

## **Internationalization as a response to globalization: Radical shifts in university environments**

NELLY P. STROMQUIST

*Rossier School of Education, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, 90089-4039, USA (E-mail: stromqui@usc.edu)*

**Abstract.** This case study probes recent developments in a number of academic and non-academic aspects of a private research university in response to current globalization trends. Under the name of internationalization, university administrators and external firms are emerging as powerful decision-makers shaping academic content and even academic governance. This is manifested in student recruitment and in the hiring of prestigious professors and researchers to increase university reputation and thus to appeal to more students and secure more research funds. Among disciplines central to economic and technological globalization, such as communication, business, and engineering, patterns of convergence are emerging. Rather than internationalism, internationalization is found to prevail, and internationalization is found to signify predominantly a search for student markets domestically and abroad rather than positioning the university's knowledge at the service of others in less advantaged parts of the world.

**Keywords:** academic governance, entrepreneurial university, globalization, higher education, internationalization, internationalism, organizational change, US universities.

### **Introduction**

As technological innovations relentlessly compress the world in space and time and our economies become rapidly impelled into the highly competitive environment of global markets, educational institutions are being challenged to follow suit. At the university level, globalization is manifested by what is termed by insiders as “internationalization,” a subtle response that not only affects academic programs, faculty, and students, but also creates new administrative structures and privileges.

The majority of US research universities mention internationalization in their current mission statements, and about half include it in their strategic plans (Siaya and Hayward 2003). The Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) endorses global education to prepare students for the global world of work as well as to bring about a shared future marked by justice, security, equality, human rights, and economic

sustainability. Ideally, to meet this challenge universities will incorporate an international/intercultural dimension into their teaching, research, and service functions (de Wit 1999). In practice, internationalization covers a wide range of services, from study abroad and greater recruitment of international students, to distance education and combinations of partnerships abroad, internationalized curriculum, research and scholarly collaboration, and extracurricular programs to include an international and intercultural dimension (Altbach 1998; Biddle 2002; de Wit 2002).

According to Jones (2000), “internationalism” is different from “internationalization.” He defines the former as: “Common sense notions of international community, international cooperation, international community of interests, and international dimensions of the common good,” including promotion of global peace and well-being (p. 31). Husén offers a view of learning close to internationalism when he maintains that “global learning means a focus on global issues and the learning needs which are associated with them” (p. 160). In a related vein, concepts of global citizenship also point to the notion of internationalism. McIntosh (2005, p. 23) proposes as global citizenship, “the ability to see oneself and the world around one, the ability to make comparisons and contrasts, the ability to see ‘plurality’ as a result . . . and the ability to balance awareness of one’s own realities with the realities of entities outside of the perceived self.” For her part, Ladson-Billings (2005) holds that competent and responsible citizens are those with the capacity to think critically, are willing to dialogue with others, and are concerned for the rights and welfare of others. She finds that schools tend to be undemocratic spaces because, among several other traits, they focus on passive learning, emphasize compliance and obedience, and lack attention to global issues. Internationalization, in contrast, refers to greater international presence by the dominant economic and political powers, usually guided by principles of marketing and competition.

Are universities moving toward internationalism or rather internationalization? A study that represented a landmark in the examination of universities under market-led forces was that by Slaughter and Leslie (1997). Their study, which focused on public universities in four countries (US, Canada, UK, and Australia), covered institutional trends between 1970 and 1995<sup>1</sup> and documented the impact of competition for external funds upon university performance. In the years elapsed since then, there have been additional developments such as increased global economic competition and new information and communication technologies.

There is consensus that higher education is undergoing substantial change in the face of globalization, which brings a greater emphasis on market forces to the process of educational decision-making. However, universities experience pressures in different ways, depending on whether they are private or public institutions. Among the public universities, there are significant trends toward decentralization, mergers, privatization, and accountability. Among private institutions, there are considerable pressures to position themselves as the universities of choice for students and to be highly competitive in the procurement of research funds, both of which generate complex dynamics in their functioning. Since private institutions are more dependent on external support than public institutions, they are forced to monitor current trends in the economic environment and look for new opportunities; hence, private universities by the nature of their organization are likely to be more sensitive to globalization forces.

Interpretations of the changes going on in higher education under the influence of globalization are by no means uniform. While the majority asserts that we are increasingly facing homogenizing tendencies in the administration, teaching, and research practices of universities, others hold that we are experiencing more localized responses, because it is not only economic forces that are at work but also cultural and environmental processes that create differences in adoption of new ideas and practices. Thus, speaking for changes in the United Kingdom, Deem (2001) considers that, while teaching and research audits were brought in for finance-driven reasons, in some cases they were introduced to reassure the public that universities' academic standards remain high.

A mechanism that will further expand the globalization of education is the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS). This agreement includes tertiary education among the 12 trade-related sectors now being negotiated among countries. GATS will have major repercussions on the types of tertiary institutions that are created abroad and on the presence of private universities in many parts of the world. GATS functions through a set of "commitments," some general and some voluntary. Education is considered a voluntary commitment, so WTO member nations will decide the degree of access to provide for different education sectors, but once agreed upon, all members are to be treated equally (OECD 2004). The United States was a major actor in requesting free trade for education and health services. Education and training represents indeed its fifth largest service sector. Globally, education investments abroad resulted in capital flows of more than \$30 billion in 2003 (Aviles 2005).

From a theoretical perspective, I explore two theses. One is that globalization gives rise not only to new economic dynamics but also to new social relations, and that these in turn have consequences for social and organizational structures. In education, the expanded economic and social forms that have come to dominate the landscape of many nations are creating “a master discourse informing policy decisions at all levels of education” (Gough 2000, p. 78). Technological innovations influence the dynamics of social relations, either by concentrating certain kinds of power in the hands of few or by dispersing it among the many and, while being constantly constructed, these “resources of power and differential knowledge about the working of institutions are implicated in the construction, manipulation, and maintenance of the social world, at both the national and international level” (Welton 2001, p. 16).

