMENT

Project: “Academic staff and international engagement: motivations and drivers in Australian higher education”

Introduction
You are invited to participate in the above study, which is being conducted by Douglas Proctor (PhD candidate) under the supervision of Associate Professor Sophie Arkoudis and Dr Chi Baik at the Melbourne Centre for the Study of Higher Education, The University of Melbourne.

The aim of the study is to investigate the factors which influence the international engagement of academic staff in Australian universities. This study has been approved by the Melbourne Graduate School of Education Human Ethics Advisory Group under delegated authority from the University of Melbourne Humanities and Applied Sciences Human Ethics Sub-Committee.

What will I be asked to do?
Should you agree to participate, you will be initially asked to complete a 5 minute online questionnaire. This questionnaire will collect simple demographic information, as well as background on your employment and experience in higher education. It will also gather information about your personal and professional international experience.

Based on the questionnaire data, a sample of questionnaire respondents (representing a range of career stages and international experience) will be invited for a 45-60 minute interview. This interview will focus on the international aspects of your work and the international activities in which you engage as an academic. With your permission, this interview will be digitally recorded to provide an accurate record of what you say. When the recording has been transcribed, you will be provided with a copy of the transcript, so that you can verify that the information is correct and/or request modifications. The total time commitment required of you would not exceed 90 minutes.

How will my confidentiality be protected?
We intend to protect your anonymity and the confidentiality of your responses to the fullest possible extent, within the limits of the law. Your name and contact details will be kept in a separate, password-protected computer file from any data that you supply. Only the researchers will be able to link your name to your responses, for example, in order to know where we should send your interview transcript for checking. In the final report, you will be referred to by a pseudonym. We will remove any references to personal information that might allow someone to guess your identity. However, you should note that it is possible that someone may still be able to identify you, as the number of people we are seeking to interview is small. The data will be kept securely in the Melbourne Centre for the Study of Higher Education for five years from the date of publication, before being destroyed.

How will I receive feedback?
Once the thesis arising from this research has been completed, a summary project report on the research findings will be sent to interested participants who indicate that they wish to receive a copy (see Consent Form for relevant section). It is also envisaged that the results will be presented at academic conferences and/or published.

Do I have to take part?
Participation in this study is voluntary. Should you wish to withdraw at any stage, or to withdraw any unprocessed data you have supplied, you are free to do so without prejudice. Your decision to participate or not, or to withdraw, will not affect your relationship with the Melbourne Centre for the Study of Higher Education or affect any services you may receive now or in the future.

Where can I get further information?
Please contact the researchers (see contact details below) if you have any questions or if would like more information about the project. If you have any concerns about the conduct of the project which you do not wish to discuss with the research team, please contact the Manager, Human Research Ethics, Office for Research Ethics and Integrity, The University of Melbourne (T: 03 8344 2073, F: fax 9347 6739).

How do I agree to participate?
If you would like to participate, please complete the online questionnaire at https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/XGNF9NB. On the basis of your responses, the researchers will subsequently contact a sample of respondents to arrange a mutually convenient time for an interview.

Assoc Prof Sophie Arkoudis
Supervisor
Ph: 03 8344 7434
E: s.arkoudis@unimelb.edu.au

Dr Chi Baik
Supervisor
T: 03 8344 4212
E: cbaik@unimelb.edu.au

Mr Douglas Proctor
PhD Candidate
T: 0417 018 385
E: d.proctor@student.unimelb.edu.au

HREC: 1443254.1; Date: 6/03/15; Version: 1.0. interview
Appendix 4 - Participant consent form

[See over]
MELBOURNE CENTRE FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Consent form for persons participating in a research project

PROJECT TITLE: ACADEMIC STAFF AND INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENT: MOTIVATIONS AND
DRIVERS IN AUSTRALIAN HIGHER EDUCATION

Name of participant:

Name of investigator(s): Douglas Proctor

Names of supervisors: Assoc Prof Sophie Arkoudis; Dr Chi Baik

1. I consent to participate in this project, the details of which have been explained to me, and I have been provided with a written plain language statement to keep.

2. I understand that after I sign and return this consent form it will be retained by the researcher.

3. I understand that my participation will involve an interview and I agree that the researcher may use the results as described in the plain language statement.

