Implementation and Collaboration in the United States-Brazil Higher Education Consortia Program

Author: Leslie A. Bozeman

Persistent link: http://hdl.handle.net/2345/635

This work is posted on eScholarship@BC,
Boston College University Libraries.

Boston College Electronic Thesis or Dissertation, 2009

Boston College

Lynch School of Education

Department of Educational Administration and

Higher Education

Program in Higher Education Administration

IMPLEMENTATION AND COLLABORATION IN THE

UNITED STATES-BRAZIL HIGHER EDUCATION CONSORTIA PROGRAM

Dissertation
by

LESLIE A. BOZEMAN

submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

IMPLEMENTATION AND COLLABORATION IN THE
UNITED STATES-BRAZIL HIGHER EDUCATION CONSORTIA PROGRAM

Dissertation by:
Leslie A. Bozeman

Dissertation Director:
Philip G. Altbach

Abstract

This case study examines the experiences of the government and academic personnel in the United States-Brazil Higher Education Consortia Program. It addresses the overall question, "What factors influence the successful implementation of international higher education collaborations?" The participants include representatives from the two government sponsoring agencies and one four-institution consortium project. The findings reveal that there were certain conditions that facilitated the successful implementation of the consortium project. These conditions are categorized into six themes: partner equality and mutuality, partner characteristics, partner relationship, finances, strategies, and staffing. The findings also reveal that the participants did not consider national culture to be a significant factor in the implementation and collaboration experience. This research is particularly relevant to the international higher education community because it focuses on the project director rather than the student perspective, addresses implementation factors rather than discipline-specific matters or student outcomes, and directly impacts an institution's ability to conceptualize and implement international collaborative initiatives.

Dedication

To my parents

Patricia J. and Bruce L. Bozeman

who accepted and supported my decision to take this path,
and loved and encouraged me along the way.

In loving memory of

Herman H. Bozeman and Alvia L. Bozeman

In earning a Ph.D., it is with great admiration that I remember my paternal grandfather
and great aunt. It is the accomplishment of their own doctorates in which I sought
motivation throughout this process.

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

This chapter serves to explain the purpose and significance of the study, state the research questions posed and the descriptive framework used, provide brief information about the research design and methodology, discuss who this research is intended to benefit, and introduce the key entities involved in the research, namely, the government sponsoring agencies and the specific consortium project under study. It provides a brief background on Brazil-United States relations and informs on why it is valuable to examine collaborations between the two countries. Finally, it informs the reader of the structure of the dissertation and the content of its chapters.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to discover the processes, actions, and conditions operating within the United States-Brazil Higher Education Consortia Program (US-Brazil Program) that affect the implementation of the program and collaboration between the program's partners. It addresses the overall question of "What factors influence the successful implementation of collaborative international higher education initiatives?"

This study describes the experience of the key actors in the US-Brazil Higher Education Program. The key actors researched in the study are government and academic personnel from both countries. They include the government program coordinators, institutional project directors, and institutional project staff. These individuals have worked jointly to foster the exchange of students and faculty and to develop curriculum reflecting both national cultures in a variety of academic disciplines. In addition to describing their experience, this study illustrates what similarities and differences are

detected in the experiences of the Americans and the Brazilians at the national and institutional levels and what information can be learned from these experiences that will be beneficial to the continued implementation of the national program and to the development of future institutional consortia projects. Towards that end, this research outlines conditions that are necessary to facilitate the collaborative relationship between partners and the successful implementation of an international higher education collaboration. The research focuses on the perceptions of the American and Brazilian partners regarding program goals and outcomes, implementation process and collaboration between partners. This knowledge could inform and facilitate the efforts of the higher education community to create, conceptualize, and fund relevant educational opportunities for post-secondary students. It could also focus the national sponsoring agencies' and institutional grantees' support and facilitation of the collaborative activities and guide evaluation of the bilateral initiative.

While this study includes both government and institutional partners, it will focus more on the partners at the institutional level. It will do so for several reasons. First, by design, the bilateral initiative focuses more on institutional collaboration. While governmental collaboration is an important aspect of the program, it is the government's goal to form bonds among a large number of institutions of higher education, and it is the formation of those bonds that concerns this research. Second, it is the academic personnel who engage in the daily management of the consortium projects. Third, it is important to show how academic personnel can incorporate an international component into their teaching, research, and professional development. Fourth, and finally,

institutional personnel constitute the largest coordinating group of the program. Certain terms used to refer to the personnel and activities of the bilateral initiative are explained for the reader's clarification in Appendix A.

Research Questions and Descriptive Framework

To address the overall question of, "What factors influence the successful implementation of collaborative international higher education initiatives"? I posed the following research questions:

1. How do the government and academic personnel in the U.S.-Brazil Higher Education Consortia Program experience the program in light of their perceptions of the program goals, implementation process, and accomplishments?

2. How do these perceptions differ between American and Brazilian participants?

3. How do these perceptions differ across consortium partners?

In posing these questions, I hypothesized that the Brazilian and the American participants would have experienced the implementation of the US-Brazil Higher Education Consortia Program differently because of their different national cultures and contexts.

I conducted research for this study between October 2007 and January 2008. I collected data in Brazil in October 2007 and in the United States during November 2007 and January 2008. I guided the research with a descriptive framework that employs a general analytic strategy (Yin, 1984) and used case study method (Yin, 1984) to present the findings. The descriptive framework uses a dual deductive and inductive design. I developed the descriptive framework by first examining the existing literature on

international higher education partnerships for common themes pertaining to the

implementation of the partnerships. I used these themes to craft the interview protocol,

then, derived common themes from the actual interviews. Using the combination of

deductive and inductive themes, I analyzed the data and arrived at certain conditions that

answer the overall study question and specific research questions.

Significance of the Study

This study draws attention to one of the strategies with which institutions of

higher education can respond to the demands of globalization on the greater society and

the need to prepare students as global citizens. This strategy, the international higher

education partnership, specifically emphasizes the binational, collaborative exchange

model and is significant because it has the potential to demonstrate the effectiveness of

that model as a means to facilitate internationalization on college and university

campuses and as an alternative source of funding for internationalization activities. This

is especially significant, as, in recent years, United States federal funding for higher

education and international education has been low and decreasing (Altbach & Teichler,

2001) and in the 4 years of the project grant, international student funding from

government/university sources decreased from 3.7% in 2002 to 3.2% in 2007

(International Institute of Education, 2008). That the United States Department of

Education and the Brazilian Ministry of Education are co-sponsoring shows that the

federal governments of the United States and Brazil are both supportive in philosophy

and in action of the need to provide students with an international component to their

professional preparation. This research is unique in that it examines the implementation

of international exchange at the undergraduate level in Brazil, where international exchange has not typically been undertaken, and at the graduate level in the United States, where it can be problematic for students to allocate time to international studies. Higher education personnel will, hopefully, consider the results of this study to be a promising tool for providing them with useful insight into the process of working with the federal government as a means of funding and developing international collaborations and to working with counterparts in other nations.

Moreover, this study will add to existing higher education literature by providing practical knowledge of the operational issues consortium partners encountered in delivering international education opportunities to students. It also adds to the body of international higher education partnership literature by specifically focusing on collaboration between the United States and Brazil and demonstrating how the national governments of two of the largest economies in the Americas have worked together to facilitate and enhance higher education delivery, specifically their efforts to provide students with first-hand experience in and knowledge of other cultures, a strategy that may ultimately strengthen the countries' economic, political, and social relations.

Intended Users of this Research

The intended users of this research are the American and Brazilian government personnel working with the U.S.-Brazil program, academic personnel embarking on or considering developing a consortium project through the program, education professionals at the national, state, and local level who may sponsor similar internationally collaborative initiatives, higher education administrators and faculty with

responsibility for international initiatives including deans, faculty, and staff, and the administrators of other similarly structured programs in colleges and universities.

United States-Brazil Higher Education Consortia Program Overview

The United States-Brazil Higher Education Consortium Program (U.S.-Brazil Program) was established in 2001 and is still in existence today. The U.S.-Brazil Program falls under the purview of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education International Programs. Unlike many of the international initiatives sponsored by the United States Department of Education that are included in Title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965, the U.S.-Brazil Program is a provision of Title VII which comes under the category of Graduate and Postsecondary Improvement Programs of the Higher Education Act Amendments of 1972. It is jointly administered by the United States Department of Education Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) and the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Ensino Superior/Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES) of the Brazilian Ministry of Education. The program, situated in the context of a globalizing world in which knowledge of cultures and languages other than one's own are increasingly relevant to educational, professional, and economic matters provides funding for up to four years to consortia comprised of at least two institutions of higher education from each country. It fosters the exchange of undergraduate and graduate students and faculty within the context of bilateral curricular development.

The purpose of the program is to promote student-centered cooperation between the United States and Brazil in order to increase cross-national education and training

opportunities in a wide range of academic and professional disciplines. It aims to improve the quality of students in undergraduate and graduate education in both countries and to explore ways to prepare students for professional careers through: the mutual recognition and portability of academic credits among U.S. and Brazilian institutions, the development of shared; common; or core curricula among the U.S. and Brazilian institutions, the acquisition of the languages and exposure to the cultures of the United States and Brazil, the development of student apprenticeships or other work-related experiences, and an increased cooperation and exchange among academic personnel at U.S. and Brazilian institutions (FIPSE, 2007).

   The U.S.-Brazil Program is one of four FIPSE-sponsored international programs that represent "a first-of-a-kind collaboration among the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Postsecondary Education and foreign government agencies to fund and coordinate federal education grant programs" (USDE, 2009). On the Brazilian side, the U.S.-Brazil Program is one of 14 international agreements that function to develop international research projects. It is the largest network of higher education collaborations between the United States and Brazil. The Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education funds the American Institutions between $210,000-$250,000 for the four-year duration of the grant. The Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Ensino Superior funds the Brazilian institutions approximately R$480.00,00 which is a sum equivalent to the American funding. The Brazilian students who traveled to the United States received $750.00 per month to cover living expenses as well as airfare and health insurance. The program features university-led consortia, student exchange, and

joint curriculum design. The university-led consortia focus on a variety of themes including the environment, social and anthropological issues, engineering, education, the arts, business administration, health, and veterinary medicine. In addition to the exchange of students and joint curriculum design, collaborative activities have included the organization of workshops and conferences related to a consortium theme, creation of internships for the exchanged students, development of student research projects, and teaching or sabbatical positions for faculty.

As of December 2006, 65 American and 65 Brazilian institutions had participated in the program, 45 consortia had been developed, 32 consortia were in progress, 800 Brazilian students had studied in the United States, and 500 American students had studied in Brazil. While community colleges in the United States are eligible for the grant competition and included in the figures above, only federally-funded universities in Brazil are eligible. The majority of the participating institutions are concentrated in California, Texas, and North Carolina in the United States, and São Paulo in Brazil (Naveiro & Young, 2006).

The U.S.-Brazil Program displays the characteristics of what Altbach & Teichler (2001) describe as the "European approach". This approach is characterized as the development of a horizontal exchange, reciprocity as the best procedure, linking exchanges to curriculum development, and facilitating academic achievement and academic recognition as the prime criteria for success (p. 13). It is based on objectives outlined in a 1997 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on Education between the United States and Brazil. The MOU laid out a plan to "enhance and expand cooperative

efforts in education" by attempting to "identify new areas for joint activities in the field of education wherever they deem appropriate and to strengthen or expand existing programs." One of the key activities outlined in the MOU was "diversifying educational exchanges between the United States and Brazil," which involved "establishing an exchange program for United States and Brazilian students majoring in mutually agreed upon academic areas…to spend up to one calendar year in [the] respective countries attending classes and interning in firms related to their areas of study." Related to this activity was the objective to establish "methods for enhancing institutional linkages between the United States and Brazilian universities and other educational institutions to enhance the mobility of faculty and students and promote mutual recognition of credits and studies."

Specific Consortia Project Studied

The consortium project studied will be referred to by a pseudonym: the Social and Economic Development Project. The goal of this project was to develop an academic program at the post-baccalaureate level that would investigate issues in international affairs, especially from the perspective of the African Diaspora, including African-Americans and Afro-Brazilians. The partners endeavored to develop an institutional basis for cooperation and exchanges, develop curriculum relevant to the consortium's theme, exchange undergraduate and graduate students, and develop a basis for collaborative research. The key actors in the consortium project are the deans and faculty of two American and two Brazilian institutions and their staff members. Over an initial period of four years and a one-year extension, these institutional representatives worked

together to conceptualize the consortium project, facilitate the exchange of students, design and implement an electronic course, and host multiple special events related to the project. Additional information pertaining to the role and participation of each consortium partner is offered in Chapter 4.

National Sponsoring Agencies

The United-States Brazil Higher Education Consortia Program is co-sponsored by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education of the United States Department of Education and the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Ensino Superior/Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES) of the Brazilian Ministry of Education. FIPSE's work specifically focuses on improving the quality of postsecondary education, and improving access to postsecondary education for all Americans. CAPES role is to facilitate the expansion and consolidation of post-graduate education throughout Brazil.

FIPSE's primary legislative mandate is to encourage the reform, innovation, and improvement of postsecondary education, and provide equal educational opportunity for all. Through its grant competitions, FIPSE supports projects that provide innovative models to reform and improve postsecondary education. The goals of FIPSE are to: (1) increase participation and completion rates of students in postsecondary education, (2) facilitate advancements in institutional performance and improvements in the quality of teaching, and (3) encourage international cooperation; student exchanges; and partnerships among higher education institutions and other organizations (FIPSE, 2007). In addition to the U.S.-Brazil Program, FIPSE sponsors the European Union-United

States Atlantis Program, the Program for North American Mobility in Higher Education, and the United States-Russia Program. These programs operate similarly to the U.S.-Brazil Program.

The Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior is an executive agency of Brazil's Ministry of Education and Culture. Its responsibilities include the development, evaluation, guidance, and coordination of activities related to higher education, including the promotion and dissemination of scientific research and international scientific cooperation. In addition to the U.S.-Brazil Program, CAPES sponsors international exchange programs in Europe, South America, East Timor, and Cuba.