My second thesis asserts that the strong links developing between business firms and educational institutions produce a tendency for the latter to imitate the former, a phenomenon first detected between schools and the economy in the United States under the principle of “correspondence” (Bowles 1972; Bowles and Gintis c1977). Along the same lines, noting the substantial homogeneity of organizational forms and practices among a wide variety of institutions, Powell and DiMaggio (1991) ask: What causes the similarity? They identify two forms of isomorphism: competitive (present in fields that have free and open competition), and institutional (visible in organizations that compete not just for resources and customers but for political power and legitimacy). This second case would seem to apply to universities. Powell and DiMaggio use the term “institutional isomorphism” to explain the ways organizations develop similarities in methods, procedures, purposes, and outcomes, a convergence that they attribute primarily to the frequent movement of administrators from one organization to another. Agre (1999) highlights the influence of information technology in bringing standardization to courses as independent universities negotiate degrees. I modify the concept of “institutional isomorphism” by positing that new cultural practices – including those adopted by universities – derive from material conditions and thus are not totally independent innovations as the simple circulation of administrators would seem to imply. I further use the concept of institutional isomorphism to explore convergence among units within a single institution. Universities – long considered examples of loosely coupled sets of units and even taken as examples of “organized anarchies” (Weick 1976; Cohen and March c1986) – are irresistibly generating patterns of conformity in objectives, processes, and outcomes of

disciplines touched by economic and technological globalization. Since universities are leaders in the process of knowledge production, they engage in practices with demonstrable positive consequences for recognition and access to financial resources. Universities, dependent on external resources acquired through competition, are evincing a rapid change from their immediate past as well as an increased similarity with each other.

### **Study methodology**

This article centers on a private university, which I will call Progressive University (PU hereafter). Located on the west coast of the United States, PU sees itself as uniquely positioned to develop ties with the Pacific Rim. Its brochures describe itself as ranking among top 10 private research universities in federal research and development support. Indeed, PU receives about \$400 million annually in sponsored research, which situates it in the 9th position for research funding among all private university and in the 18th position among all universities. PU has also been quite successful in attracting private donations, averaging over \$350 million annually in cash gifts. According to the *Philosophical Gourmet Report* and *US News & World Report*, PU is ranked among the top 50 research universities in the country.

To examine PU's internationalization efforts, I use the case study approach (Ragin and Becker 1992; Yin 1994), which fosters a holistic understanding of organizational processes by being attentive to a number of trends combine and reinforce each other to create particular impacts. The naturalistic method of the case study enables the researcher to present the points of view of the social actors involved, and to link these perceptions to their particular locations in academic units.

Deem argues that studies which do not offer full comparative and longitudinal data do not permit research to capture the substantial hybridity that is occurring; in particular, she maintains that case studies are not suitable tools to engage in local-global analysis. While comparative (and longitudinal) studies provide valuable data, one could argue, on the other hand, that case studies provide an in-depth look into phenomena that might easily be missed when using questionnaires that cover a large number of universities but minimize the particular context and location in which they operate. Case study approaches bring to life the interrelated parts of an organization while enabling us to see the interplay between the organization and its environment.

Understanding the details of key aspects of university functioning in a non-profit private institution – which despite the formal legal name status, is vulnerable to profit making – offers a window to useful knowledge and insight, as some of the transformations they undergo today may dramatically forecast patterns that public universities will evince tomorrow.

Universities comprise numerous fields of study. The intention here is not to represent the full university but rather to understand its internationalization dynamics. To do so, I focus on four key axes of university work: governance, research, teaching, and student and faculty selection. Since Slaughter and Leslie (1997) argue that business, vocational, and professional programs have benefited most from globalization, I have limited our study to these types of programs in order to update the nature of the globalizing influence. Focusing on three professional schools: engineering, communication, and business, I interviewed 12 professors, evenly distributed across each of the three selected schools, to explore their experiences and perspectives.<sup>2</sup> In addition, on two occasions I interviewed a top-level administrator in charge of advancing the university's strategic plan. The faculty interviewed in communications and business included prior experience as former deans and associate deans, program directors, and department and curriculum development chairs. Planning documents sketching PU strategies over mid- and long-term scenarios were also analyzed. Data analysis was sensitive to predetermined themes such as program offerings, curriculum, governance, university/industry ties, and the effect of all of these on faculty roles and hierarchies, but it was also alert to new themes. Among these, student recruitment and study abroad turned out to be unexpectedly vigorous.

### **PU's definition of internationalization**

The first time internationalization is mentioned in PU's strategic planning discourse, it appears in the context of the growing importance of globalization, which it defined as the sharing of information across borders, developing international research collaboration, and enabling students to come from overseas or to work overseas (PU 1994a). Ten years later, PU's strategic plan of 2004 continues to refer to internationalization. It appears as one of its three strategic pillars, and the term is now translated as an "expanding global presence," which is defined as having two dimensions: "developing a global perspective and presence . . . to ensure that the work of our faculty is read and applied worldwide,"

and assuring that PU “will attract the most talented students in the world” (PU 2004a, p. 3). The internationalization section of the plan highlights the effectiveness that students will achieve by understanding the language and cultures of the people with whom they interact. However, it circumscribes involvement to the Pacific Rim and Latin America and states that connections are to be made with universities, communities, alumni, and corporations abroad to increase research collaboration, attract students, and develop opportunities in other countries for PU faculty and students (PU 2004a). The 2004 strategic plan ends stating, “We seek to become the university of choice for future leaders in all parts of the world” (PU 2004a, p. 3).