4. I acknowledge that:
   (a) the possible effects of participating in the interview have been explained to my satisfaction;
   (b) I have been informed that I am free to withdraw from the project at any time without explanation or prejudice and to withdraw any unprocessed data I have provided;
   (c) the project is for the purpose of research;
   (d) I have been informed that the confidentiality of the information I provide will be safeguarded subject to any legal requirements;
   (e) I have been informed that with my consent the interview will be audio-taped and I understand that audio-tapes will be stored at the University of Melbourne and will be destroyed after five years;
   (f) my name will be referred to by a pseudonym in any publications arising from the research, although it may still be possible to identify me based on the small number of people being interviewed;
   (g) I have been informed that a copy of the research findings will be forwarded to me, should I agree to this.

I consent to this interview being audio-taped  □ Yes  □ No (please tick)

I wish to receive a copy of the summary project report on research findings  □ Yes  □ No (please tick)

Participant signature:     Date:

HREC: 1443254.1; Date: 6/03/15; Version: 1.0. interview

Melbourne Graduate School of Education
100 Leicester Street | The University of Melbourne Victoria 3010 | Australia
T: +61 3 8344 8285 F: +61 3 8344 8213 W: www.education.unimelb.edu.au
Appendix 5 - Annotated interview

Questionnaire data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Frank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>45 to 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born where?</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Australia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>La Trobe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/College</td>
<td>College of Arts, Social Sciences and Commerce (ASSC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/School</td>
<td>Department of Management &amp; Marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of employment</td>
<td>Level B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since which year?</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of current position?</td>
<td>Teaching &amp; Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in higher education</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in this position</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest qualification</td>
<td>PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where obtained?</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTE?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which LOTE?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived o/s?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where and how long?</td>
<td>Hong Kong, 2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of international engagement</td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview date – 18 June 2015

0.00 Principal engagement is in working with international students in Australia – large numbers at LTU, particularly in business

1.00 Draws insights from having travelled in Asia, business is important in Asia, whilst sport/recreation are frivolous pursuits. So lots of Asians come to LTU to study business and some choose Sports Management subjects. Small number of int’l students choose to study Sports Management as a major, but small compared to enrolments in electives. Teaching discipline = sports management, but research interest in environmental sustainability/climate change & sports management...

2.00 Just starting to teach into this research area (starting Semester 2 this year). Teaching Asian students is main activity – just currently marking Semester 1 assessments
(some issues & some encouraging material). Another international dimension is in research. Has to publish his research (expectation) – as a consequence, has approaches from international students to supervise their research...

3.00 Mainly from Middle East. Hasn’t taken anyone up on this yet for a range of reasons. Tied to research = public profile (if small). Occasionally approached for written work by publishing houses or for comment by journalists – e.g. approached by US journalist for interview on sport and climate change.

4.00 Found through Google and his was a recurring name in that field. Has yet to teach overseas, but may do that in the future – might do so if given the opportunity, depending on family circumstances & also gets home sick fairly quickly. Tries not to prioritise work over his family. Also, international conferences – initial reference to meeting international students at these conferences & discussions re. supervision possibilities.

5.00 Main international conference is SMAANZ (Aus & NZ), but also in USA and Europe. Asian conference too, but yet to attend that. Therefore, mainly in Anglosphere. Another international dimension is with inbound exchange students...

6.00 Who he finds interesting and engaging. They’re often more accomplished students. Re. conference attendance, he’s attended the regional conference but not yet been to the USA/Europe ones as he’s an early career researcher. However, these are on his list of things to do in the next couple of years. But publication record comes before conferences (although interwoven). Re. international research collaboration...

7.00 Became aware (through PhD) that the leading figures in his field are all in North America (Canada & USA). One of them was one of his PhD examiners, so – when looking for people to write or publish with – they’re on his list, particularly the examiner. Hoping to develop a working relationship with her and her colleagues. On his research agenda = get one/two articles out with supervisor and then approach North Americans to publish with...
8.00 TransPacific partnership of kinds – no real sense of how it would work out or whether they’ll agree to collaborate with him. However, he wants to collaborate with like-minded people in his discipline area and, given that he’s about the only person in this field in Australia (one more at Deakin), there’s no-one here to write with. Lots of local colleagues but not specialists in his area. Therefore one reason for conference attendance is to meet these researchers overseas and to develop relationships which will lead to working/writing relationships.