Rationale for Studying Collaboration Between the United States and Brazil

Brazil and the United States have had a long history of economic and political relations and collaboration. Historically, Hirst (2007) characterizes U.S.-Brazil relations as "unique" and "complex" because the countries' relationship has fluctuated between "good" and "cool" but has never been hostile. (p. xvii), unlike other Latin American countries such as Mexico and Argentina. She categorizes the progression of phases of U.S.-Brazil relations in the 20th century as "unwritten alliance", a strong friendship marked by reciprocal diplomatic support and close economic times until the early 1940s. Although their relationship was positive politically, militarily, and commercially, an imbalance in the countries' trade relationship was present in that Brazil was exporting more to the U.S. than the U.S. exported to Brazil. This imbalance can also be seen in the exchange of students during the period of this research study. Brazil engaged in mutual

political and military alignment to the US from the early 1940s to the late 1970s,

especially related to 'anti-Soviet diplomacy" (Hirst, p.5) and the Korean War. Toward

the end of their alignment phase, Brazil began to take on a more autonomous stance in

international relations overall. The U.S. government was not accepting of this new policy

because, in particular, it was not aligned with the U.S.'s stance toward Cuba. The

Brazilian policy of autonomy lasted until 1990. During that time, Brazil attempted to

enhance its relationship with the United States, however, during the same time, the Carter

administration was opposed to Brazil's positions on nuclear proliferation and the two

countries entered into a period of tension. The end of the Cold War and the onset of

globalization brought about an "adjustment" in U.S.-Brazil relations that took on a

flexible nature between the countries and then most recently, and affirmative posture

after 2003 which saw friendly relationships between Brazilian President Fernando

Henrique Cardoso and President Clinton. It was, in part, because of the amicable

relationship between these two presidents that the U.S.-Brazil Program came to fruition.

By the end of the 20th century Brazil's stature in the world had increased

substantially. As two "hemispheric economic powers" Brazil and the United States are

logical choices for partnership (Schott, 2003, p. 3). As mentioned earlier, they have

"enjoyed friendly, active relations encompassing a broad political and economic agenda"

(United States Department of State, 2006). In addition to trade, according to the United

States Department of State, the U.S. and Brazilian governments have ongoing discussions

about and have cooperated in such areas as finance, hemispheric economic integration,

regional security, nonproliferation and arms control, human rights and trafficking in

persons, international crimes, environmental issues, energy, and education. "Hundreds of U.S. companies" maintain offices in Brazil, and the number of trade events taking place in Brazil and U.S. companies traveling to Brazil to participate in U.S. Commercial and Foreign Agriculture Service Programs has tripled in recent years. The United States continues to be Brazil's number one trading partner, in both imports and exports (Brazil-United States Council, 2007). The number of U.S. multinational companies in Brazil is increasing and currently 37% (193) of Fortune 500 companies have locations in Brazil. (Silva, 2007). In addition, modern industries such as eco-tourism in Brazil have increased business connections and intercultural interactions. Lastly, it is estimated that 60,000 U.S. citizens reside in Brazil and over 150,000 U.S. citizens visit the country annually. Comparatively, according to the 2000 United States Census Bureau, 181,076 Brazilians were living in this country, representing the appeal of each country to the other's citizens and emphasizing the value of enhanced knowledge of the other's culture, original national context, and personal and professional values systems. This increased economic and social activity increases intercultural interaction which, in turn, places a significant amount of responsibility on institutions of higher education in both countries to graduate future professionals with the knowledge, skills, and abilities to work and exist in global situations.

Economics, politics, and culture underscore the importance of studying the U.S.-Brazil Program specifically. United States Undersecretary Sampson (2006) said of the relationship between the two countries, "We have much in common. We share a history of being nations of the New World. We were founded by empires but grew up free

democracies. We are united by geography. And we share a common vision for our hemisphere in the 21st century where freedom and justice are enjoyed by all the peoples of the Americas, and where our economies are linked by open and fair commercial trade". Although the relationship between the two countries has had its difficulties (Cardoso, 2006), both the United States and Brazil have important interests in expanding their exports and imports to promote economic growth and employment in their societies (Schott, 2003). Schott (2003) writes that "the fortunes of the world economy over the next decade depend on what happens in [Brazil, Russia, India, and China]" otherwise known as the BRIC countries (p. 2). He writes that these countries are already reshaping global commerce and they have the potential to change it even more. Brazil, for example, is fast becoming a major destination for outsourcing and its location in South America makes it a particularly convenient option for U.S. businesses (Silva, 2007).

Much attention has been paid to economic, political, and cultural collaboration between the U.S. and Brazil, however, much less appears about academic collaboration between the two countries. A resolution presented in a U.S. Senate subcommittee hearing in 2007 indicates that the United States and Brazil have a "warm friendship and expanding strategic relationship". The U.S.-Brazil Program is, no doubt an extension of that relationship. Academic collaboration between the countries is increasing. The United States, in fact, appears in 40.5% of all Brazilian collaborative scientific publications between 1981 and 2000 (Leta & Chaimovich, 2002). The U.S.-Brazil Higher Education Program provides an excellent opportunity to highlight academic collaborations involving student, faculty, and administrators in a variety of disciplines.

Dissertation Structure

   This dissertation is developed in seven chapters. Chapter One provided certain contextual information surrounding the theme, purpose, and research design as well as introducing the program studied and the key entity involved in that program. Chapter Two reviews the existing literature on international higher education and international business partnerships. Because the literature on international higher education partnerships was limited at the onset of the study, I sought insight from the international business sector. Both the business sector and the higher education sector have similar experiences in the implementation of collaborative international endeavors. Chapter Three details the research design and methodology used to develop this study. Chapter Four provides detailed information on the national sponsoring agencies, institutional consortium project partners, and individual participants. These case studies provide information about each of the four institutional consortium partners and detail the role each of the institutions, the project directors, and the project staff played in the implementation of the consortium project. Chapter Five presents the findings of the study, directly addressing the research questions and the overall study question of, "What factors influence the implementation of international higher education partnerships?" Chapter Six compares the consortium project to existing international collaborations and addresses the issue of national culture in the study. Chapter Seven summarizes the studies findings, provides recommendations for further study, and shares final thoughts.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Collaboration between international entities is a key factor in the implementation of the U.S.-Brazil Program. This chapter reviews literature from two related areas: international collaborations in higher education and international strategic alliances in business. It provides an overview of international higher education collaborations and strategic business alliances, explains the rationales for engaging in them, and highlights the challenges, benefits and factors necessary for the successful implementation of international collaborations. It situates both bodies of literature in the current context of globalization, and discusses the relationship between international collaborations and globalization.

Criteria for Inclusion and Exclusion

This review informs a study on collaboration and implementation in a United States-Brazil international higher education collaboration. The scope of this review is relatively wide for two reasons. The first is because literature specifically focusing on U.S.-Brazil collaboration in higher education is limited. The second is because many studies on international collaboration in higher education focus on discipline specific outcomes or research projects. For example, in initial searches for articles address international collaborations, a number of comparative studies surfaced focusing on topics such as nursing education in two different countries or the difference in teaching practices between Brazilian and American teachers. Also found in initial searches were studies comparing scientific production between the United States and Brazil but they did

not focus on the implementation experience. While this review informs a discipline specific program the main goal of the study is not to present discipline related findings. It is to present findings on the collaborative and implementation process between the representatives of two countries. The inclusion of international business literature helped to achieve the goal of informing on the general principles of international collaboration.

The review comprises qualitative and quantitative studies and monographs in higher education and international business that address the implementation process of international collaborations and international business alliances. Regarding higher education specifically, the review is concerned with the international collaborations of four-year institutions of higher education in either the public or private sector and does not include the collaborations of for-profit providers. It includes international collaborations of two or more institutions from different nations that have combined efforts to provide an educational experience or to create educational materials for post-secondary education students at the undergraduate or graduate level. Literature addressing international cooperation between individuals formalized by networks or associations is not included, nor will the review focus on the activities of international associations specifically geared toward professional development of institutional international education officers.

Neave (1992), in remarks made at the 3rd Annual UNESCO-NGO Collective Consultation on Higher Education, stated that the issue of international cooperation and the adoption of a business ethic in higher education were inextricably associated. International alliances in higher education and those in business share motivations,

challenges, and benefits, however each sector has its own particular set of characteristics. Beerkens & Derwende (2007) determined that theories of strategic management and international business are applicable to the study of international higher educational consortia. They hypothesize that both strategic alliances in business and international higher education consortia are based on two major concepts, those of compatibility and complementarity. Therefore, in developing this review, it is beneficial to juxtapose a presentation of the higher education literature with a parsimonious one regarding international strategic alliances in business. Indeed, other higher education researchers have combined literature from the two sectors in discussing international higher education collaborations (Saffu & Mamman, 1999; Heffernan & Poole, 2005).

The review first clarifies terminology used to refer to international collaborations in both fields. It then provides an overview of international collaborations and discusses rationales for entering into collaborations, implementation challenges, collaboration benefits, and implementation success factors. It also addresses the relationship between collaborations and globalization, presents research implications, and finally demonstrates the significance of the proposed study this review informs.

Terminology

Academic consortium and international consortia are two terms frequently used in higher education. de Wit (2004) offers a typology of international associations, consortia, and networks in the higher education sector. He considers an academic consortium to be a group of academic units united for the purpose of fulfilling a contract based on synthesing different areas of specialized knowledge. Denman (2002) and

Beerkens (2002) also offer definitions of international consortia. Denman describes them as higher education organizations in groups of three more that work together on a voluntary basis to advance and disseminate knowledge on an international level. Beerkens refers to them as groupings of higher education institutions which have limited and private membership.

Other terms that are important to understand in this area of study are cooperation, coordination, and collaboration. Reilly (2001) offers definitions of these terms. She defines cooperation as an informal relationship between parties that do not share a structure or planning. The focus is on information giving and the parties maintain authority and autonomy.

Coordination is a strategy characterized by increased structural complexity, shared planning, and increased work sharing. Reilly (2001) states that coordination more formal than cooperation. The focus of coordination is on shared tasks the establishment of communication channels. Each party maintains authority and autonomy yet there is an increase in risk for the parties.

Finally, she addresses collaboration and says that it is necessary for a stronger and more intense relationship. Such a relationship unites parties to create a new structure in order to attain a common goal. Such a relationship requires comprehensive participatory planning, a shared vision, and regular clear communication. Authority is determined by the collaboration structure. Risks are substantially more because parties are *investing* their own resources. Often institutional reputations are also at risk as they are directly connected with the collaborative effort.

In the business sector, two terms are commonly used to describe collaborations between firms in different countries. Those terms are international strategic alliance and international joint venture. An alliance is defined by Buckley (1992) as an inter-firm collaboration over a given economic space and time for the attainment of mutually defined goals. In providing this definition, Buckley highlights several important characteristics of international strategic alliances including: 1. the alliance is operated across the boundaries of a firm; 2. it must have input of resources from all partners in the alliance; 3. it is defined over economic time and space; 4. it can range from local to global, can be defined in real time or until the achievement of certain goals; 5. and all partners may not necessarily have the same view of the objectives of the alliance. Alliances can be equity and non-equity. Equity alliances require equity investment by both partners. Non-equity alliances take various forms including licensing agreements, research partnerships, supplier agreements.

As Culpan (2002) explains, an international joint venture is a type of equity alliance. It is the creation of a new company by two parent companies that have allocated assets to the new creation. This new company is considered an independent legal entity. Beamish & Berdrow (2003) describe an international joint venture as "a form of international cooperative agreement which brings together two or more firms to engage in a joint activity, to which each member contributed resources and hopes to extract resources of a higher value" (p. 285).

This review encompasses literature that uses several terms to refer to international collaborations including international collaboration, international partnership,

international linkage, international alliance, and international strategic alliance. These

terms are used interchangeably and understood in context to refer to collaborative

activities in both the business and higher education sector. The term international joint

venture is used only in the context of the business sector.

Overview of International Collaborations

This segment of the review will provide information about the general

characteristics of international collaborations in higher education sector, identify some of

the objectives of specific collaborations, and highlight aspects of the administration and

structure of collaborations.

Description of Collaborative Activities. International collaborations in higher

education serve to provide both students and faculty with overseas educational

experiences, to promote intercultural working relationships that lead to intercultural

understanding, and to structure partnerships that yield internationally relevant curricular

materials. The forms of international collaboration in the higher education sector are even

more varied than in the business sector. Godbey & Turlington (2002), in their article

discussing collaborative approaches to international programs, provide an overview of

consortia strategies and programs categorizing them as long or short term, responsive to a

particular problem, curricular, governmentally-funded, institutionally-funded, fully and

permanently staffed, or staffed only by a limited amount of faculty. Chan's article (2004)

informs that academic exchanges, curriculum development, joint course delivery,

research collaboration, joint bidding for research projects, and benchmarking are the most

common activities associated with international cooperation, and that the fastest growing area of international university cooperation is joint on-line course offerings.

International business alliances increasingly serve to restructure industries, create new products, keep abreast of rapidly-changing technologies, and ease problems of worldwide excess productive capacity (Harrigan, 1987). They have also been used as a means to confront problems caused by a lack of capital and to reduce international competition (Boateng & Glaister, 2003).

Objectives. The objectives of international partnerships in higher education vary at the institutional, departmental, and programmatic levels. Collaborations can be designed to respond to a particular short term problem or opportunity, or they can be created with the intent of stimulating a sustained, institutionally supported and funded program (Godbey & Turlington, 2002). With regard to international partnerships between U.S. institutions and institutions in developing countries, some collaboration objectives include to establish a private university, to facilitate development activities, to develop an educational infrastructure and sustain a community college system, to develop the tourism workforce through faculty and student exchanges, and to address critical needs in sustainable development resource management, human resource development, and economic growth (Godbey & Turlington, 2002). The teaching of less commonly taught languages and area and global studies are other specific objectives that surfaced in the literature (O'meara et al, 2001) as well as development of courses, projects, short term exchanges for intensive seminars, workshops, and cultural experiences, and the use new instructional technologies to supplement courses (Devon & Hager, 1998).