### **Competition with other universities for faculty, students, and rankings**

Interview data indicate that PU’s faculty is on top of developments in other private universities. Faculty is also quite cognizant of the rankings academic units have in comparison to those in other elite universities (what PU faculty call their “reference” universities). They are knowledgeable as well of how other academic units within their own university are doing; namely, which departments are nationally known and therefore can be considered “major selling points” for PU.

To compare well with other universities, PU seeks to augment its research funding and to attract well-known and proven academics. It also engages in numerous less visible maneuvers: merging weak and strong departments to produce increased average reputation ratings, reallocating research funds to make a particular school appear more able to attract research grants/contracts, having researchers from peripheral units serve as “joint appointments” to decrease the faculty/student ratio, and pursuing a much higher number of student applications than it will ever admit in order to produce high student selectivity indices. These efforts are carried out at the departmental/school level, but they are fully known and supported by central administrators.

### **Shifts in program offerings**

All three academic departments in the study engage in efforts to promote a greater global presence. This often means seeking what respondents call “multilateral collaboration” among universities, which implies the creation of worldwide university networks. Partnerships

have therefore been achieved with foreign universities, carefully choosing reputable institutions with leading departments or schools. PU's school of communication has successfully secured a joint master's in communication management with the London School of Economics, while its business school has crafted a joint MBA with the University of Shanghai. In addition, both schools have study-abroad exchanges with universities in Amsterdam, Singapore, and Hong Kong. For its part, the school of engineering is now developing a new collaborative research program with a Korean institution. Faculty indicate that over the past five years, there has been a sizable growth in the number of international study programs in PU as a whole. There is also greater participation of PU faculty in international conferences.

Programs whose internationalization importance increases succeed also in augmenting the numbers of their faculty. Twenty years ago, the business communication department within the business school had only six faculty members; by 2004, it had 33 full-time faculty. The business school as a whole has 184 full-time faculty. Even larger is the school of engineering, with 202 full-time faculty (PU 2004b).<sup>3</sup> Specialization in fields that ensure a solid return on investment are allowed to grow; in contrast, other specializations that suffer from a lack of external funding – even though they may serve to address the important societal problems targeted by the university's strategic plan – are closed down gradually through non-replacement of faculty or abruptly by simply declaring them unproductive. Ironically, thus, the specialization on international and comparative education, which deals with the relevant issues of globalization and intercultural education, was summarily shut down.

Several new fields have been emerging in the past 10 years at PU. Some of this growth might be attributable to the competition frenzy that leads to the development of innovations, which in turn calls increasingly for interdisciplinary approaches. Three such fields making a solid appearance are bioengineering, neurobiological sciences, and the biosciences. These fields receive much attention and are favored with funding to hire “star” faculty, defined as those who both have attained national and worldwide reputation and are engaged in multi-million dollar research grants that will be brought to PU as they join the university.

### **Student recruitment and expectations**

A number of PU administrators maintain regular contacts with heads of international schools abroad (which produce highly mobile high school

graduates) to identify potential recruits. A large number of international faculty come to PU to teach on a short-term basis; they usually bring additional contacts and referrals with them.

As students come to PU with a job already in mind, professors are concerned with serving them. Seeing them as consumers, faculty members try to satisfy their expectations. Several business professors stated that, "a faculty member can forget the idea of [acquiring] tenure if he does not please the students who evaluate him." Faculty share the view that students are increasingly seeing university education as a path to job procurement rather than as an occasion to deepen their knowledge of the surrounding world. They note that, in many cases, the reputation of a particular university is shaped by its ability to place students in high-paying jobs when they graduate. In some programs, such as the master's in business administration, it is not uncommon for a student to invest \$60,000 to \$70,000 in student loans, obliging him or her to seek immediate placement after graduation.

The expectation of students in seeking skills for careers is also justified because in the competitive economic world climate there is less emphasis on well-rounded individuals. Practical experience has become more highly rewarded than the traditional broad-based knowledge. For students, this translates into getting good grades, not learning. According to several professors of engineering, many students do not learn what they need to know to succeed in life, and show attitudes very different from those of their parents, who went to college with a greater sense of scholarship and pursued knowledge for the sake of knowledge. The targeting of students as the new customers has also brought changes in the relationship between faculty and students. As tuition rates are high and rising, students expect higher levels of institutional responsiveness and professor responsiveness. In the view of one administrator, "Students are now very demanding consumers who perceive the university as a vendor. Conversely, the university looks at students as paychecks."

Students have changed in other significant ways. Professors with lengthy experience at PU recall that 20 years ago, several students could articulate what liberal arts education means. In their view, today, even faculty have difficulty understanding this concept. Hence, it seems that the idea of a liberal arts education is dying. An anthropologist professor working at PU for over 20 years, and normally very nuanced in his judgment, comments that the undergraduate students from engineering and business he encounters in his classes (which are part of the general education requirement) rarely have the ability to think abstractly and

synthesize diverse pieces of information. He finds them skilled in solving problems within a narrow and predetermined range, and unwilling to learn subjects whose practical application is not immediately visible.

As with other institutions in a market-led economy, universities – including the non-profit – seek to accumulate capital. This is manifested in the recruitment of students who pay their tuition fully, although a few scholarships are available to them. For many years, PU has had one of the largest numbers and proportions of international students of any private US university. Some 20 years ago, most international students came to PU from the Middle East; today, most of them come from South and East Asia. The regions have changed but the common denominator is that these students come from countries that enable them to pay for their studies. PU is extremely interested in maintaining this advantage since higher education is seen as an export commodity; the recruitment of Asian students, at both undergraduate and graduate levels, from China, India, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Japan, and other Asian countries has therefore become aggressive.