9.00 Considers this to be most interesting (if unexplored) part of his international engagement – invests most hope in this! In an ideal world (in 2-3 years’ time), he’ll be publishing papers with North Americans. Has a clear sense of career agenda for the future and this is based on discussions with a leading academic at LTU (and one of the key reasons why Frank came to work here)...

10.00 Entering 3rd year of probation and this mentor has helped Frank to sketch out a 6-pronged research strategy – 1) Publish some articles to build up international profile, 2) Stage an international symposium in Australia with invitations to key researchers, 3) Encourage publication of symposium papers in an edited book for which Frank would be the editor...

11.00 4) Then look at international partnership with some of the North Americans to investigate comparative international perspectives on his discipline. Requires research in Australia but may be attractive to North Americans. As a pioneer in his discipline, having empirical work available for comparison and sharing in the academic scholarly community is a necessary part of his development as an academic.

12.00 Academic mentor at LTU has been influential in shaping Frank’s career thinking. He knows the game really well and how to progress through the levels, including conference attendance and forging alliances with people you might write with. This mentor doesn’t really write much with overseas co-authors, but...

13.00 Strong encouragement from him for Frank to identify the key people overseas and then work with them. Encouraged Frank to write to the North Americans, set up a meeting in the sidelines of a Nth American conference to introduce Frank, then invite...
them to LTU on a teaching fellowship for 3-6 months to build the connection, then Frank to go to one of their universities on a reciprocal basis. All designed to give ballast to a relationship – all talk at this stage, but planning is in place.

14.00 “You have to imagine what the future might be before you go and create it, so there’s many hurdles to cross before we get to that, but in an ideal world, three to four years from now, I’ll be writing with these North Americans...” Also interested in working with Europeans, as he sees relevance of his research to a European context. Given paucity of people in Australia to work with, international collaboration makes sense. Re. mentor support, there is financial support too – this mentor has paid out some of Frank’s UG marking so he can...

15.00 Finish PhD and then get on with some articles. Naturally, funding the next round of research will require access to competitive funding, but there is moral and financial support in the early stages. Re. PhD supervision, he was encouraged to go to conferences...

16.00 And to network/introduced himself. Went to SMAANZ conferences in NZ and Brisbane. Also, PhD supervisor supported Frank’s choice of a North American examiner for his thesis (given that leading figures were there). The supervisor wrote to this person and she was very happy to be involved

17.00 She gave very positive feedback on his PhD. Of course, one external examiner was required for PhD anyway, so this support was institutional (a requirement), not just from the supervisor.

18.00 “When I talk with colleagues, we know that we work in an international world now. Two of the three major conferences are outside Australia, so we’re expected to go to those conferences and to mix with people from overseas.” Principally the Anglosphere, in his discipline – less in Asia, but there is emerging academic interest in Asia. “It’s a norm now” For example, on the editorial board of SMAANZ, there are now people who are not Aus or NZ-based (Americans & Canadians)
19.00 As such, international aspect of discipline is there already and Frank is stepping on structures that have already been created in his own research. Re. career planning & international engagement, he starts from a disciplinary focus – climate change is real & means a lot for Australia cf. vulnerability of ecosystems...

20.00 Therefore, reasons to believe that climate & climate change mean something for sport in Australia, but research is needed. Frank is curious about what that means comparatively – in cool climates? in tropical climates? As such, he hopes (at some point) to be able to encourage people to pursue these comparative perspectives in his discipline.

21.00 (Continues to reflect on what future directions of his research might be)

22.00 Research points to climate-specific and geographic-specific responses to sports management – worthy of comparison. Where are the intersections and commonalities? Wants to build networks in his research in order to facilitate this future comparative research. You do this by going to conferences, presenting on your research, doing the research, developing networks with like-minded people, then asking others to contribute... Another prong to his personal research strategy is to edit a special issue of...

23.00 One of the major sports management journals. Requires preparatory work in terms of publications/research to put you in a strong position for this. “Of course, the other thing that is international about research is that, when we as academics say “what is the literature?”, “who are the key figures in the literature?”, “what are the key research problems?”, “what are the key methods?” and so on, the literature itself is by definition international” [23.23-23.42] Therefore, engaging with existing academic structures brings exposure to the international world.

24.00 Regardless of his own initiatives, ‘internationality’ is embedded in the nature of academic work and facilitates future collaboration. Just written a chapter for a Routledge handbook on sport and sustainability – fairly new area
In doing so, had to engage with the small body of existing literature (mostly in North America, but some in Asia). Routledge opportunity came from one of his academic colleagues (now in College leadership role)...