The specific objectives of the international business alliances were not emphasized in most of the literature reviewed. Rationales for engaging in the alliance, learning outcomes, and partner selection received a great deal more attention. Glaister, Husan, & Buckley (2003) provide data regarding Western European industries in particular that engaged in international joint ventures that sheds light on objectives. They found some specific objectives to be production in the areas of chemicals, defense, electric parts, textiles, explosives, and motor vehicle parts as well as aircraft ground handling, aircraft parts manufacturing, and telecommunications. Prevot & Meschi (2006) are more detailed in their account of a French-Brazilian venture and list as its objectives to sell mainframes, provide after-sale services, to run electronic laboratory tests and to produce parts and components.

Administration and Collaboration Structure

Collaboration initiation and formation both have bearing on the administration and structure of international collaborations. Neave (1992) points out that since the early 1990s much of the responsibility for the initiation of international cooperation is at the institutional level, however it is essential to understand that institutional involvement in international arrangements is often structured by bilateral or multilateral governmental accords.

Saffu & Mamman (1999) completed a census of 22 universities in Australia that also focused, in part, on the initiation of collaborations. They found that multi-country and multiple alliances were common and that senior management, faculties, and

individual staff members were all involved in initiating the alliances, rather than the alliances resulting from a top-down mandate.

de Wit (2002) informs that international collaborations can be formed at the department, center, school, or institutional level and that traditional collaborations are formed with a partner institution abroad through bilateral agreements, memoranda of understanding, and letters of intent. He states that international networks operate within a "general framework" and have a "multipurpose character" (p.197.) He includes that an academic consortium can be led by faculty or administrators and typically lasts only the length of the contract. According to de Wit (2002), "international academic consortia are a rather common phenomenon in higher education and that they seem to appear to come and go according to the needs of the different partner institutions and make use of their partners' complementary skills, experiences, and facilities" (p. 197). For consortia in particular, Denman (2002) states that there are certain necessary administrative characteristics they must possess including a governing body, a manager, a mission, an active commitment by member institutions, and a funding source used expressly for the development of the consortium.

Of particular note in the administration of collaborations is the concept of equality between participants. Canto & Hannah (2001) in their study of a UK-Brazil partnership created to facilitate academic collaboration, address the phenomenon of the traditional north-south relationship in which the northern nation is the donor and the southern one the recipient. The researchers emphasize the provision of equal funding for the

collaboration from each nation. This perspective did not surface in other literature reviewed.

As mentioned earlier, international joint ventures (IJVs) typically consist of a newly formed entity created by two parent companies. In this situation, at least one of the partner companies will have its headquarters outside of the country in which the IJV operates. International joint ventures can be "one-partner-dominant" or operate under shared management. It is also the case that some IJVs will have different levels of "parental" control, that is either light or heavy oversight from the partner companies that created the joint venture (Choi & Beamish, 2004).

Rationales for Engaging in International Alliances

"It can also be said that never before has it been so necessary for academics to work together in networks. The complexity of the questions asked of researchers, the obligation in the face of financial constraints to work together rather than alone allied to the realization that the sum of the parts is often greater than the whole, are all factors which motivate people to establish different types of collaboration, and in particular to create networks." (Tousignant, as cited in de Wit, 2002).

Tousignant's quote illustrates the wide scope of rationales for engaging in international alliances in higher education, from the theoretical in the exploration of complex research questions to the practical in procuring funding sources for educational activities. Reasons to enter into international alliances tend to mirror the rationales for internationalization, including to strengthen academic stature, to

compete in the globalized higher education environment, to benefit from access to joint funds from international entities such as foundations, corporations, and governments (Godbey & Turlington, 2002; O'Meara et al, 2001) as well as to develop cross-cultural competencies.

Chan (2004) asserts that most often universities combine forces in order to have a stronger competitive advantage and that marketization and massification have led to competition for funds, students, and faculty. Denman (2002) notes that universities reach out to the international community for both academic reasons as well as to enhance their influence, visibility, and market share.

One focus of the previously mentioned study of Australian universities conducted by Saffu & Mamman (2000) was to examine the espoused versus the true motivations for engaging in international alliance. The researchers found that the most important motives for engaging in an international strategic alliance were to share scholarship and knowledge with overseas partners, have an opportunity to expand into new markets, to garner acknowledgement as an international center of research, and to raise revenue. Another of the researchers' research goals was to determine current and future geographical foci of Australian university international alliances. They indicate that when viewed in the context of geography, the motivating factor becomes opportunity based on economic factors such as high economic growth areas, higher population growth rate, and increased government interest in the form of bilateral relations.

Chan (2004) provides the following motives for universities to collaborate internationally: to distinguish themselves from other universities, to gain market share, to

enhance an already good position in the higher education community, to increase leverage, to increase access to scarce resources, to address new intellectual perspectives, to gain a competitive edge in recruitment, and to gain necessary employment skills.

Devon & Hager (1998) and de Wit (2004) attribute context of the times or regional environment as reasons to engage in collaboration. Devon & Hager assessed the implementation and outcomes of an international collaboration in a case study of a partnership between the Université d'Artois in France and Penn State University. This assessment indicates collaboration motives to be the demand of the global economy, relevancy, and competitiveness. de Wit, in a chapter on academic alliances and networks, posits that, "international inter-organizational arrangements result from changes in the production of knowledge and changes in the regional and global environment in which higher education institutions and the production of knowledge take place" (p. 29).

Ayoubi & Al-Habaibeh (2006), in their case study of four leading institutions in the United Kingdom, found that the most cited reasons for engaging in international partnerships are exchange of students, collaboration on research projects, recruitment of fee paying students, exchange of staff, and development of joint conferences and joint cultural programs, specifically overseas teaching programs

The income-generating capacity of international cooperation is a strong motivating factor for some nations and institutions. Neave (1992) points out that international cooperation is "big business" for many institutions on the receiving side of the arrangement and that it is a key means of income generation for some institutions,

especially those receiving institutions which he refers to as the "global training systems"
of higher education and those under pressure to diversify their sources of income (p. 84)
This pressure and the trend toward privatization, according to Neave, have resulted in
international cooperation being an alternative manner in which institutions can meet the
needs of the market. Denman (2002) demonstrates like-minded thinking to Neave's, and
is emphatic that economic gains, namely consolidation of costs, staff, and resources as
well as international recognition and visibility play a primary role in international
collaboration.

Harrigan (1985, 1987) has contributed greatly to the discussion of alliance
motivation in the business sector. Initially, she attributes entry into joint ventures to the
change in the skill sets for which firms will be accountable, due to the accelerating pace
of technological change and broader range of necessary technological capabilities. She
later follows up this statement by elaborating four fundamental reasons for engaging in
international partnership. Those reasons are: to introduce new products, to keep abreast
of new technology, to share technological standards, and to restructure. Harrigan points
out that an underlying factor in international alliance formation in the business sector is
the globalization of markets, where they were previously restrained by geographic
boundaries. She adds that risk reduction in product development is also another strong
incentive for engaging in international alliances (Harrigan, 1987). Finally, she
emphasizes that federal mandates related to national defense and other matters of national
importance such as trade balance and employment issues stimulate companies to engage
in international alliances, rather than to compete.

Glaister & Buckley (1996) found, in a mixed-methods study of 94 strategic

alliances between firms in the United Kingdom, Western Europe, and Japan, that the top

five highest ranked motives for international strategic alliance in the international

business community include: 1. to gain presence in a new market, 2. to quicken entry

into a market, 3. to facilitate international expansion, 4. to compete against a common

competitor, and 5. to maintain market position. The researchers point out that these top

five motives are all focused on improving a firm's competitive position.

Challenges of Implementing International Collaborations

Saffu & Mamman (2000) found that challenges can occur at several stages of an

alliance including the initiation, negotiation, and implementation stages. The main

challenge that plagues all three stages is lack of resources. However, that particular

factor proves to be especially challenging during the initiation and implementation stages.

Additional challenges the researchers report include what they refer to as "red tapism" as

well as differences in goals, lack of attention to detail, excessive bureaucracy, cultural

differences and poor communications. Lastly, they found that an imbalance in cross-

contribution of resources can also be detrimental to the collaboration.

After conducting case study research of Australian universities engaged in

partnership in Malaysia, Singapore, and Hong Kong, Heffernan & Poole (2005) caution

that "high risks are assumed by expansive international strategies" (p. 226) and highlight

the need for effective management techniques in the development of collaborative

international activities, warning that the lack of good management can have negative

financial consequences. These authors also state that developing and maintaining

effective relationships between partners is both a challenge and one of the most important factors in realizing success.

Other challenges revealed in the literature include a weak understanding of the partner's language causing a slow-down in the collaborative process (Devon & Hager, 1998), costs of implementing the consortia's or partnership's goals, i.e. cost of housing foreign students, the challenge of quantifying benefits (O'Meara, 2001) as well as the relevance of the collaborative activities, financial viability, and accountability (Neave, 1992).

Alliance management in itself stands out as a challenge in the business sector. Lane & Beamish (1990) share that some traditional difficulties inherent to international strategic alliances in the business sector include: two-headed management, a decision making process slowed down by continual negotiation between partners, conflicts and divergence of aims between partners, and multiplicity of decision making centers.

National culture is also a concern when collaborating across borders. Rodríguez (2005) in his study of American and Mexican managers, addresses the matter of shared management in international joint ventures. He found that "national culture doesn't shape the existing management styles in the alliance" (p. 12) and that managers in international alliances "face the challenge of alignment between their cultural backgrounds and established structural characteristics in the organization" (p. 11). However, Johnson, Cullen, Sakano, & Takenouchi (1996) state that "the marriage of firms from different cultures created a potential for opportunism, conflict, and mistrust" (p. 346). Kumar & Nti (2004) explain that "managers socialized in different national

cultures are likely to have different frames of reference, and it is the differences in frames

of reference that may give rise to opportunism and/or coordination problems" (p. 346).

Kumar & Nti suggest that international alliances may be prone to interpretational,

attributional, and behavioral conflicts originating from differences in value orientation

among partners and state that international alliances may be more likely to succeed if

conflicts in these areas can be effectively managed. Like Johnson et al; they also found

that the work culture, specifically the concepts of being a good-team player and

involvement in the process, had more influence than national culture.

Benefits of Realizing International Collaborations

The literature did not produce a substantial discussion of collaboration benefits

separate from the rationales for entering into alliances. This is the case for both business

and higher education sectors. It appears that rationales for entering alliances such as risk

reduction, cost-sharing, and enhancement of competitive advantage also serve as benefits.

Especially in the business sector. One seemingly obvious benefit in the higher education

sector is student learning gained from participating in the exchange programs that are a

common activity of international collaborations. There is indication that benefits are hard

to quantify, though (O'Meara, 2001). This difficulty in measuring benefits in

international collaborations seems to be in line with the difficulties that higher education

as a whole has in quantifying its student learning outcomes.

While also related to market positioning, The Observatory (2006) points out the

value of "strategic information sharing" within international consortia in higher

education and how this type of activity may offer members a competitive advantage over

other institutions and allow them to "make inroads into new markets through relationships with the alliance" (p. 2).

Additional benefits identified by Saffu & Mamman (2000) include diversity on campus, international image creation, internationalized curriculum, quality of education, and financial assistance to the institution.

Success Factors and Strategies

The most commonly mentioned success related factors and strategies in the higher education literature are the development of a strong relationship between partners, commitment to the collaboration, and equal resources between the partners. Heffernan & Poole (2005) determined that the effectiveness of the relationship between partners is an important factor contributing to the success of international collaborations. They state that effective relationships depend on the availability of adequate resources, the construction and implementation of well-written contracts, the development of explicit quality assurance methods, and the development of effective teaching and learning strategies. Some specific implementation strategies the researchers advocate are to make in-person visits between the participant countries, to use informal and formal monitoring arrangements, and to write memoranda of understanding. Most importantly, the researchers found that the partners must establish trust, have face-to-face and timely communication, and demonstrate a commitment to the relationship.

Ginkel (in de Wit, 2002) states that it is important to ensure that both partners agree on the collaboration mission, show a financial commitment through budget allocation and extra resources, use liaison officers to bridge cultural differences, and

agree on important logistics such as methodology, standards, intellectual property rights, and take time to get to know one another. Prichard (in de Wit, 2002) echoes Heffernan & Poole in emphasizing the importance of building long term relationships. Prichard feels it is important to cultivate enough resources for the collaborative program to succeed, design limited and realizable goals, for people with relevant experience and interest to run the international collaborations, and to have project champions at key institutions who will promote the program.

Kearney (1992), also in remarks prepared for the *3rd UNESCO-NGO Collective Consultation on Higher Education*, speaks to the importance of assessment as a means to determine if the service being offered by the cooperation is being met and to use as a comparison against other entities engaged in similar cooperative activities. She also asserts that it would be beneficial to acquire knowledge about sustainability strategies that foster local actor commitment and allow project objectives and activities to continue.

Devon & Hager (1989) found that it was "critical" to involve faculty, identify common interests between partners, and develop missing resources in initial establishment of the collaboration (p. 4). In addition, with reference to collaborations that are renewed on a regular basis these researchers point out how longevity in international relationships leads to trust between cooperative parties.

In their study of UK business partnerships, Ayoubi & Al Habaibeh (2006) found an inconsistency in how the partnerships are designed compared to how they are implemented. This finding highlights the importance of consistency between what the partners say they will do, and what they *actually* do. They propose that deciding factors

in the consistency between design and implementation and in the ultimate success of the partnerships are clarity and orderliness, and that international partnership strategy should be a continual process of design, implementation, and evaluation.

Finally, in their study of interorganizational arrangements in higher education, Beerkens & Derwende identify several critical aspects of higher education consortia centering around compatibility and complementarity. They found that the members of a consortium must possess resources that are "strategically valuable" for the other members (p.76), that coping mechanisms must be employed to communicate, reduce, or nullify differences, that the complexity of the cooperative arrangements determines the complexity level of institutional fit, and that relationship management is essential, including improving communication and creating a transparent and stable consortium organization.

With regard to the international business community, Brouthers, Brouthers, & Wilkinson (1995) offer a framework for analyzing the likely success of international strategic alliances. The framework suggests that cooperative cultures, compatible goals, and commensurate levels of risk are prerequisite conditions to engaging in international strategic alliances. Culpan (2002) believes that a departure from conventional thinking is an important prerequisite to international collaboration. Specifically, he recommends that business leaders understand that "drawing on the competence of others around the world to compete effectively is not only feasible but also often necessary (p. 65).