The recruitment of international students by the business school is justified on multiple counts, some of which stand in contradiction to each other. The respondents argue that business schools today need to link to the international community and to remain competitive as a university requires greater recruitment of international students; here the assumption is that a global presence and recognition generates more students and connections that feed into an expanding cycle. Business schools throughout the US are indeed making significant efforts to reach overseas students. They do so through satellite schools abroad and by joint partnerships, as exemplified by the links between the University of Chicago and schools in Singapore and Spain, a joint program between the University of Texas at Austin and the Monterrey Institute of Technology and Higher Education Studies (ITESM) in Mexico, and between PU and the University of Shanghai. Arguments are presented that “the international scope requires greater international sensitivity, more awareness of foreign cultures.” Finally, related comments by the business faculty but focusing on US students state that, “because business has become more global, we have to educate more global-minded students.” Contradictions emerge, however, because students from poorer regions such as those from Africa and many Latin American countries are not recruited. Contradictions surface only because, while recruitment has been intensified, the curriculum has not been adapted to global needs. Guided by the need to recruit more students as well as to develop more connections with other institutions,

PU has now established four “development offices” in four Asian countries and one in Mexico. An important objective of these offices is to organize recruitment fairs, especially for prospective science and business students.

The search for international students is officially limited to students who can speak English well enough to take classes. A business professor assures that, “We use great caution to limit our recruitment to students who can speak English fluently.” To this end, some Asian students are contacted by phone early in the morning in their homes to verify their English proficiency. However, instructors at PU’s Language Institute serve yearly over 600 Asian students (mostly in engineering) whose English is so incipient that they must take intensive language classes often for two semesters before joining regular classes.

International students have become more common in US universities as national boundaries have become more blurred: the increasing homogenization of cultures has made it psychologically easier to travel and to live and study in a foreign culture. It is surprising, however, to learn that in some cases PU does not seek to respond to students’ needs and identities but rather to cater to those who already buy into US culture and society. This is evidenced in the following comment by a business professor:

We limit our recruitment efforts to students who share an American market ideology because we don’t have the resources or time to preprogram students to think like Americans. If they don’t think like capitalists before they come to the States, they likely will not find jobs in the US when they graduate. We assume that all the students we recruit will stay in the country to work, even though some return back home. (Professor with 28 years at USC)<sup>4</sup>

Part of the students’ practical experience, especially for US students, involves study abroad to become familiar with other contexts. In the case of the schools of communications and business, there are programs that take students for intensive tours of firms and institutions. Since all major firms today have international subsidiaries in all regions of the world, the business school seeks to “train our students to work for these firms.” Its programs, therefore, have been redesigned so that business students may visit a foreign corporation to help solve problems the corporation is facing. Some professors assert, “We identify problems and then offer solutions on how to fix them.” Others say, “The students become aware of international business and gain more awareness of international and global sourcing activities.” Such experiences have

already taken students to Thailand, Cuba, Mexico, and China. But since these are brief visits to the other country (about 10 days) and even briefer to the corporation involved, it is doubtful that considerable cultural or organizational knowledge is gained. Often, students go to these countries with a minimal understanding of the culture and even more frequently with no knowledge of the language spoken there. Students have greater exposure abroad, but such experience seems superficial since not only is their stay brief but they live in an English-speaking cultural bubble.

Internationalization of program offerings and student recruitment have become today the new form of entrepreneurialism, moving into new conceptions of students and knowledge. In turn, this permeates faculty governance. The search for new student markets and attractive programs unleashes a need for more students, more faculty to teach them, and timely decisions based on constant scanning of the environment – both national and international. Globalization and internationalization therefore become entangled.

### **Faculty governance**

Although PU never had a very strong faculty participation in major decisions, there is ample consensus that decision-making by the faculty has been reduced greatly over the past 30 years, while that of the administration has grown considerably. Faculty assert most power resides with the PU board of trustees and the “Central administrators.” Several factors are identified as contributing to the current situation: First, a decrease in tenured faculty has brought considerable increase in full-time and part-time adjuncts and clinical professors. While prestigious universities have more tenured or tenure/track professors than less prestigious ones, slightly less than half (49.6%) of the PU faculty is tenured or on tenure/track. However, the three schools in the study, whose fields are deeply involved in the globalization process, have a greater proportion of tenured or tenure-track faculty (62% for business, 66% for communication, and 81% for engineering) (PU 2004b).<sup>5</sup> It would seem, therefore, that powerful (i.e., wealthy) schools and departments are able to negotiate better conditions for their faculty and to address the “problem” of teaching by less secured faculty by enlarging their faculty, rather than by changing the faculty status.

Second, even though most research universities are run primarily by faculty, this is not so at PU, where deans have traditionally had more

power than the faculty. This dominance is justified by the need to differentiate between governance and leadership. Presumably the latter calls for a greater visionary role and the ability to act within short windows of opportunity. According to the respondents, the deans' dominance in decision-making processes has often resulted in the promotion of managerial over intellectual interests, with budgetary and profit-seeking rationales prevailing over academic considerations.

Echoing a pattern detected at national level, in which faculty in doctoral institutions stated having substantial influence in general standards of promotion and tenure and for evaluating teaching, and in setting graduate education policy, but relatively little in setting strategic and budget priorities for the institution. For their part, administrators (academic vice presidents) acknowledged high influence in setting strategic priorities and slightly less so in setting graduate education policy. While there is an emergent bifurcation of decision making in the university, the majority of faculty in the study were in agreement with the current state of affairs as the large majority felt there was "sufficient trust" concerning actions on governance issues (Tierney and Minor 2003).

The faster rate of growth of administrators over professors, as well as the increasing rate of part-time faculty also noted by Rhoades (1998), who observed the phenomenon between 1977 and 1989. PU professors saw it as having accelerated significantly in the 1990s. Rhoades detected also a simultaneous stratification of faculty (into tenure and non-tenured track) and the solidification of university professors as merely university employees, whom he termed "managed professionals."