Who is co-editor of this Routledge Handbook. Frank was approached to write this, given his reputation/tagline as the sports and sustainability person (even though he has much more experience in sports management per se). Therefore, presence of another academic mentor was crucial to this opportunity appearing so early in his career.

This mentor also on editorial board of SMAANZ and is closely involved in the world of publishing in sports management. Therefore, an opportunity which Frank couldn’t say no to. Frank sees having academic mentors as crucial – lack of this support means that you don’t progress in your career.

Re. HE internationalisation more broadly, personally finds it enriching to be working with international UG students (particularly from Asia), a downside is that many of them study in their second language and this brings problems. So, cultural enrichment for him (and maybe domestic students) on the one hand, but classroom can also be a fraught place for international students. Eng language skills may be advanced in home country...

But writing here in their second language. Email from student today (Chinese) in broken English, but her group assignment was in polished written English – hard for him to reconcile. Assumption that she paid someone to help with her written work. Issue raised with colleague/discipline leader and he agreed that there was an issue, but counselled against pursuing it.

So, a negative of int’n, but he is aware how difficult it must be to study in a second language. He couldn’t do it in China. Having international students come here is a good thing, but this has led to dependency. Federal governments have walked away from funding universities over a quarter century. Proposed budget cuts (stalled in Senate)....
31.00 Would make us more dependent on int’l student revenue. Very worried about this. Having international students is great, but should we be dependent on the int’l student market/currency exchange rates? No. Problems with essay factories are another negative – current news story on how easy it is to purchase an essay.

32.00 “If that’s the way that internationalisation is working in higher education, I really wonder if that’s a good idea” [32.01-32.10] Re. extent of this issue at LTU, has come across a few cases of this – int’l students who’ve clearly used someone else to produce their work. Not the same as having a critical eye cast over your work, but actually having it done for you.

33.00 E.g. students who say nothing in class, but produce written work in polished English. Struggling to reconcile this himself cf. integrity of students and integrity of universities. Re. positives of international students on campus, he thinks it’s good for Australians. Aus HE exists in historical context – White Australia policy until 1972 has led to lots of white-skinned people on campus. No accident.

34.00 Waves of recent migration to Aus have in most cases contributed to this country. But migration was distorted up until 1970s, so largely white population (Anglo-Celtic). It’s a shame that that historical position has meant that it’s only in last couple of decades that we’ve become more multicultural...

35.00 Fraser, policy, SBS... But we’re now much more ethnically diverse than we’ve ever been (1 in 4 born overseas). That’s a good thing and it’s playing out in his own life. Currently trying to learn to speak Hindi. As a sports person, has a strong interest in cricket. His partner speaks Mandarin and Indonesian, has travelled extensively in Asia. Therefore, she is influencing him.

36.00 Her international engagement has been a good thing for him and has rubbed off on him in terms of his attitudes towards other people. Family decision to learn a language all together (him, partner & two kids) – didn’t want to choose Mandarin (where his partner is already strong), so Hindi was chosen as an alternative, especially given links to cricket. This choice has been validated with increased migration from India. More opportunity to practice conversational Hindi here.
Considers himself to be positively disposed towards Asian culture (in particular Indian). This is all playing out in his own life and maybe they wouldn't to the same extent if his partner wasn't Asian-focused. Hopes to use Hindi in a work context, but doesn’t think that he'll gain the right level of proficiency for this.

Further reflection (and previously discussed with colleagues) - Asian students bring their culture with them to the classrooms, which is great, but notions such as loss of face are also brought with them (eg. deference to authority). “One of the challenges, I find, is being able to optimally engage with Asian students, but that requires Asian literacy and that requires immersion, ideally, in Asian culture” [38.46-39.00]

Or access to workshops on how to understand Asian peoples and cultures and what that means in a classroom. Then expands this out to reference people from the Middle East and the different cultural/dress norms there (not yet encountered by him in his work). Has no idea how to engage with that.

Re. training/development of Asian literacy, feels that this has come from his partner and he’s travelled with her in Asia and lived for a short period in Hong Kong, i.e. not drawn from his work as an academic. However, this has enabled him to do his job better – more empathy for Asian students. Some of the domestic students at LTU don’t’ have this sympathy for students from other cultures...