It is also valuable to develop certain skills that will facilitate the management of the alliance or joint venture. Buckley, Glaister, & Husan (2002), state rather simply that,

34

"management makes the difference" (p. 130).   In their analysis of personal interviews with senior managers of European international joint ventures (IJVs), they identified four categories of skills necessary to the successful management of IJVs: inter-partner skills, upward skills of managing the partners, skills of managing the IJV managers, and skills of managing the IJV.

International Collaborations in Higher Education and in Business: A Comparison

How are they similar? While international cooperation manifests differently in each sector, the sectors share some common characteristics. It is evident from the literature that one of the major reasons that businesses create alliances is to enter into a foreign market. Foreign market entry is a goal of many institutions in the higher education sector as well, as evidenced by such offshore activity such as twinning programs and dual degree programs. Foreign market entry is relevant to the student as well as the institution. Students in many countries, both developing and developed, need international collaborations between universities to further their professional preparation and to gain language, cultural, and industry-specific knowledge from outside of their national boundaries.

In both business and higher education, there is a reliance on combined forces. Companies in the business sector need to provide a service that they are not capable of providing alone and institutions of higher education need to provide their students with knowledge, training, and resources, that are beyond their institutional or national capacity. International involvement poses a certain risk for both firms and institutions of

higher education, and both sectors report a sense of risk reduction from working with

industry counterparts across borders.

Another similarity between alliances in the two sectors is the initial relationship

between developed and developing countries in the history of international cooperation.

Culpan (2002) explains that traditional international joint ventures were partnerships

between multinational corporations in developed countries and a local firm in a

developing country. This is similar to the traditional North-South higher education

partnerships in which higher education institutions in developing countries lacked

resources, therefore they collaborated with better-resourced institutions in developed

countries (Canto & Hannah, 2001).

How are they different? There appears to be more emphasis on cost-saving and

profit production in business international alliance than in higher education

collaborations. No doubt a review targeted on for-profit higher education companies

would demonstrate otherwise. Higher education collaborations in traditional institutions,

while most certainly using collaborations to share costs and resources also report a strong

focus on learning and knowledge sharing for both students and faculty, that was not

discussed in the business sector. The business literature did present a substantial

discussion on organizational learning from involvement in alliances, (Beamish &

Berdrow, 2003; Glaister, Husan, & Buckley, 2003) however this learning was not the

purpose of alliance, it was as a result of participation in it.

Both sectors are concerned with the production of a product, however, the product

is more tangible in the business sector, it being an actual object or service. While in the

higher education sector the product was more often knowledge, a global-ready graduate, or curriculum to be used in the context of the collaboration, rather than for mass distribution.

One major characteristic of international alliances in business that the literature does not reveal for those in higher education is a characterization of the international entity as the child and the domestic entity from which it was created as the "parent" (Harrigan, 1985; Cuplan, 2002; Neilsen, 2003; Glaister & Buckley, 1996). This is an important distinction because the use of a child characterization for the international entity stresses the concept of a separate entity having been created, while international alliances in higher education demonstrate more of a melding of efforts between entities, rather than the creation of a new entity. Harrigan (1985) points out that the child entity created by parents in the business sector is meant to develop into a viable industry competitor in its own right, which is not the case in the higher education collaborations featured in this review. Most international collaborations are developed as short term activities such as a study tour, workshop, conference, or semester-long study abroad. In most cases, there is no permanent cadre of partners that sets up shop in the partnering country to create a new entity. There is only a temporary presence of representatives from either country in the partner country at a given time.

Finally, the literature reveals an explicit discussion of theoretical groundings for the formation of international alliances in business that was not evident in the higher education literature. Several theoretical frameworks are discussed throughout the business literature, including mainstream economics, transaction cost theory, resource

dependency theory, organizational learning, and strategic positioning. Glaister & Buckley (1996) provide a useful organization of strategic motives for engaging in international alliances and their coinciding theoretical explanations. Risk sharing, they demonstrate, can be explained by mainstream economics and transaction cost theory, while international expansion can be framed by organizational learning and strategic positioning. Goerzen & Beamish (2005) discuss network theory of alliance, which supports linkages between otherwise unconnected firms, with regard to increasing the diversity of information that flows through firms such as technology and organizational practices.

The Canto and Hannah UK-Brazil (2001) study as well as the Denman (2004) articles stood out from the other literature on international collaborations in higher education by applying specific theoretical frameworks to their discussions. The Canto and Hannah study featured a collaboration that intended to replace traditional north-south relationships of donor participants. The researchers therefore analyzed the performance of the collaboration through lenses of classical colonialism, international colonialism, and neo-colonialism. Denman applied Gestalt theory to why international university cooperation exists. He describes Gestalt theory as a non-empiricist approach to thinking and problem solving created by Max Wertheimer in 1923 that is based on the idea that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. From this perspective, Denman asserts that institutions of higher education are to be recognized by the strengths of their partnerships cultivated over time and not by an individual institution's mission.

The international collaboration literature in both the higher education and business sectors overwhelming emphasizes challenges that may arise during collaboration as well as strategies for effecting successful collaborations. This focus communicates the tendency for these types of alliances to pose difficulties and the need for continued guidance and support in implementing them. While not mentioned in the literature, it would not be farfetched to suggest that the independent and relatively solitary professional culture of the professoriate could pose additional challenges to international higher education collaborations. With universities continually seeking alternative funding for all aspects of higher education activities, especially international endeavors, it is beneficial to offer as much insight and guidance as possible toward the positive and successful realization of international projects so that such projects are viewed in a positive light by higher education administrators and potential funders alike. This study can provide that insight and guidance as well as informing the higher education community of a viable funding source to assist in campus internationalization efforts.

Conclusion

This chapter has reviewed the literature on international higher education collaborations and international business alliances. It has informed on terminology used to refer to international collaborations in both fields and provided an overview of international collaborations. It presented rationales for entering into collaborations, implementation challenges, collaboration benefits, and implementation success factors. It also addressed the relationship between collaborations and globalization.

Next, Chapter Three informs the reader on the methodology and design used to elaborate the study. It presents the specific research questions used and explains the descriptive framework created on which the study was based. An accounting of the methods used to collect and analyze data are also given.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN

Research Questions

The overall question that this research seeks to answer is: "What factors influence the successful implementation of collaborative international higher education initiatives"? To address this query, I posed the following questions about the main actors in the U.S.-Brazil Higher Education Consortia Program:

4. How do the government and academic personnel in the U.S.-Brazil Higher Education Consortia Program experience the program in light of their perceptions of the program goals, implementation process, and accomplishments?

5. How do these perceptions differ between American and Brazilian participants?

6. How do these perceptions differ across consortium partners?

Methodology

Dual deductive-inductive design. In this study I developed a dual deductive-inductive design. This duality between deduction and induction is fitting for the following reasons. First, a deductive component is appropriate because the literature clearly reveals certain themes related to international collaborations that can be applied to this study (Huberman & Miles, 1994). The descriptive framework that guided the initial research is a function of the deductive component. Second, Lincoln & Guba (1985) suggest inductive analysis as a process for "making sense" of field data (p. 202). An inductive component to the design is appropriate because "the terrain is unfamiliar, a

single case is involved, and the intent of the study is exploratory and descriptive" (Huberman & Miles, 1994, p. 431). Inductive analysis will help make sense of the data by identifying that which is specifically unique to the study participants' experience. The results of the study, facilitative conditions, are fruits of the inductive component of the study.

Qualitative case study analysis. The U.S.-Brazil Program is designed to be an equivalent process for both national partners. However, considering the differences in national and institutional context, can it really be so? At the onset of this study, I assumed that the Brazilian and the American national program coordinators and institutional project directors would experience the implementation of the U.S.-Brazil Program differently specifically because of their different national cultures and contexts. Singer (1998) asserts that the same stimuli are often received and perceived differently by different individuals and groups. He states that "if, for biological and environmental reasons, it is not possible for any two individuals to perceive the universe 100 percent similarly, then neither is it possible - for the same reasons - to share absolutely no similarity of perceptions" (in Bennett, 1998, p.101). Applying this philosophy to the actors in the U.S.-Brazil Program, it could be true that the partners would experience the program differently, yet also have some commonality of experience.

Morse & Richards (2002) state that if the research purpose is "to learn from the participants in a setting or a process the way they experience it, the meanings they put on it, and how they interpret what they experience, you need methods that will allow you to discover and do justice to their perceptions and the complexity of their interpretations"

(p. 28).   To discover and do justice to the perceptions of the key actors in the U.S.-Brazil

Program, it was necessary to use a research methodology that would allow for thorough

inquiry into the experiences of those actors. I chose qualitative methodology for this

research because it seeks to "understand the meaning of the experience" as well as to

understand how all the parts work together to form a whole" (Merriam, 1988, p. 16).

More specifically, I used the descriptive case study method to develop this

research. As described by Yin (1984), the case study "is the preferred strategy when

'how' or 'why' questions are being posed, when the investigator has little control over

events, and when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life

context" and "contributes uniquely to our knowledge of individual, organization, social,

and political phenomena" (p. 13-14). This study meets the criteria posed by Yin in that:

1. the main research questions seek to determine in what way actors in a collaborative

process experience the process, 2. the researcher will attempt only to understand a

phenomenon rather than control it, as in an experimental design, and 2. the purpose of

the study is to provide insight into a specific educational intervention and into the

entities responsible for that intervention.

Yin (2003) explains that a descriptive case study, in particular, "presents a

complete description of a phenomenon within its context" (p. 5). Such context can be

physical, historical, or economic. In this case, all three of these aspects affect the

phenomenon, and, in addition, it is also important to take cultural context into

consideration. In this study, the case is the binational program itself and all three of the

contextual possibilities play an important role in deciding the overall context. The

physical aspect is the geographical location of the participating institutions, the historical

aspect is the era of globalization, in which the world's nations are becoming more

socially, politically, and economically interdependent; driving the formation of

international higher education consortia, and the economic context is characterized by the

distinct economic situations of the partner nations and the consortium institutions.

Regarding cultural context, both national and institutional culture potentially affect the

consortium partners' relationship.

In developing a case study, according to Merriam (1997) the researcher should

provide "intensive descriptions and analyses of a single unit or bounded system, such as

an individual, program, event, group, intervention or community" (p.19). In this study,

one four-institution consortium composed of two American and two Brazilian institutions

along with representatives from the national sponsoring agencies constitute a bounded

system. Patton (2002) informs that case studies may be "layered or nested" (p. 447). He

states that in a study in which a single program is the case, the researcher may develop

case studies of individual participants in that program. Yin (1984) refers to this as an

embedded case study, where, for example, the single, overall case is a program and the

embedded cases are individual projects within the program. Using that approach, I

developed individual, nested case studies of the institutions in the consortium studied.

Cultural and institutional diversity are built-in features of the consortium structure and

therefore facilitate comparative analysis across the nested cases. In examining the

experience of key actors in the U.S.-Brazil Program, I employed a phenomenological

perspective, posing questions that are designed to elicit the meaning, structure, and

essence of the lived experience of participants (Patton, 2002). In conducting this research,

I focused on what it was like for the partners to collaborate with each other, what it was

like for them to implement the processes and activities that formed the national program

and the consortia projects, and what factors they perceived influenced both collaboration

and implementation. In examining those aspects of their experience I considered the joint

development of the memo of understanding between the two national partners and the

four consortium partners, the various planning activities in which the consortium partners

engaged during the planning year at the initiation of the grant cycle, in-person planning

sessions at the annual project directors meeting, interactions with faculty and staff at each

consortium partner's own institution, interactions with government personnel in each

consortium partners country, interactions between American and Brazilian government

personnel, and interactions between American and Brazilian consortium partners.

Descriptive framework. Yin (1984) advocates organizing case study research around

a descriptive theory or a descriptive framework. I chose to organize the research around

a descriptive framework. This approach is more descriptive than analytical and can be

used when a case study is chosen for a subject or an issue for which an underlying

theoretical proposition is not obvious. The descriptive framework can operate to identify

types of cases that warrant further analysis (Gray, 2004, p. 139). A review of the

literature revealed certain themes that have been present in the formation of international

collaborations. Using the themes identified in the literature review, I created the

descriptive framework, applied deductively, that guides the study and that is the basis of

the structured interview component of data collection. The descriptive framework as follows:

1. Motivations and rationale for engaging in collaborations

2. Administrative and collaborative structure

3. Collaboration challenges

4. Collaboration benefits

5. Strategies for success

This framework was useful in arriving at the interview protocol (See Appendix F), organizing the initial analysis, and helping me to determine which data were most useful to address the study research questions. After engaging in further analysis, the findings of this study were organized around a set of themes that were inductively derived from the interview responses. These themes directly address the study's overall question, "What factors influence the successful implementation of international higher education collaborations?", and are referred to as "facilitative conditions". These facilitative conditions revealed themselves to be more relevant than the themes in the initial descriptive framework. This is true because the facilitative conditions speak to the unique experiences and reality of the consortium institutions.

Data Collection

Field Work. I conducted field work in Brazil over a period of three weeks in October 2007. This time period was sufficient to travel between Brazilian universities, establish a rapport with Brazilian national project coordinators and consortium directors, and access any materials pertinent to the program. There were no unexpected travel

delays or schedule changes that affected the interview schedule. I conducted the same type of field work in the United States directly after the Brazil field work at two different times and locations including the Annual Project Directors Meeting that was held in the first week of November 2007 in Nashville, TN and in January at the American lead institution.

Interviews. To gather data for the case study, I conducted individual semi-structured interviews, analyzed program documents, and engaged in a limited amount of observation. Using multiple methods of data collection serves to achieve data triangulation, which demonstrates the convergence of evidence (Yin, 1993).