The contrast between governance and leadership is often made among the respondents, with leadership the dominant concept. University leaders are said to be much needed if an academic unit or university is to be competitive, for they are the ones with fundraising experience and the "business savvy required to perform the job." Because of the increased leadership role by administrators, the number of mid-level management positions has grown tremendously at PU and its structure is becoming more complex. In the voice of one engineering professor, "I cannot believe how many provosts and associate deans are hired today!" Explaining the situation, a communication professor makes the analogy, "Just as hospitals no longer hire the most talented doctors to head up administration, universities no longer credit the most talented professors to run them either." Corroborating this view, a professor from the school of engineering indicates that leaders today must be "marketers, politicians, and administrators." Some decisions

based on funding rationale run into opposite consequences. For instance, in the school of engineering it would be impossible to hire as a faculty member someone who cannot raise a substantial amount of money for the university. Presumably, faculty who get external funding are addressing problems with major social implications, but this is not always the case.

Third, a number of fields have seen the formal incorporation of business firms into the governance of the academic unit. A recent development has been the formation of Corporate Advisory Boards (CAB), which provides an opportunity for the universities to invite the most generous donors to participate in them. According to a business school professor who served as curriculum coordinator for several years, once on the board, these influential figures shape course offerings.

Facing the current changes, some faculty express ambivalence. This is reflected by a communications professor, who states:

The number of faculty involved in governance is down. But I do not believe this is a negative shift because faculty are not always known for having a positive influence on the direction of the university. They tend to think conservatively. But on the other hand, I am concerned that many deans today do not have a vested interest in academic life either. Often we hire administrators with little or no research experience. They come from outside of the university culture, often with little knowledge of the disciplines they oversee. (Faculty with 24 years at PU)

### **The impact of industrial ties on the university**

According to the administrator with key responsibilities for implementation of PU's strategic plan, there has been an "exponential increase each year in the degree of collaboration with industry."<sup>6</sup> Increased connections are reported by all three schools in the study. Longitudinal data on PU's funded research (Table I) confirms a steady decline of federal research funds and, concomitantly, an increase in private research funds, going from 8% of all sponsored projects in terms of amount in 1985 to 19% by 2004. The federal government remains the main source of research funds, but it is clear that competition for public and private funds is on the increase.

Although the link between academia and industry has always characterized journalism programs, the relationship has become even more

*Table I.* PU Sponsored projects by sponsor (in thousands of dollars), 1985–2004

Source	FY 1985		FY 1990		FY 1995		FY 2000		FY 2004	
Federal	98,595	89%	141,387	81%	176,487	76%	240,506	74%	328,845	78%
<i>State/local</i>										
Government	3059	3%	4,474	3%	10,777	5%	16,975	5%	12,203	3%
Private	9215	8%	28,593	16%	44,053	19%	67,875	21%	80,014	19%
Total	110,869		174,454		213,317		325,356		421,062	

*Source:* PU Office of Contracts and Grants, June 2005.

pronounced in the school of communication because industrial leaders in the media industry expect universities to produce students with specific communicational skills. In engineering, some industries, such as aerospace, have long connected to PU, but now the links have expanded to cover electronics, media, and computers, resulting in significant contractual research. The school of engineering has a Board of Counselors made up of domestic and international advisors from industry; this board promotes connections especially with the Pacific Rim.<sup>7</sup> IBM and other industries have endowed several chairs in engineering, and these endowments have been used to hire specific faculty who have interests that align with the interests of those industries. The number of endowed chairs that industry finances within each department has also grown significantly over recent years. Respondents noted that though industry has traditionally supported endowed chairs across business school departments, the number of faculty in the PU business school who are sponsored by corporate donors has escalated.<sup>8</sup>

In describing the connection with industry, some engineering professors indicate that the relationship goes both ways. Thus, many professors often work for industrial firms before, after, or while they work as university professors. Also, many faculty have started their own companies. Communication professors consider that they have a say in industrial administrative matters as well because many boards of industry recruit academicians and thus professors have an increasingly important voice in corporate boardrooms. The links are not free of problems. Especially in engineering, it is noted that industry and the university have different timelines, with industry seeking quicker cutting-edge ideas than academia produces.

The links between PU and industry not only affect research and governance; they affect curriculum as well. The Accrediting Board for

Engineering and Technology (ABET) has issued directives pressuring engineering schools to de-emphasize theory and promote application. ABET is shaped by the views of professional societies that are staffed by industry. Its views are strongly considered in determining undergraduate programs in engineering. Similar influences can be detected in business schools. Reportedly, a very small number of CPA firms influence what accounting schools should teach. These firms are known as the “Big Four” – large professional firms offering a wide array of services, such as “auditing, taxes, consultation, and an increasingly broader focus on international business.” At PU the Big Four support the school of accounting by matching alumni donations. In return, these firms also expect to recruit from the universities they sponsor. To be responsive to industry, the school of communications established an entertainment track about five years ago for undergraduates. The influence of industry on the university is sometimes subtle. As one communication professor puts it, “Industrial sponsors cannot tell universities what to study, but they can chose to sponsor only programs that align to their interests” (Faculty with 26 years at PU). Yet another communication professor offers a sharper judgment: “Faculty are forced to become prostitutes, because today they are forced to recruit the support of industry. We, here at [PU’s school of communication], are fortunate because of the endowment we have received. If faculty are the prostitutes, then administrators have become the pimps” (Faculty with 32 years at PU and six years as a former department chair).

### **Shifts in faculty roles and hierarchies**

As noted above, to move up in ranks compared to other universities, the hiring of “star” professors is a common strategy. These faculty instantly bring with them large research projects and the high probability of new research funds in the future. Often, “star” projects are allowed to create their own research centers. However, as these faculty take on research projects, they “buy out” their teaching responsibilities, a practice that results in hiring of adjuncts to teach classes at PU and seriously compromises the quality of instruction students receive, according to several professors.