Perhaps he was like that too at their age, but he’s now richer for his travels and having learnt different ways of thinking/understanding. Re. other benefits of int’n for staff, air travel is a positive, except for its negative impact on the environment.

Not his individual responsibility, but a collective responsibility re. increased air travel more broadly. However, travel is a great educator in itself. He really appreciates the opportunities he’s had to travel and engage educationally with other people. As such, when domestic students approach him re. outbound mobility, he actively supports them by writing academic references...

Really tries to support them to get them to go. This did great things for him and he wants them to have the same experience. When you go and come back, you see that
the world is different to Australia and that there are different ways of understanding. You come back with greater maturity and become a better citizen here. He feels that we ought to be engaged with the world internationally. Re. discussions with academic colleagues...

44.00 Difficulties with domestic and international student interactions is discussed, cf. group assignments (put in place for efficiency reasons, rather than pedagogical). Group formation has not been managed in his units, but he recognises that other staff do this better by intervening. However, that takes time and it is more time for teaching rather than research...

45.00 Some groups this semester were dysfunctional, leading to complaints from domestic students re. quality of international student work. Common discussion with colleagues and his solution is to abandon group assignments for following semester. Also talk about language difficulties of students – student from Nepal likely to fail all subjects...

46.00 Aware of earthquake in Nepal and effect on this student. Also, an international student presented this year with a documented learning difficulty (first time he’d seen this). Although empathetic...

47.00 This was a lot of extra work. Re. discussions with colleagues about research, this frequently focuses on requests for PhD supervision from abroad. Frank’s been trying to find out from colleagues how to respond to these requests...

48.00 Colleagues have advised that they invariably say no, as international students are harder work by virtue of language difficulties. Not currently supervising any PhD students, but cautioned not to take a student with potentially weak English. They take longer to finish their thesis and it’s harder work for the supervisor.

49.00 Reference to postgrad work being edited by a third party. Int’l students at PG level pose particular difficulties, so although he’s supportive of them coming here and helping them, “one of the dilemmas I face as an academic is that, because my job (...) I’m judged on my academic output, so if I take on an international student and they’ve got
language problems, I’m doing all the work and it’s affecting my own research productivity and I’m closer to getting the chop” [49.42-50.07] (in the context of 350 job losses at LTU in 2014)

50.00 Not fair to international students, but a result of a system where you have to put your own survival first. Rightly or wrongly, plays into his thinking when approached to supervise international students. Re. awareness of institutional international strategy...

51.00 Only aware in vaguest sense. Struggling to keep up with other responsibilities & email. Aware of engagement with rest of world, cf. partnerships. Some of his senior colleagues were recently in India to visit management of Indian Premier League cricket competition. Placement students have now gone over there. Part of strategy to be outward-looking, engaged with the rest of the world, partnering with the best...

52.00 Doesn’t see this as having any direct effect on what he does. But, if he wants to work with Nth Americans, he’s confident that LTU would support this aspect of his work. Funding is available from the College to attend one to two conferences per year, with one being overseas. Re. barriers, government policy is not helping...

53.00 Prime Minister’s comments on terrorism and Middle East. Australia hasn’t invested much in Asian languages – people like him are monolingual and trying to learn a language in his late 40s. This should have been at school. Money is always a barrier. Student selection processes...

54.00 IELTS scores are supposed to be at a certain level, but in the classroom, they’re poor. Maybe LTU recruits students that it shouldn’t. As such, their capacity to succeed is given less attention than the money they bring. Potential impost on his time as a lecturer.

55.00 Poor communication skills due to lack of English & no contribution in tutorials. Students don’t have the confidence to speak in front of others. Therefore, recruitment processes for ESL students are problematic. Re. his career agenda, lack of funding to support travel to Nth America would be a major issue, but he doesn’t foresee this being a problem
However, he’s aware that there are limits to the funding that LTU will provide to support him in his research. This will depend on whether LTU sees that there will be a return on their investment in terms of publications etc. One of the biggest hurdles = teaching workloads (i.e. number of subjects, supervision of sessional staff).

Direct correlation with reduced research output during semester time. As such, teaching workload is a major barrier to being an internationally engaged academic. Fears that having a lot of teaching on his CV will mean less opportunity for research in the future, i.e. pigeon-holing as a teaching academic. However, his career plan is research-focused. Constant tension between teaching and research.

[Close of interview]
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