Polit & Hunter (in May, 1989, p. 191) describe the semi-structured interview as one that is "organized around ideas of particular interest, while still allowing considerable flexibility in scope and depth."   I used open-ended interview questions that were designed to elicit a diversity of opinions, feelings, and knowledge related to what each actor experienced throughout the duration of the consortium activities (Patton, 2002). In all but one case, I conducted the interviews with American participants in English in the United States and the interviews with Brazilian participants in Brazil in Portuguese or English, according to the preference of the informant. There was one Brazilian project director who I interviewed in Portuguese in the United States. While the Brazilian partners at the national and institutional level speak English to varying levels, conducting the interviews in Portuguese allowed me to pose questions and receive responses reflecting the nuances of the participants' native language. It may also have yielded more authentic and richer responses than if the interviewee were limited to speaking in a foreign language. The interviews with both American and Brazilian partners, were recorded and transcribed. I took notes by hand, in addition to recording them. This enabled me to capture my own thoughts and observations during the interview as well as the participants' words. They lasted between 45 minutes to one hour and a half. I interviewed the project directors and project staff involved in the specific institutional

consortium project and the government agency directors and national program coordinators. I translated in English any Portuguese quotes from the interviews that were used to present the findings. After transcribing the interviews I summarized each in English and sent them to the participants for their review and feedback. While one of the participants whose English was not as strong as the others clarified her own understanding of my summary, no other clarifications were requested or offered. In total I held 16 interviews: three with representatives from the Brazilian lead institution, two with representatives from the Brazilian secondary institution, two with representatives from the American lead institution, two with representatives from the American secondary institution, four with FIPSE personnel and three with CAPES personnel.

The set of interview questions below is written in English and was adaptable for both the Brazilian and American participants. With the assistance of native Portuguese speakers in the higher education field, I translated the protocol into Portuguese.

As qualitative research is generally characterized by the simultaneous collection and analysis of data, I found it necessary to refine my interview protocol throughout the interviewing process. In general, I asked the same questions of both American and Brazilian partners, however, I changed the wording and order of the questions in some interviews to fit the flow of conversation. In some cases, I may not have asked all of the questions from the protocol because of how the interview progressed and the conversational style of the interviewee.

Piloting the interview protocol. Via phone, e-mail, and in-person, I shared the interview protocol with current and past consortium partners who did not participate in

the study as well as colleagues and mentors well-versed in qualitative research. In addition, I shared the Portuguese version of the protocol with native Portuguese speakers in my own personal network in order to verify the accuracy of the question formation and word choice. Sharing the interview protocol allowed me to receive feedback on the type, number, and wording of the questions, to incorporate additional questions as suggested by the reviewers, and to gain deeper insight into the program itself from the discussion that ensued while reviewing the questions.

Document review. Hodder (1994) states that texts such as records and documents are important to qualitative research because they provide a lasting, historically-based outlook, illuminate what was not communicated orally, and differentiate information from what was available orally. He states that texts can be used in conjunction with other forms of evidence in order to understand and compare the biases of each, but that it is important to understand that texts do not necessarily provide a truer account and that they can only be understood within their particular historical context. Document review did not account for as much data collection as interviewing, however, there were several items that proved useful for the study. These included the program announcement on the Federal Register of the United States government, the program announcement (Edital) from the Brazilian Ministry of Education, the Academic Agreement/Memo of Understanding approved by all four institutional partners, an independent evaluation commissioned by the American lead institution, institutional websites, programmatic materials such as flyers for curriculum activities, and the consortium project websites at the individual institutions. I requested an equivalent evaluation report from the Brazilian

lead institution, however one, if it exists, it was not provided. The Brazilian lead project

director did, however, furnish quantitative data that was equivalent to data found in the

American evaluation. The report provided by the American lead institution contained

information relevant to the Brazilian institutions as well.   I reviewed the documents in

either English or Portuguese, and translated into English any of the Portuguese material

used in the write up of the study.

     Observation. While not a primary source of data collection, field observation

provided some contextual information that was helpful in preparing the case study. I

assumed neither the role of complete observer nor complete participant as described by

Creswell (1998). Instead, I used observation skills to take in the surroundings and used

notes recorded away from the site to recall salient elements of both the American and

Brazilian institutions, and the interpersonal behaviors that were visible between partners

that were relevant to include as context for the case study.

Data Management

     Data management entails the tracking of and access to data collected in the field.

The main issues and decisions associated with data management are: ensuring high

quality and accessible data, documentation of analyses carried out, and retention of data

and associated analyses after the study is complete (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 45).

Creswell (1998) advocates the use of computer software to provide an organized storage

system so that material, including whole cases, ideas, statements, phrases, or words, can

be readily located. To manage data for this study, I used the qualitative analysis software

Atlas ti, which is designed to enable the researcher to code and retrieve data, build

theories, and conduct analyses of data. Specifically, I used Atlas ti, to code the

transcribed interviews line by line and write memos regarding salient issues in the

research. The visual display offered by the software program enabled me to more easily

see patterns, themes, and connections in the data that ultimately led to the study's

"facilitative conditions".

Data Analysis

   Qualitative description. According to Patton (2002) data analysis is deciphering

the statements of one's study participants, then connecting and coherently organizing

what was deciphered. Because this is a descriptive case study, an initial step in data

analysis is to describe the experience and how it unfolded (Miles and Huberman in

Denzin & Lincoln, 1994) I used qualitative description to communicate what transpired

in the implementation of the consortia project in plain language (Sandelowski, 2000).

This method was appropriate because the purpose of this study was to describe

experiences rather than explain them and because this study "did not require a conceptual

or otherwise highly abstract rendering of data" (Sandelowski, 2000, p. 335). In using

qualitative description, I emphasized the meanings the participants attributed to the

events they experienced. It was my goal to do this comprehensively and accurately, and

then to convey those meaning in a coherent and useful manner (Sandelowski, 2000).

This is an appropriate data method because, according to Sandelowski (2000), qualitative

description is especially amenable to obtaining straight and largely unadorned answers to

questions of special relevance to practitioners and policy makers. Use of this method is

in line with the goal of this study which is to benefit the institutional and governmental

personnel, in the role of practitioners, who are directly responsible for the implementation of the international collaboration.

     Coding. As mentioned earlier, the literature revealed certain themes regarding the formation of international collaborations and strategic alliances. From these themes, I derived specific codes with which to analyze the data. Miles & Huberman (1994) consider coding to be analysis. I chose to follow their suggestion of creating a provisional list of codes prior to field work and used the international collaboration literature to accomplish this. I applied those codes to the interview data. I found that not all of the codes in the provisional list were relevant to the data and revised the codes as I was analyzing and found it necessary to narrow down the list of pre-existing codes as data analysis illuminated which of the preexisting codes would be appropriate for the study and which would not. Because of the dual deductive-inductive nature of this study, I also allowed for themes and codes to arise from the data collection. The inductive coding technique I used is advocated by Strauss & Corbin (1990). It entailed reviewing the transcribed data line by line, then assigning categories or labels to the interview text. To aid in the inductive analysis, I used Strauss' (1987) suggestion of coding for conditions, interactions among actors, strategies and tactics, and consequences using key words and phrases in the data such as "because" and as a "result of".

Case and Participant Selection

     To identify the particular case, I employed purposeful sampling. Sampling in qualitative research involves boundary-setting. For Miles & Huberman, 1994 boundary-setting is a process in which the researcher must determine what can be studied within the

researcher's timeframe and means that also will yield data related to the research question.   Patton (2002) indicated that this manner of selecting cases is used to select cases that are informative and yield insight. Reviewing the U.S.-Brazil Program consortia project abstracts was a useful first step in the process. In addition to identifying a case, a specific consortium project within the U.S.-Brazil Consortia Program, I also needed to identify appropriate individuals to be interviewed. To do this, I specifically engaged in snowball sampling. I used snowball sampling to make initial contacts and identify participants at the national coordinating level. Snowball sampling, also known as nominated sampling, is a process of using one informant in the study to identify others (Morse, 1989). Initially, I identified potential participants for the study through recommendations from the American national program partner. I did this because I was familiar with this person through prior professional involvement. Through the American partner, I made contact with the Brazilian partners and several American and Brazilian consortium project directors who provided preliminary feedback on the study focus, interview protocol, and selection criteria for the consortium participants. I relied on the project directors of the selected consortium to refer me to other faculty, staff, and administrators who could inform the study.

According to Morse (1989) "a good informant is someone who has undergone or is undergoing the experience and is able to reflect and provide detailed and experiential information about the phenomenon" (p. 121). The consortia created under the bilateral partnership are funded for a period of four years; the first year being a planning year. I felt it was best to identify informants that had gone through most of or the entire funding

cycle in order to provide a comprehensive illustration of the experience of the sponsoring agencies and the student participants. Criteria for inclusion in this study, for both the consortium and individual informants, was participation in the 2001, 2002, or 2003 cohorts of the U.S.-Brazil Program, willingness and ability to participate in the study and serve as a rich source of data, and availability of institutional faculty and staff who participated in the program.

Selected Consortium

Based on the above criteria I chose the Social and Economic Development Consortium Project that began in 2002 and ended collaborative activities in August of 2007 after having received a one-year funding extension. I chose this consortium because: 1. It was recommended as a reliable and rich source of information for the study, 2. Its funding cycle ended within a year of data collection, which allowed for the participants' comprehensive and immediate reflection on the collaborative activities, and 3. Its institutional composition was likely to provide a diversity of perspectives.

This consortium centered on social and economic development issues and succeeded in developing cross-cultural and interdisciplinary curricula of benefit to both countries. The activities developed for the consortium included a series of lectures that formed an electronically-delivered course that is appropriate for both Master's and doctoral degree programs.

Human Subjects Protection

To address the protection of human subjects, I disguised the identity of the participants, their institutions, and any third parties mentioned in the study. I also

obtained their informed consent in writing before interviewing them. This consent also

specified that the data collected in this research study would be used for the immediate

purpose of a doctoral dissertation, and that in the case of publication or presentation, as

Cohen (2000) instructs, the data will be published or presented in a manner that protects

the participants anonymity and confidentiality. Because the Brazilian institutions

featured in this study do not use the same type of informed consent letter or human

subject protection procedures as American institutions, I drafted a consent letter in

Portuguese and shared it with two Brazilian professors for feedback and to ensure clarity

in the communication of human subjects protection concerns.

    Keeping in mind the ethical cautions presented by Hadjistavropoulos & Smythe

(2001), the nature of this study does not pose physical or long-lasting psychological

harm. I did, however, offer the institutions and individual participants anonymity. While

I named the governmental sponsoring agencies, I referred to the participants and

institutions with pseudonyms. I obscured descriptions and demographic information, that

could call attention to the specific identity of a person, place, or entity. Most of the

project directors did not feel institutional or individual anonymity was necessary. In fact,

some of the participants pointed out that because of the limited number of consortium

projects in certain locations in both the U.S. and Brazil, and because of the limited layers

of leadership at the national level, that participant identities could easily be determined.

This did not deter them from participating in the study. Two support staff participants,

however, did feel that anonymity was necessary, and therefore anonymity remained the

rule for the study.

Role of the Researcher

About the researcher. There are certain factors regarding my background and disposition towards international education and American-Brazilian interpersonal relations that should be made explicit considering my role as researcher. I support wholeheartedly the collaboration of members of different nations in educational initiatives and promote the involvement of all members of the higher education community in international education efforts, whether they be facilitators on their home campus or international sojourners themselves. It is this very belief that contributed to my motivation to pursue doctoral studies in international higher education and to choose this research topic.

It was through participation in a U.S. Department of Education program that I developed a professional interest in international education. If it weren't for that program, the Fulbright Summer Seminar program for K-12 educators, I may not have had an opportunity so early in my professional career, to be exposed to the work of federally-funded international initiatives. It was through the Fulbright program that I had my first educational experience in Brazil and led to my ultimate acquisition of the Portuguese language, which proved useful in establishing a connection with and interviewing participants. The Fulbright Program and the Department of Education entity that coordinated the seminar in which I participated are not related to FIPSE or the U.S.-Brazil Higher Education Consortia Program. Also with regard to the U.S. Department of Education and the FIPSE program, I should disclose that it was the national director of the FIPSE program who suggested the U.S.- Brazil Higher Education Consortia Program

as a possible research focus. This person did not influence the actual topic of the research, the research design, or the presentation of the findings. He did, however, facilitate my access to the program's project directors and participated in the study. Prior to completion of the study, he took another role in the U.S. Department of Education.

Before beginning this research, I had a multi-year history of association with an American international-intercultural professional society that began while I was I working on a Master's in Teaching. This association, international in philosophy and membership, helped to form my thinking around intercultural relations and informed my understanding of American-Brazilian interpersonal relations as experienced in the United States.

Lastly, I have several longstanding personal relationships with Brazilians, and have traveled to Brazil several times for pleasure and educational opportunities. These relationships and travel experiences have instilled in me a deep respect for Brazilians, the Brazilian culture, and the Brazilian perspective, recognizing that Brazilians represent diverse perspective, with regard to intercultural relations with Americans. I feel that the combination of owning my own American identity and having intimate access to the thoughts and lives of a number of Brazilians living and working in the United States uniquely positioned me to undertake this research project.

Researcher bias. Keeping these factors in mind along with the potential for researcher bias in qualitative research generally (Cherry, 2000; Merriam, 1988) and in case study method specifically (Yin, 1984), my role in the research process was to be the primary instrument in data collection. I was the vehicle through which the data was

collected and interpreted. Even though the purpose of this study was descriptive rather than interpretive, all research is, in part, interpretive because the data is filtered through the researcher. According to Sandelowski (2000), in the process of describing the experience the researcher will select what he or she wants to describe and that a transformation of that experience results as a consequence of that selection (p. 335).

In general, it was my responsibility to transform the knowledge of my participants into a form readily captured and understood by those who would use the study's findings. In some qualitative research, a researcher can participate in the phenomenon understudy, or even become immersed in it. This was not my goal nor was it possible because the project activities were largely completed before I began research. I was, however, able to attend one national project director's meeting during data collection. This gave me an opportunity to assume the role of participant observer. As an observer, I took note of the proceedings of the meeting, participant interactions, physical setting, and my own thoughts that occurred during the meeting (Bogden & Biklen, 1988). Doing this allowed me to gain insight in to the interpersonal interactions of the participants as well as additional program-wide issues that did not surface during the individual interviews.