The pressing need to engage in problem-solving research in certain areas is promoting an interdisciplinary approach by which entrepreneurial faculty seek partners in fields perceived to make contributions to a greater understanding of a given issue and its potential solution. PU

itself is presently involved in efforts to increase interdisciplinary research and has shown willingness to make exceptions to its revenue center management, a practice which makes each academic unit exclusively and totally responsible for generating the revenues it needs to function. The interdisciplinary initiatives offer much promise; they are also creating a typology of faculty into the “old guard” (traditional academics who commit themselves to one disciplinary area) and the “new guard” (the growing number of faculty with interdisciplinary preferences).

With research given greater weight than teaching, and with the increasing need to serve the practical interests of industry, universities are changing their hiring practices. In the school of engineering, the tendency is to hire faculty who have real world experience, especially those who own their own business. Faculty across all engineering specializations are being hired for their potential to raise money for the school or to bring in research funds. As one engineering professor observes:

The only way to improve the ranking of PU in the *US News and World Report* is to increase grant money from industry. We live and die by this ranking. We are now ranked [among the top ten] in the nation. Our graduate program is ranked by the quality of our faculty. Faculty who are affiliated with professional organizations, those who publish, and those who raise money for research increase the ranking of the school. (Faculty with 17 years at PU)

The recruitment of “star faculty” creates new dynamics and contradictions. PU’s strategic planning officer states that the “compensation offered to hot faculty has skyrocketed in its lavishness, up to a half million [dollars] for the most desirable.” Of course, this is not true of every discipline; business and law are identified as two fields that have the resources to pay these salaries. Some star faculty use agents today, especially if they publish frequently. Hiring the best means satisfying a whole array of demands. Usually an academic position has to be offered also to the spouse. Facilities for housing, labs, travel expenditures are part of the negotiations. “The amount of money we spend on labs and other perks to bring in the big guns would amaze you,” asserted a former department chair.

The increased presence of international students is also creating pressure to hire professors from abroad. The majority of the respondents noted, however, that most of these international faculty are trained in the US or in the West because “foreign-trained academics do not command the same respect the American-trained academics do.” In

addition, some schools, such as business and engineering, seek recruitment of international faculty with both international teaching experience and business experience. According to a business professor with 20 years experience at PU, the university has a particular interest in hiring faculty with first-hand familiarity in Asian affairs to increase the number of students it can recruit from the Pacific and Asian mainland. Several external political events have also affected the internationalization of PU's faculty. Professors in the school of engineering report that the collapse of the Soviet Union led to an increase in hiring of Russian engineers for US industry and academic positions. Innovations in communications and transportation are also identified as having facilitated the intense exchange between academics abroad and those at PU.

### **Task-focused curricula**

As a whole, the curricula emerging in all three fields investigated in this article show a marked tendency toward practical applications and job relevance. Many academicians observe that PU has shifted away from funding and supporting certain programs that promote a more comprehensive education while pushing more money into other programs that promote skills-based education. The influence of ABET in the field of engineering extends to selection of the kinds of courses that are preferred by industry. These are described as courses that teach skills like communications and how to be interdisciplinary team players. A professor of engineering exclaims, "Today, skills, skills, skills Nobody cares about anything other than skills. Education means hands-on engineering. Students learn computer programs and computer language." Engineering faculty are unanimous in expressing the view that today industrial leaders look for a workforce that is more broadly skilled; thus, there is a greater tendency toward general skills-related education as opposed to specialized knowledge at the undergraduate level.

Professors of engineering, a field notorious for emphasizing practical applications, consider that university education has become diluted, for, "If you ask a student today to conduct research on a topic, and I am not only talking about undergraduates, even a graduate student ... he would enter his search on a Google or another popular Websearch engine. They do not even think about the authenticity of the research they undertake" (professor with 12 years at PU). Echoing opinions

made by other faculty in the school of engineering, the same professor observes that the curriculum focus on skills has displaced the traditional emphasis on the science curricula the students should receive: “We promote jobs skills over life-long enduring knowledge. There are faculty who try to nurture students to become whole individuals, but most faculty today push students to develop marketable skills.” PU’s school of business has established a very extensive study-abroad program to promote global awareness and to make its students more competitive in international markets.

In the field of communication, the curriculum is now said to be much more sensitive to the international media, and thus courses are described as being more varied. The curriculum changes include globalization as a subject area, more coverage of cultural diversity, and introduction to new media forms to promote a range of technological competencies. On the other hand, the school of communications has decreased the number of mandatory coursework requirements in order to encourage students to pursue double majors or double minors, but with an emphasis on acquiring practical skills. For example, an English major might minor in communications, to gain some professional preparation. In addition, the school of communications has come up with the notion of tracks. This is explained thus by a former department chair: “Today we have tracks rather than majors. Our programs are geared toward careers as opposed to knowledge for the sake of knowledge. These tracks help students to develop focus in their concentration area.” The need to connect university training to jobs is encouraging an interesting blurring of fields; thus, for instance, students in communication are moving into business track fields, such as advertising and media culture.

Faculty report changes in instructional methodologies, as there is an emphasis away from rote memorization of facts to skills that stress writing, working in groups, and communication. The curriculum, especially in engineering, is constantly changing because the US technology is said to undergo substantial change every five years. A trend that seems to be quite strong in all departments is the use and reliance on educational technology within the classroom. Industry grants have allowed these academic units to make technological renovations in every department and classroom. In addition, student research must involve technological resources, which make it possible for every student to incorporate the most current information, facts and figures in their presentation and papers.

Mutually reinforcing ties have developed between students, industry, and programs, as this business professor explains: “New alumni networks

enable [PU] to connect with industry abroad to recruit more and more international students. These industrial firms conversely inform the new programs that we develop here. If we want international corporations to send their employees to PU to train, we need to formulate programs that meet their needs” (Faculty with 30 years in business and 10 years as a PU faculty member).

## Conclusions

Dynamics linked to economic and technological features of globalization have led to university responses known collectively as internationalization. This term seems to be the new and more palatable term for the “entrepreneurialism” observed by Slaughter and Leslie (1997).

What we can see from the PU examination, is that: (1) there is a major effort to recruit more international students and faculty; (2) there is considerable shift toward convergence among schools in strategies and decisions affecting the issues of governance, curriculum, and selection of both faculty and students; (3) there is a growth of “star” faculty in the pursuit of higher institutional rankings and thus of higher number of student applicants; (4) there is a sustained increase in the proportion of administrative positions, as internationalization is based on “strategic planning” that requires knowledge of external forces and quicker response times; and (5) the expansion of the student markets leads to a dissociation between teaching and research, with increased numbers of professors in non-tenure, part-time, and clinical positions being reported. In all, notions of knowledge have been reshaped and become predicated on utility and narrowly focused problem-solving rather than on seeking broader understandings or an expanded vision of reality which might in the long term provide greater resilience and adaptability to the rapid and seemingly inexorable obsolescence of the transitory technologies that are the staple of these fields.

There are, nonetheless, different dynamics at work in the three schools investigated. Business and communications feel a stronger pressure to develop international contacts and expand their array of international experiences. Engineering is quite successful with its recruitment of international students, in part because the US is considered by most observers as the most technologically developed country. Communications puts the greatest weight on curricula that will give practical experience to students.

While it is still not clear how the new internationalization efforts of joint programs and study abroad will impact the university culture on a long-term basis, the hierarchies now being formed within PU are clearly giving greater salience to those fields that can be directly linked to growth in revenue. Among faculty who have been at PU for more than 15 years, there is consensus that significant changes have occurred. Behaviors analogous to those of business firms are increasingly evident, for now university rankings receive top priority, presumably because they give information as to the quality of the product. As knowledge becomes a product, then the market logic dominates. If customers are willing to buy the products in sufficient numbers for the projected class size to make a profit, then the product is offered. If not, courses and programs simply disappear. They risk disappearing also when the job market does not favor their alumni with salaries high enough to make them potential donors. As internal differentiation continues, the sense of common purpose that traditionally united different disciplines will decrease and the private university will emerge instead as a collection of economically productive units.

DiMaggio and Powell (1991) detected three mechanisms that secure institutional isomorphism: the coercive, the imitational, and the normative. At least the latter two would seem to apply to universities today as staff/faculty transfers are increasing due to constant raids by competitors to acquire the best people, and elite universities (those that supply most of the faculty) are characterized by training, academic practices, and professional norms that closely resemble each other. We find that the competition fueled by globalization increases turnover of faculty (and likely also administrators) and accelerates border-crossing between industry and the academic world. Competition for excellence also leads to standardized norms of performance, both in quality and quantity of academic production.

DiMaggio and Powell (1991) predict an alignment of organizations with successful models when technologies are not clear. Universities, especially private universities, consider imitating the business world a safe approach and thus introduce criteria of competitiveness, marketability, and profitability that have done well in the marketplace. A second reason for the imitation, however, is that universities feel compelled actually to join the market and its strategies. The translation of such features to the university signals the beginning of a process that has deeply transformed the conception of higher education and the disciplines it has traditionally housed. PU's case study did not reveal that at the faculty level any changes in the *purpose* of education had occurred,

but students have now become more interested in practical training to succeed in the new economy, and industry is happy to help. Students and some of their funders are shaping academic programs to promote their economic potential not their intellectual growth. While faculty still hold on to the more expansive views of knowledge and would like to think of themselves as a community of scholars, they are becoming complicit in the ongoing transformations. The evidence from PU's priorities and activities is that internationalization reigns, with little contestation of its full-range, long-term consequences.

Contacts between PU and institutions in other countries are increasing. There is also greater recruitment of international students and greater exposure of US students to conditions abroad. This internationalization is an expression of economic and technological globalization in which university "entrepreneurs" are not merely looking for more contracts and contacts with industry but, ultimately, are concerned with establishing regular international sites and presence. The current pursuit of overseas expansion and recognition at PU is to a large extent internationalization and even though its own discourse refers to sensitivity and usefulness to other cultures, it is not *internationalism*. Finally, this case study sees internationalization from the perspective of an advanced industrial country's response to the process of globalization; it would be useful to examine whether private universities located at the periphery of globalization dynamics are experiencing a similar process.

## Notes

1. Many scholars have described unprecedented changes in higher education (for a full set of references see Slaughter and Leslie 1997, p. 208) and several have linked the transformations to the global economy.
2. The sample consisted of 10 men and 4 women, all full professors with an average of 22 years at PU, and thus able to comment on perceived academic and organizational changes over time. Their length at USC ranged from 10 to 40 years. I sought to interview a larger number of women, but since women faculty were underrepresented in these disciplines, I could locate only these few respondents. The interviews with faculty and administrators lasted about one hour each; they were followed by additional communications to clarify points as needed. Data were conducted between 2002 and 2004. The meticulous and persistent research assistance of Carlos Cortez in the procurement of the interview data is gratefully acknowledged. Anthony Tambascia's help for some of the literature references is also acknowledged.
3. Another phenomenon, widespread in US universities, is the growth of part-time faculty, or what Kirp (2003) calls the "outsourcing of higher education" (2003, p. 114), which results in considerable reduction in teaching expenses. By 2004, 46% of PU's faculty was part-time.