As a researcher representing one of the two partner nations, I was especially alert to any issues that could have arisen related to the perception of my role as the researcher. It was possible that being an American researcher would an effect on the openness of the Brazilian informants. Miles & Huberman (1994) recommend clear communication of intentions for those researchers who will collect data on-site as one way of avoiding bias stemming from researcher effects. This includes why the researcher is on-site, what

researcher is studying, how it will be studied, and what will be done with the findings. Having provided that information in the informed consent, I made it a point to communicate to the participants that I would not favor the American partners because of my nationality or be judgmental of the Brazilian partners for communicating anything about the partnership that could be construed as negative. In addition, in data collection and the presentation of the findings I made every attempt to include information and ideas equivalent in scope and amount between the two countries. This was not always possible, however, due to availability of information or the nature of the interview responses.

Rigor

To maximize rigor, and to ensure validity and reliability, I made use of several checks and balances. First, I followed the guidelines for the evaluation of the credibility of research offered by Beck (1993). These guidelines include keeping in-depth field notes regarding the researcher-informant relationship, employing multiple methods of data collection to determine the congruence of the results, and validating the findings from the study with informants, also known as member-checking (Lincoln & Guba, 1985 Taking field notes regarding the researcher-informant relationship assisted me in self-monitoring and in monitoring the relationship in as objectively a manner as possible.

This study adheres to the basic criteria for acceptability pertaining to case study methodology offered by Webb (2003): it is an in-depth analysis of a single case; using multiple sources of data yielding description, themes, and assertions, describing both the case and context, developing issues and assertions, and finally, discussing the findings in

relation to the literature. Davies & Todd (2002) consider ethics to be an "essential part of rigorous research." The steps followed to protect the human subjects mentioned earlier also serve as measures for ensuring rigor.

Strengths and Limitations

This study demonstrates certain strengths and limitations. The strengths are seen in its chosen method, bilingual nature, diversity of representation, and usefulness to the field. Its limitations are typical of the criticisms of qualitative inquiry. Case study method is especially useful in defining topics broadly and covering contextual conditions Contextual issues surfaced as significant factors in this study that were essential to understanding the participants' experience. Case study research is especially useful when the phenomenon is intertwined with its context (Yin, 1993).

Interviews for this study were conducted one-on-one in the participants' native language and natural setting. In the case of the Brazilian, Portuguese-speaking participants, this allowed them to easily and naturally communicate their thoughts. Otherwise, for the less English-proficient of the Brazilians, they may have been limited in the authenticity of their expression.

This study provides a diversity of experiences and perspectives which is essential to providing a balanced and comprehensive view of the phenomenon. Institutionally, this diversity is present in type and geographical region, individually it is seen in project director rank, staff member role, level of responsibility in the project, faculty focus of research, and length of experience higher education. These representations of diversity combined with each participants unique outlook on life and philosophy of education.

This study is meant to be of particular use to faculty, staff, and administrators assuming the role of international education providers in the context of an international collaboration. Its straightforward presentation of findings is especially useful to them in their practitioner role (Sandelowski, 2000).

However, qualitative research and the case study method are not considered to be generalizable (Yin, 1984; Merriam, 1988) and it would not be reliable to extend the findings of this study to the wider population of consortia in the U.S.-Brazil Program. In an effort to decrease subjectivity inherent using just one case, this study treats the institutions that make up the consortium project as nested cases.

Conclusion

Chapter Three described the methodology and research practices used to conduct the study. It explained the dual deductive-inductive formation of the study and the descriptive framework that initially guided the research, how the participants were chose, and what was asked of them. The methodology of this study was chosen because of its usefulness in describing the experiences of the participants, and its utility and appropriateness in using that information to inform international education providers. The chapter also introduced the reader to the researcher. It let's the reader the know the researchers background, perspective, and experience as it is relative to conducting this study. Chapter Four will now introduce the reader to the participants of the study.

CHAPTER FOUR

CONSORTIUM PROJECT AND PARTNER OVERVIEWS

This chapter is an overview of the consortium project, the two international sponsors, and the four institutional partners. It presents the goals and theme of the consortium project and the project's staffing, funding, and activities, provide a brief history and nature of the sponsoring agencies, and offer profiles of the institutional partners. The chapter will focus mostly on the consortium project and the institutional partners, in keeping with the primary focus of the study. Each institutional profile provides information about the institution itself and the academic or research unit within the institution that is affiliated with the project, the institution's and affiliated unit's international profile, and the institution's and institutional project staff's participation in the consortium project.

Coordinação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Ensino Superior (CAPES)

Coordinação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Ensino Superior/Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES) was formed in 1951 with the objective of assuring a sufficient supply of qualified specialized professionals to attend to the needs of public and private initiatives. It was originally established as the National Campaign for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel during the second administration of Brazil's President Vargas. During this time the country was focused on re-creating itself as an independent developed nation. The era of industrialization necessitated the development of specialists and researchers in diverse areas, particularly

in physics, math, chemistry, finance, and the social sciences. In the 1950s, the initiation

of the government's University Program stimulated exchange and cooperation between

institutions, academic scholarship, the hiring of international visiting scholars, and the

support of scientific events. In the 1960s, the Brazilian Ministry of Education took

CAPES under its purview. Shortly after, the government embarked on nationwide

university reform. As a result of this, CAPES acquired funding to enhance its educational

activity and expand its involvement in determining qualifications for teaching faculty. In

the 1970s, CAPES was reorganized by federal decree, and took on a more prominent role

that afforded it both administrative and financial autonomy. In the 1980s, CAPES was

recognized an Executive Agency of the Ministry of Education and Culture, and as the

entity responsible for implementing the National Plan for Graduate Education. Briefly, in

the 1990s, the administration of Brazil's President Collor disbanded CAPES due to

philosophical differences. However, it was reinstated within a few months and

restructured to strengthen its position as the responsible body for the evaluation of

graduate education.

    Today, CAPES's work can be grouped into four categories: evaluation of

graduate programs, research dissemination, investment in the development of education

resources nationally and internationally, and the promotion of international scientific

cooperation. CAPES is widely known for its work in the evaluation of graduate

education. Its evaluation process is constantly being refined and serves as an instrument

universities can use in their search for a model of academic excellence. The results of its

evaluations serve as the basis for policy formation in graduate study as well as to determine scholarships and other academic support mechanisms (CAPES, 2009).

The CAPES staff who participated in the study will be referred to as CAPES Senior Official and CAPES National Program Coordinator.

Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE)

As stated earlier, FIPSE's primary legislative mandate is to encourage the reform, innovation, and improvement of postsecondary education, and provide equal educational opportunity for all. It was established by the Higher Education Amendments of 1972 as a program office within the Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE), U.S. Department of Education. FIPSE has a broad mandate, determined by statute, to address the needs and problems of postsecondary education. This mandate has allowed FIPSE to elaborate a wealth of educational improvement projects. FIPSE determines its educational improvement priorities through wide consultation, including advisory boards and groups both internal and external to FIPSE. Once its priorities are determined it sponsors special competitions that target a specific priority. FIPSE has traditionally operated its programs through modest seed grants that serve as incentives.

FIPSE conducts several different programs that address educational improvement at the post-secondary level. The Comprehensive Program is FIPSE's major grant competition. Grants from this program have provided seed capital for innovation in student access, retention, and completion, improving the quality of K-12 teaching, curricular and pedagogical reform, and controlling the cost of postsecondary education, and many other areas. A wide variety of nonprofit agencies and institutions offering

education at the postsecondary level, such as colleges and universities, testing agencies, professional associations, libraries, museums, state and local educational agencies, student organizations, cultural institutions, and community groups have applied for FIPSE Comprehensive grants.

Since 1995, FIPSE has conducted three separate international special focus competitions: 1) the Program for North American Mobility in Higher Education (North American Program), which is run cooperatively by the United States, Canada, and Mexico; 2) the European Union-United States Cooperation Program in Higher Education and Vocational Education and Training (EU-U.S. Program), which is run cooperatively by the United States and the European Union; and 3) the U.S.-Brazil Higher Education Consortia Program (U.S.-Brazil Program), which is the focus of this study.

The primary purpose of the FIPSE international programs is to support collaboration between colleges and universities in the United States with higher education institutions in Europe, North America, and Brazil. Grants are made to consortia of institutions to support curriculum development, student and faculty exchange, foreign language learning in the disciplines, and international credit recognition and transfer (FIPSE, 2005).

The FIPSE staff who participated in the study will be referred to as FIPSE Senior Official, FIPSE New Senior Official, FIPSE National Program Coordinator, and FIPSE New National Program Coordinator.

Social and Economic Development Project

     The consortium project studied will be referred to by the pseudonym "Social and Economic Development Project." The goal of this project was to develop an academic program at the post-baccalaureate level that would investigate issues in international affairs, especially from the perspective of the African Diaspora, including African-Americans and Afro-Brazilians. The four consortium partners will be referred to as American Lead Institution, American Secondary Institution, Brazilian Lead Institution, and Brazilian Secondary Institution. They are referred to as such because of their role in the consortium project leadership. Lead institutions were the institutions in each nation that were responsible for coordinating the cooperative activities, administering the program funds, and preparing all project reports. The secondary institutions served as partners, and as such, participated fully in development of the project proposal, decision making processes, and implementation of project activities, however they were not responsible for submitting the project proposal, preparing project reports, financial matters, or communication with the sponsoring agencies. A variety of individuals were involved in different aspects of the consortium activities including the project directors at each institution, and in certain cases, their staff, additional faculty to develop and deliver curriculum material, and a consultant to evaluate the consortium project. The project staff who participated in the study will be referred to as: Brazilian Lead Institution Project Director, Brazilian Lead Institution International Student Advisor, Brazilian Lead Institution Academic Advisor, Brazilian Secondary Project Director, American Lead Institution Project Director, American Lead Institution Co-Project Director, American

67

Lead Institution Graduate Assistant, American Secondary Institution Project Director and American Secondary Institution Co-Project Director. Brief professional descriptions of the project staff who participated in the study are included later in this chapter.

The American institutions in the Social and Economic Development project received from the Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education between $210,000-$250,000 for the four-year duration of the grant. The partner Brazilian institutions received from the Coordenaçao de Imperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Ensino Superior/The Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel approximately R$480.00,00, which is a sum equivalent to the American funding. The funding they received covered the direct costs of project staff salaries, benefits, travel, equipment, materials, consultants, mobility stipends, and indirect costs. Up to three domestic or international trips per funding year were necessary to plan and coordinate activities. Some materials and equipment needed were related to video production, transcription, translation, and subtitling for an electronic course that was developed. Both Brazilian and American students received stipends to pay for living expenses while studying abroad.

The consortium project was initially funded for four years between 2002-2006 and received a one-year funded extension to end in 2007. This first year of the project was designated as a planning year. No activities were held and no students were exchanged during that time. Students were exchanged on an alternating basis between countries in the following years. In addition to their own project activities, each of the

two American institutions in this consortium project hosted the FIPSE-CAPES Project Director Annual Meeting on different occasions during their funding period.

Other than exchanging students between the countries, the project yielded several cooperative activities. These include the conceptualization and delivery of an electronic course, conceptualization and delivery of a summer course, a panel session at a Brazilian studies conference, and a culminating project event. Descriptions of these activities follow.

The conceptualization and development of an electronic course was the most involved of these endeavors. The course comprised of a series of lectures given by academics from all four institutions. Developing the course entailed the creation of a syllabus, the identification and selection of appropriate faculty from each institution, and the translation and transcription of English and Portuguese course materials. This course, offered in English and Portuguese, is appropriate for both master's and doctoral level study. From a comparative United States-Brazil perspective, the course addresses political and social history, religion, culture, art, and social and economic inequality. The course was finalized in the last year of the project.

The partners created a classroom-based Summer History Program, also referred to as the Summer Intensive Program, that was held at the Brazilian Lead Institution and the Brazilian Secondary Institution during the summer of the final project year. This program was an accelerated course that condensed a semester-long specialized curriculum into six weeks. It was specifically designed to accommodate American graduate students who were reluctant to deviate from their prescribed graduate course of study for fear of

delaying graduation. The intensive course was offered in three-week sections at each location. Some of the course topics included the history of slave resistance in Brazil, race relations, Afro-Brazilian literature, capoeira, and carnival.

Four of the consortium project directors presented a panel session during the annual conference of a U.S.-based Brazilian Studies Association. The panel addressed course development and student exchange in the consortium project and was chaired by the American lead project director. The Brazilian Secondary institution project director discussed individual and institutional challenges, the American lead project directors presented on the HBCU experience, and one of the American Secondary Institution project directors reported on lessons learned. The project director of the Brazilian Lead Institution was not available for travel to conference and one of the American Secondary Institution's project directors had leadership responsibilities at the conference.

In a culminating event for the project, the American Lead Institution hosted *Brazil Day.* This event, which took place during the extension year of the project, consisted of formal remarks by project staff, senior officials from FIPSE, and the Brazilian Ambassador to the United States, student presentations, a Brazilian culture presentation, and a reception. The American project directors and both project directors from Brazil attended.

Through the consortium project, a total of 56 students were exchanged between all four partner institutions over five different time periods. The American institutions sent 24 students to Brazil and the Brazilian institutions sent 32 students to the United States. A total of 105 American students participated in project activities on the home

campuses of the American partners but did not participate in the exchange. The total

number of Brazilian students who participated on the home campuses of the Brazilian

partners but who did not travel was 60. Fourteen Brazilian faculty members travelled to

the United States and 40 Brazilian faculty participated in the program on their home

campuses but did not travel. Eighteen American faculty travelled to Brazil and 15

participated on the American home campuses but did not travel.

The partners found that it was easier to identify Brazilian students who were

motivated and willing to travel to the United States for study than it was to identify

American students to travel to Brazil for study. One reason for this, as mentioned earlier,

was the that American graduate students, mostly doctoral students, feared interrupting

their studies and delaying graduation. Another reason is the endemic perception that

Americans do not need to leave their country for academic pursuits and the traditional

acceptance by the Brazilians that there is value in studying abroad, especially in the

United States.

American Lead Institution

Institution. American Lead Institution contributes a long history of research

pertaining to the African Diaspora to the consortium. It is a Historically Black College or

University (HBCU) and is classified by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of

Teaching as a private comprehensive doctoral institution with medical and veterinary

programs. It is located in the South Eastern part of the United States and was chartered

as a university for the education of youth in the liberal arts and sciences by an act of

Congress in shortly after. The mission of the university is to provide an educational

experience of exceptional quality at reasonable cost to students of high academic potential. Its mission statement also communicates a commitment addressing national and international human and social problems and it's Strategic Framework for Action is based on the idea of "providing leadership for America and the global community." Both concepts are in the spirit of the consortium project theme.