4. Recent data indicate that doctoral recipients from other countries in science and engineering have firm plans to stay in the US; this is the case for about 55% of students in those fields from India, 53% from the UK, and 48% from China (Johnson and Regets 1998, p. 2).
5. PU statistics on the breakdown of faculty by full-time and part-time status or by tenure/tenure track and other full-time status could be obtained only for 2002 and 2003. Perhaps because this represents a very brief period, no shifts could be detected in the distribution of faculty in the three schools selected for this study.
6. Some connections between industry and the academy predate globalization. If industry leaders had never sponsored the construction of the first business schools, it is likely that Tier I universities would not have created MBA programs. Schools of communication were established after World War II, in the 1950s, with the impetus from the media industry.
7. Approximately 70% of the global economic growth is estimated to be produced by the 21 member countries of the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC). The attention to Asia, therefore, has a strong economic rationale.
8. Indicative of the increased importance of private firms is the change in the classification of research universities. The Carnegie Corporation, whose role it has been to develop classifications for higher education institutions, changed its classification in 2000. Whereas before the top segment of universities were classified as Research I universities and defined as those that granted 50 or more doctoral degrees and received \$40 million in federal support per year, the 2004 definition dropped the federal research criterion and created instead the “research university – extensive” to refer to those that granted “50 or more doctoral degrees per year across at least 15 disciplines” (The Carnegie Foundation 2001, p. 10).

## References

- Agre, P. (1999). Information technology in higher education: the “global academic village” and intellectual standardization, *On the Horizon* 7(5), 8–11.
- Altbach, P. (1998). *Comparative Higher Education: Knowledge, the University and Development*. Greenwich, CT: Ablex.
- Aviles, K. Rectores de Latinoamerica, contra la mercantilización educativa. *La Jornada*. 21 June 2005. Retrieved 9 July 2005, <http://www.journal.unam.mx/2005/jun05>.
- Biddle, S. (2002). Internationalization: Rhetoric or Reality. ALCS Occasional Paper no. 56. American Council of Learned Societies. New York.
- Bowles, G. (1972). Unequal education and the reproduction of the social division of labor, in Carnoy, M. (ed.), *Schooling in a Corporate Society*. New York: David Mckay.
- Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. (c1977). *Schooling in Capitalist America. Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Cohen, M. and March, J. (c1986). *Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- de Wit, H. (1999). Changing rationales for the internationalization of higher education. International higher education (online), Spring 1999. <http://www.bc.edu/bc-org/avp/soe/cihe/newsletter/New15/text.html>.

- de Witt, H. (2002). *Internationalization of Higher Education in the United States of America and Europe: A Historical, Comparative, and Conceptual Analysis*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Deem, R. (2001). Globalisation, new managerialism, academic capitalism and entrepreneurialism in universities. Is the local dimension still important? *Comparative Education*. 37(1), 7–20.
- DiMaggio, P. and Powell, W. (1991). The iron cage revisited: institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields, in Powell, W. and DiMaggio, P. (ed.), *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, pp. 63–82.
- Gough, N. (2000). Globalization and curriculum inquiry: locating, representing, and performing a transnational imaginary, in Stromquist, N. and Monkman, K. (ed.), *Globalization and Education: Integration and Contestation Across Cultures*. Boulder: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Green, M., Ackel, P. and Barblan, A. (2001). *The Brave New (and Smaller) World of Higher Education: A Transatlantic View*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education and European University Association.
- Husén, T. (1990). *Education and the Global Concern*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Johnson, J. and Regets, M. (1998). International mobility of scientists and engineers in the United States – brain drain or brain circulation? Report No. NSF-98-316. Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resource Studies.
- Jones, P. (2000). Globalization and internationalism: democratic prospects for world education, in Stromquist, N. and Monkman, K. (ed.), *Globalization and Education: Integration and Contestation Across Cultures*. Boulder: Rowman & Littlefield, pp. 27–42.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2005). Differing concepts of citizenship: schools and communities as sites of civic development, in Noddings, N. (ed.), *Educating Citizens for Global Awareness*. New York: Teachers College Press, pp. 69–80.
- McIntosh, P. (2005). Gender perspectives on educating for global citizenship, in Noddings, N. (ed.), *Educating Citizens for Global Awareness*. New York: Teachers College Press, pp. 22–37.
- OECD (2004). *Internalisation and Trade in Higher Education: Opportunities and Challenges*. Paris: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.
- Powell, W. and DiMaggio, P. (eds.) (1991). *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Press, E. and Washburn, J. (2000). The Kept University, *The Atlantic* 285(3), 39–54.
- PU. Fall 2004 Data Portfolio. Faculty by Rank. Internal document, 2004a.
- PU. *PU's Plan for Increasing Academic Excellence: Building Strategic Capabilities for the University of the 21st Century*. October 2004b.
- PU. *The Strategic Plan of the PU*. Adopted by the PU Board of Trustees, 8 June 1994a.
- PU. *University of PU. Four-Year Report on the 1994 Strategic Plan*. Adopted by the PU Board of Trustees, 7 October 1998.
- Ragin, C. and Becker, H. (eds.) (1992). *What is a Case? Exploring the Foundations of Social Inquiry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rhoades, G. (1998). *Managed Professionals. Unionized Faculty and Restructuring Academic Labor*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Siaya, L. and Hayward, F. (2003). *Mapping Internationalization on US Campuses*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

- Slaughter, S. and Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (2001). *The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education*. New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Tierney, W. and Minor, J. (2003). Challenges for governance: a national report. Los Angeles: Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis, Rossier School of Education, University of Southern California.
- Weick, K. (1976). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems, *Administrative Science Quarterly* 21(1), 1–19.
- Welton, G. (2001). The Materialist Basis of a Socially Constructed World? Globalisation as a Political Project. Paper presented at the Center for International Studies, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, 16 October 2001.
- Yin, R. (1994). *Case Study Research: Designs and Methods*, 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Copyright of Higher Education is the property of Springer Science & Business Media B.V. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.