The university employs 1,641 faculty members. Fifty-five percent of them have earned doctorates, 26% have earned first professional degrees, 16% have earned master's degrees, and 3% fall into the category of "other." Fifty-nine percent are male and 49% are female. Eighty-three percent have earned their degrees from national research universities. At the beginning of the last academic year, its student enrollment totaled 10,586 and it graduated 2,300 students inclusive of undergraduate and graduate students. In 2006, it was ranked by the U.S. News and Word Report among the top 100 Best National Universities, and in 2007, it received $54 million in research awards.

Affiliated unit. The consortium project is under the auspices of the university's Graduate School. The Graduate School supports the University's commitment to "leadership for America and the global community" and demonstrates this by participation in international exchange programs such as the one featured in this study as well as other bilateral programs funded by FIPSE. The Graduate School offers master's and doctorate programs in more than 30 disciplines and approximately 100 specializations. It boasts a multicultural faculty and student population, which the school asserts complements its commitment to national diversity and global access and perspectives.

The Graduate School offers several programs that are designed to support its students. Among these is a retention and mentoring program that is designed to improve the quality of graduate student life, reduce attrition, reduce time to degree completion, provide opportunities for fellowships and internships, and enhance career and academic development. Another is a faculty preparation program, which fosters the development of future academic professionals and prepares students to enter the professoriate. The Graduate School is also concerned with the production and development of Ph.D. holders. It promotes future graduate study through The *Ronald E. McNair Post-baccalaureate Achievement Program* which provides undergraduates who intend to pursue master's and doctoral degrees with academic enrichment, graduate school preparation through workshops, stipends and other academic resources. It funds doctoral study through the *Frederick Douglass Scholars Program* and mentors doctoral students through the *Alliances for Graduate Education and the Professoriate Program* , which is designed to increase the production of Ph.D. recipients in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics through mentoring, scholarship, and workshops.

Institution and affiliated unit's international profile. The American Lead Institution has several entities and programs on campus that address international issues or serve the international population. They include the Office of International Students Services, the center for international affairs, the Office for Study Abroad, a division of international health services offered by the university's hospital and several international study programs hosted by the Graduate School.

The Office of International Student Services (ISS) promotes, provides, and supports international and intercultural educational opportunities for the American Lead University community and others by serving as an information and advising resource, providing immigration and visa services to students and scholars, and coordinating special projects. It facilitates the integration of international students and scholars into the American Lead University community and functions as an advocate for international students, staff and scholars. It also serves as a resource center for members of the international and university communities.

The mission of the center is to provide international affairs support, services, information, and opportunities to the university's students, faculty and senior administrators as well to constituencies beyond the university. It is the center's goal to assist the university in producing internationally relevant knowledge and ideas as well as individuals prepared to make positive contributions to national and international society. The center is interdisciplinary in nature and sponsors lectures and internationally-oriented programs. Its program themes span a wide variety of topics, including women's issues, economic development, country-specific events, ethnic conflict, democratization, civil wars, and the global financial crisis, and features lecturers ranging from professors to heads of state. It serves as the point of contact for inquiries from foreign embassies, governments, and universities as well as U.S. based entities. The center also coordinates the university's study abroad and exchange programs and offers internationally-themed scholarships and fellowships. It also counts as one of its main responsibilities to

encourage, support, and prepare students from the university and external communities in the pursuit of international and public affairs careers.

The Office of Study Abroad functions within the center for international affairs. It works with the Council on International and Education Exchange, the American Institute for Foreign Study, and the International Student Exchange to provide international study opportunities for American Lead University students. It facilitates several scholarship programs, including the Luard Scholarship, the Freeman-ASIA Award, and Benjamin A. Gilman International Scholarship.

The American Lead University is international in service as well as in academic endeavors. Its university hospital has a division of international health services which responds to the medical and healthcare needs of international and diplomatic clients residents.

The Graduate School offers a number of international opportunities. It offers a Graduate Certificate in International Studies, participates in the Ryoichi Sasakawa Young Leaders Foundation Fellowship Program, leads a trans-Atlantic graduate exchange program between two other U.S. institutions and three European institutions, and collaborates with institutions in Thailand and India. The purpose of the Graduate Certificate in International Studies is to provide graduate and doctoral students as well as professionals in the government and private organizations, an opportunity to acquire an in-depth and broad analysis of issues of concern to people all over the globe. It is centered around a thematic model in which a number of major issues in international studies are explored, including global environment, HIV/AIDS, gender and development,

globalization, the war on terrorism, democracy and human rights at home and abroad, the intersection of international affairs, race, and ethnicity, the role of religion in society, humanitarianism, information technology, food and water, health, education, family, poverty/socioeconomic status, and war and peace.

The Sasakawa Young Leaders Foundation Fellowship is designed to provide full financial support to outstanding Ph.D. students admitted to candidacy with a research concentration in international affairs and/or world peace. This fellowship is sponsored by the Sasakawa Peace Foundation whose mission it is to contribute to the welfare of humankind and the sound development of the international community by conducting activities that foster international understanding, exchange, and cooperation as well as efforts to promote these activities

The Graduate School sends three students per year to Jadavpur University in India to collect data for research projects. Students from any university department who are interested in elaborating research projects in United States-India Studies, African American and Indian Studies or the African Diaspora in India are eligible. The students are matched with an advisor from Jadavpur University and are funded for two months of data collection.

The Trans-Atlantic Graduate Exchange Program on Race, Ethnicity and Migration Studies (REMS) facilitates the academic exchange of students and faculty, with a view to developing joint research and innovative curricula. The consortium partners, three American universities and four European universities develop courses and certificate programs around the themes of race relations, ethnicity, and migration studies.

These themes draw on complementary expertise at all seven consortium members. The Trans-Atlantic Graduate Exchange Program on Race, Ethnicity and Migration Studies (REMS) is part of the EU/U.S. Cooperation Programme in Higher Education and Vocational Education and Training. It is funded by the Directorate General for Education and Culture of the European Commission (EU), and the Fund for the improvement of Postsecondary Education of the U.S. Department of Education (FIPSE).

Along with international programs and entities, the student population at the university contributes to an international climate on campus. According to the Institute of International Education, 1,150 of the 10,745 students at the American Lead Institution were international students in 2007. That accounts for 10.7% of the total student population. The top 10 countries of origins of international students include Trinidad & Tobago, Nigeria, Jamaica, Canada, Ghana, Barbados, Kenya, Cameroon, India, and Grenada.

Consortium participation. American Lead Institution is responsible for the coordination of the Social and Economic Development program in its country. Its director administers the project funds, processes reimbursements, and submits necessary paperwork to the funding agency. It was the American Lead Institution project director, the dean of its Graduate School, who brought the consortium project idea to the dean of the School of Economics, Business, and Accounting at the Brazilian Lead Institution, suggesting a partnership. He did so because of the continuing successful relationship between the two schools in another international program. This relationship included the development of a series of six workshops, conferences, and an international forum

focusing on social inequality as well as student and faculty exchange between the two institutions. This prior relationship allowed the two institutions to develop a good working relationship, achieve a level of trust, and cultivate a mutual affinity that served as the foundation for working on the Social and Economic Development Project.

To identify additional partners, the American Lead Institution project director used a personal contact at the American Secondary Institution to connect with the individuals there who ultimately became the American Secondary Institution's project directors. According to one of project director's, a motivating factor for American Lead Institution's involvement in the consortium program was to strengthen its knowledge and ties in the non-English speaking African Diaspora.

The American Lead Institution, which hosted the FIPSE-CAPES Project Directors' Annual Meeting in 2005, benefitted from the involvement of several staff members. The three main staff members were the project director, the co-project director, and the graduate assistant. In this institution's case, while there were two project directors, one had distinctly more accountability than the other. The project director also held the title principal investigator of the grant, however, because of his primary role of vice provost for research and dean of the graduate school, he was assisted by the co-project director. The co-project director was faculty in the Department of Computer Sciences for most of the grant period. Both project directors communicated directly with the funding agency and Brazilian partners and traveled to meetings, domestically and internationally. The graduate assistant had primary responsibility for student related matters and project logistics. She recruited students, processed

information for the review process, served as liaison for incoming students, and handled logistics for web page and distance course. She was able to travel to at least one annual project director's meeting. The project was also supported by an administrator and faculty member with responsibilities for International Affairs and Women's Studies Programs. This person was not identified by project staff for participation in the study; she was a point of contact for certain procedures and paperwork.

The American Lead Institution experienced difficulty in recruiting graduate students to participate in the program. The goal of the program in terms of exchange was for students to study in the partner country for an entire semester. The American graduate students, some working on doctoral degrees, hesitated to go abroad for fear of losing contact with their advisors, not meeting academic benchmarks, and delaying their time-to-degree completion. This circumstance, which was unique to the American Lead Institution, resulted in the institution not meeting their student exchange quota. The problem was remedied by creating the Summer History Program described earlier. The program allowed the students to travel for a short period of time in the summer months, rather than to separate themselves from campus during the academic year.

In the end, the American Lead institution sent nine students to the Brazilian Lead Institution and five students to the Brazilian Secondary Institution. They received 10 students from the Brazilian Lead Institution and seven students from the Brazilian Secondary Institution.

Brazilian Lead Institution

Institution. Brazilian Lead Institution was established at the beginning of the 20th century by a state decree, however some if its schools have existed since the late 19th century. Its mission is to produce and disseminate relevant knowledge throughout the nation. It is an autonomous, tuition-free institution funded by the state. In the Brazilian context, an autonomous institution is one that retains administrative, financial, and instructional control. It receives approximately 5% of the state's tax revenues, however, is given the discretion to use the funds as it deems appropriate. Located in the South East of Brazil, it is highly regarded and considered influential for its scientific productivity on a world scale and especially in Latin America. It is composed of multiple campuses throughout the state, several learning and research units, hospitals, museums, specialized institutes, multiple experimental laboratories and scientific and cultural centers. Undergraduate education at Brazilian Lead Institution serves just under 50 thousand students. The institution offers approximately 230 undergraduate programs with more than 3,400 subject areas. It offers graduate degrees in more than 500 areas to approximately 22,000 students. The university graduates, on average, 5,500 students annually. One third of the institution's students are in master's and Ph.D. programs (Schwartzman, 2007).

Affiliated unit. The Social and Economic Development Project is affiliated with one of the institution's professional schools where the Brazilian lead project director is the dean, I refer to this school as the Professional School. This Professional School was established in the mid 1900s when, at that time in history, Brazil was undergoing an

economic transformation. This transformation resulted in an increased demand for professionals in the three major academic areas of the school. The school is divided into three departments representing each of the three major academic foci. It occupies six buildings on the institution's main campus. There are approximately 4000 students enrolled in undergraduate courses at the school and it offers 620 openings annually in its graduate degree courses. The school's faculty consists of 177 professors, most of whom have doctorates and have also received at least one of their degrees from competitive institutions outside of Brazil. The school's three academic departments address several academic areas that are in line with the themes of the Social and Economic Development Consortia Project. Among them are poverty and inequality, the economics of health, education, and agriculture, international relations, and regional and urban economics. Its library collection is considered one of the biggest and most up-to-date in Brazil in its fields of specialization. Teaching and research activities at the school are supported by three faculty-sponsored foundations pertaining to each of the main areas of economics, business, and accounting. The foundations act as research centers and offer training, technical assistance, advising, and consulting services. The school's professors are substantially engaged in the foundations' activities and its students may take part in research projects and/or work there as trainees.

　　Institution and affiliated unit's international profile. Brazilian Lead Institution is involved internationally at the institutional, departmental, faculty, and student levels. The institution engages in more than 320 international agreements worldwide. International activities at Brazilian Lead Institution are, in general, supported by a

university entity called the International Office that was created with the objectives of formulating international policy, promoting the expansion of international activity, and guiding university leadership in the area of international cooperation. This entity is run by an administrative team that supports initiatives of faculty interested in international cooperation, the execution of international university agreements, faculty exchanges, and international students studying at the institution. The International Office assumes responsibility for international student visa and passport issues, orientation, and academic matters and offers funding and logistical support to faculty who seek to engage in internationally-focused teaching and research. The International Office works with a university institute which offers intercultural orientation and assistance to international students studying at the university, to immigrant students, and to the university's students who will study abroad as well as re-entry assistance to the university's students who return from study abroad.

While the university's International Office did not provide tangible support to the Social and Economic Development Program at the Brazilian Lead Institution, the Professional School has its own branch of the university's International Office that substantially supported the project. The Professional School's international office coordinates the international activities of the faculty and students at that particular school. It is as much concerned with exposing the faculty and students to diverse educational contexts as it is with enhancing the school's production of scientific research. It administers more than 80 international cooperative agreements. Through these agreements students and faculty participate in international exchange, elaborate research

projects, and share academic and scientific knowledge. The office keeps detailed information on the numbers of international students who study at the professional school and their country of origin. In addition to international opportunities the school offers a Portuguese language instruction for foreigners. With the assistance of the project's international student advisor, the professional school's international office not only facilitated logistical and social support for the projects students, it was the source of additional staffing at national program level meetings and project meetings. It is staffed by five individuals including two senior staff members and two international relations assistants and a web master.

Individual academic departments throughout Brazilian Lead Institution have a history of being involved in scientific and technological bilateral cooperation, whether through inter-university agreements or through institutional programs funded by external providers. These agreements are normally managed by faculty, however the International Office will support the faculty in the initial phase of the agreement, as collaborative documents are elaborated , and during the implementation of teaching and research activities. Almost all of the institution's international agreements involve First World universities, those primarily in the U.S., Japan, and Europe. Most also are developed as doutorados sanduiche/sandwich doctoral programs in which the Brazilian doctoral student begins his or her studies in Brazil, spends one year abroad and then finishes the program in Brazil. The institution also encourages post-doc appointments outside of Brazil and brings international visiting professors to the university.

The Brazilian Lead Institution and the Professional School are active in international student mobility. Between 2005 and 2007, the institution sent 1, 935 student abroad for educational opportunities and it received 1,229 from other countries. Between 2005 and the first semester of 2008, approximately 315 international students studied at the Professional School. The majority of those students were from France, and only one was from the United States. Between 2002 and the first semester of 2008, the School sent approximately 694 of its students to study abroad. The majority of those students went to France, and only 11 chose to study in the United States.

Consortium participation. Brazilian Lead Institution was invited to be in the consortium by American Lead Institution because of a pre-established relationship between the two universities. It brings to the project expertise in economics and regional development and is well-positioned to handle the demands of project implementation. This is primarily so because it lends to the project a director with high university rank. The project director at Brazilian Lead Institution is dean of the Professional School. As the project director, he is the lead Brazilian institutional representative and has joint responsibility for project coordination with CAPES. One of the project director's main responsibilities is to allocate the project funding from CAPES at his own institution as well as the Brazilian partner institution. While he is responsible for the general direction of the project on the Brazilian side, his position of dean allows him to delegate program tasks to other institutional staff and faculty in the Professional School. Therefore, several individuals have contributed to and assisted with project implementation at the Brazilian Lead Institution. The three main people to staff the project include the project director, an

international student advisor, and an academic advisor. The project director delegates

student-related tasks to the international student advisor and academic tasks to the

academic advisor. The international student advisor's regular university roles include

serving as the Chief of International Service and Executive Assistant to the President of

International Office of the Professional School. In these roles, she has access to her own

staff, knowledge base, and resources. She was able to use all of these in addressing

student needs during the Social and Economic Development Project. The international

student advisor attended to a wide range of project needs including the logistical,

orientation, and even emotional needs of the American students who were received at the

institution through the program. This particular staff member was an asset to the program

not only because of the tasks she fulfilled but because she was well-respected and well-

positioned in her relationships with others in the university community. This was

essential to her ability to promote and garner support for the program. Her

responsibilities included program coordination, student orientation, logistical and

emotional student support, student recruitment, program promotion, dissemination of

application materials, implementation of the student selection process, liaison between

the consortium partners, and even meeting students at the airport.

   While the project director assumed overall responsibility for the academic aspect

of the consortium activities, he received support from a university faculty member who

he appointed as academic coordinator and an academic advisor who supported the

coordinator. The faculty member was not available to participate in the study. The

academic advisor was a researcher affiliated with the university and contracted by the

project director using grant funds. The academic advisor provided substantial support to the project by promoting the program across the institution, serving as a liaison between the professors who taught the American exchange students and the program, linking the exchange students to scholars both internal and external to the institution, identifying professors to teach the consortium's distance course, organization of the video courses, implementing the student selection process, assisting students with their research needs, and attending to the emotional needs of the exchange students. The academic advisor also provided substantial social support to the American exchange students. This multi-layer arrangement of staffing and support is rather exceptional among the population of consortia institutions in the United States-Brazil Program and is a direct result of the project director being a dean.

The Brazilian Lead Institution project staff found itself needing to adjust the academic component of the project for the American students who studied on their campus. Initially the project staff had intended to integrate the Americans into courses with Brazilian students. The staff found, however, that the American students were not sufficiently proficient in Portuguese to fully engage in a Brazilian classroom. This resulted in the project staff needing to create a separate instructional environment for the American exchange students after they had arrived on campus.

During the grant period, the Brazilian Lead Institution sent 15 students to the two partner institutions (10 to American Lead Institution and five to American Secondary Institution) in the United States and the American partner institutions sent 13 students to

Brazilian Lead Institution (nine from American Lead Institution and four from American Secondary Institution).

American Secondary Institution

Institution. American Secondary Institution was founded in the late 1800s with a one million dollar gift from a shipping and railroad magnate. It was founded on the idea that it would strengthen ties between all sections of the nation. The institution was initially under the auspices of the Methodist Episcopal Church. It was created with the idea of being an all-male institution and, while it didn't prohibit women, remained all male for much of its early existence. Through the years, the institution grew to be measured on national standards, more and more women were enrolled, and by the mid 20th century it was recognized as one of the top 20 private universities in the United States. By the beginning of the 21st century, American Secondary Institution was the leader in growth of academic research funding in the U.S. and became one of the most selective universities in the nation.

American Secondary Institution is classified by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as a private comprehensive doctoral institution with medical and veterinary programs. It is an independent, privately-supported university employing nearly 2,700 full-time faculty. Between 2004 and present, the institution has been ranked in the top 200 best universities in the world according to The Times Higher Education. Its highest ranking, in 2006, was around #50. The university comprises 10 schools, a distinguished medical center, a public policy center, and nationally renowned center focusing on constitutional issues. It serves almost 12,000 students and offers

undergraduate, graduate, and professional degrees in 66 major fields of study in the arts and sciences, engineering, music, education, business, law, nursing, and medicine. Its unique contributions to the consortium project are its highly renowned programs in Latin American and Brazilian studies and in-country knowledge that the American Lead Institution did not have at the outset of the project.

Affiliated unit. The consortium project at the American Secondary Institution is linked with the Center for Latin American Studies. With federal funding provided after World War Two, the institution established an Institute of Brazilian Studies in the mid 1900s. This institute evolved into the modern day Center for Latin American Studies and expanded its focus to include Mesoamerica, Spanish South America, and the Caribbean. The center boasts one of the strongest concentrations of Brazilianists of any university in the United States, and offers foreign language instruction, including Portuguese, and area studies. Students can enroll in an undergraduate program or a master's program in Latin American Studies along with three joint master's degrees in business, law, and economics. The center's strengths lie in Mesoamerican anthropology and archaeology; the history, politics, languages, and literatures of Brazil; Iberian and Spanish-American literature and languages; comparative political systems; and Caribbean Studies. Its faculty conducts research and publishes on most countries in Latin America. It offers both undergraduate and graduate programs and, besides university staff and faculty, it is guided by a community and a national advisory board. Together with its campus work, the Center for Latin American Studies seeks to expand awareness and knowledge of

Latin America in K-12 and postsecondary settings, business, legal and medical organizations, the media, and the general public.

Institution and affiliated unit's international profile. American Secondary Institution is committed to fostering global citizenship in its students and faculty and actively seeks to form interdisciplinary international relationships. The institution's global interest is demonstrated through its research endeavors, student population, and faculty development. It offers a variety of internationally focused entities including university offices, programs of study, centers, institutes, and initiatives.

The institution's International Office, established in the early 2000s, provides support for international matters at the institution. Relatively new, its role is to facilitate individual and institutional connections between faculty, researchers, staff, students, alumni, and the global community. Its goal is to enhance the international exchange of people and ideas, the quality of learning experiences on and off campus for students and scholars, the pursuit of world-class research, and the university's academic reputation outside of the United States. It provides information and resources related to opportunities for research, study abroad, international academic programs on campus, and services for international students and faculty. It offers assistance in planning visits for international delegations, creating cross-cultural trainings to prepare faculty, staff, or students in preparation for experiences abroad, gaining knowledge about travel to or from the United States and finding additional resources or contacts related to internationally-focused endeavors. To cultivate the university's academic reputation on a global scale, the International Office's advancement entity coordinates 35 alumni clubs around the

world, promoting the university and managing relationships with alumni and friends of the institution.

Despite the substantial assistance the International Office offers to the university community, the consortium project directors were not able to rely on the office for project support. Both of the directors agreed that the International Office was more a resource for the institution as a whole but did not offer dedicated support to the consortium project. Ultimately the responsibility fell on the two directors to provide the majority of the student assistance and to handle all program logistics.

The American Secondary Institution also has an office that specializes in global education which serves to address the needs of the institution's diverse student population and to support the institution's internationalization goals. It offers study abroad programs to more than 60 countries, serves as a resource for post-graduate study and scholarships, international careers, volunteering opportunities, international teaching opportunities, internships, and international careers. The office also runs a year-long program in international study and civic engagement which offers innovative scholarship and service opportunities abroad. In this program, students explore topics of global significance through a learning sequence beginning in the spring semester with a core course at the American Secondary Institution, followed by summer service or field-based project abroad, and a seminar in the fall semester.

American Secondary Institution has a long tradition of interest in Brazil's people, culture, economy, and history. This interest began after World War II, when the Carnegie Foundation awarded it and three other universities a cooperative grant to create

centers for the study of Latin America. With the grant, in the mid 1900s, American

Secondary Institution established an Institute for Brazilian Studies. Shortly after, the

Institute broadened its scope to include all Latin American and Iberian affairs. Today, a

wide variety of programs, departments and centers in the institution's College of Arts and

Science support Brazilian studies. Its Center for Latin American studies is federally-

funded and offers fellowships for the study of Portuguese during the academic year and

summer.   Themes of Brazilian culture can be studies in its departments of Anthropology,

Economics, History, Sociology, and Spanish and Portuguese.

According to the Open Doors report, between 2003 and 2006, the bulk of the

grant period, over 900 international students studied on American Secondary Institution's

campus each year. During the 2007-2008 academic year, the project's extension year, the

university increased international student enrollment to 1,010. In addition to

international students, the university hosted 1,003 international scholars in the 2005-2006

academic year. This was an exponential increase in the 2004-2005 academic year when

they hosted 232 scholars (IIE website, 2008).

Consortium participation. American Secondary Institution was a partner

institution in the consortium. The project directors at the American Lead Institution had a

relationship with a former faculty member from the American Secondary Institution that

led the American project directors to identify partners at the American Secondary

Institution. As a partner, the American Secondary Institution's project directors

participated fully in the design and implementation of program activities but were not

accountable for the administrative actions of the project. During the time of the project,

the directors were an associate dean and a center director, who were also both professors in the history department. They consider themselves specialists in Brazil and issues of race, rather than in grantsmanship or international education. They were well-positioned and well-networked within the institution, and their institutional capital allowed the university administration to more easily make a financial commitment and institutional investment in the consortium project. One of the project directors stated that if the project had been run by an unknown assistant professor, the administration would have been uncertain as to whether or not the lesser known assistant professor could be trusted. In stark contrast to Brazilian Lead Institution, that benefited from the assistance of several staff members, the two directors at American Secondary Institution handled all of the project responsibilities on their campus, from academic matters to meeting students at the airport. This caused some strain on the project directors because of their already busy schedules as higher level administrators. To compensate for a lack of staffing, the project directors made use of students who could informally assist with orienting the Brazilian exchange students to their new social and academic surroundings. This helped to balance the workload for the project directors.

Despite some workload challenges, implementing the consortium program at the American Secondary Institution was relatively problem-free. The 60 year institutional history of academic interest in Brazil coupled with buy-in from institutional leaders helped to solidify support for the project. After winning the grant, the project directors actually took their institutional leaders to Brazil. This allowed the institutional leaders to experience the country firsthand and to see exactly what the students would experience.

This kind of cultivation resulted in institutional financial support for the consortium project.

The American Secondary Institution received five students from the Brazilian Lead Institution and 10 students from the Brazilian Secondary Institution. It sent four students to the Brazilian Lead Institution and six students to the Brazilian Secondary Institution.

Brazilian Secondary Institution

Institution. Brazilian Secondary Institution, also an autonomous institution, was created by federal decree in the mid 1900s and restructured by a second federal decree in two decades later. Its mission is to provide higher education, develop research in diverse areas of knowledge, and promote university extension. Several of the university's professional programs began in the 19th century, prior to the federal decree. In the middle of the 20th century, the university incorporated an artistic and cultural dimension and has become home to several cultural centers, including one focusing on Afro-Oriental themes that has played an important role in the implementation of the consortium. The university incorporated graduate education programs in the late 1900s.

This institution is located in the Northeast of Brazil in a city that is characterized by an ethnic mix of Indians, Europeans, and Africans. The state's economy is based on mining, agriculture, and industry. Although the state population is substantially Afro-Brazilian, Afro-Brazilians represent a small percentage of the total enrollment of the Brazilian Secondary Institution. At the start of this consortium project, the state had just

begun to institute quotas for the enrollment of non-white students as well as students from public secondary schools (Schwartzman, 2004).

Brazilian Secondary Institution is considered the most important institution of higher education in the state. It is founded on the principles of social justice and democracy, which are in line with the theme and goal of the consortium. Brazilian Secondary Institution offers 29 areas of study, 56 undergraduate majors, 43 graduate programs, 41 master's level courses, 17 doctoral programs, and 26 areas of medical specialization. Recently, just over 32,000 students applied for admission into the University. At that time there were just under 4,000 slots available, making an 8:2 ratio between applicants and available spaces.

Affiliated units. There are two university entities that were affiliated with the consortium project and that made Brazilian Secondary Institution particularly well-suited to serve the project. These are a research group and a center for ethnic studies. The research group was established in the early 1990s with the objective of producing empirical research about racism, culture, and the black identity in Brazil. From a comparative and international perspective, the research group examines issues of public Brazilian higher education and ethnic and race relations in the country. The research group is supported by the center for ethnic studies, which is a supplementary entity of the Faculty of Philosophy and Human Sciences. The center is dedicated to study, research, and community action pertaining to Afro-Brazilians. Both the research group and the center were resources for the American students studying at the institution. The center was one of the entities that hosted the consortium project's Summer History Program.

Institution and affiliated unit's international profile. One of the guiding

objectives of the university over the period of consortium activities was to promote the

diffusion of the university's scientific, technical, and artistic production nationally and

internationally. Towards that end, in 2005, there were more than 38 international

agreements signed at the University. The Office for International Affairs (OIA),

generally, supports faculty, staff and administrative departments of the university in their

relationships with international institutions. The OIA administers all aspects of

institutional contracts and agreements, supports Brazilian and foreign students on

exchange programs, receives representatives of foreign institutions, represents Brazilian

Secondary Institution at events that bring together different organs of international

collaboration, and organizes and supports events related to international exchange (OIA).

The OIA, however, was not a source of additional support for the project director at this

institution.

Consortium participation. Brazilian Secondary Institution served as the partner

institution. This institution offered a well of expertise in race relations to the consortium

project. As a partner institution, its project director participated fully in the design and

implementation of program activities but was not accountable for the administrative

actions of the project. The project activities at Brazilian Secondary Institution began

under the leadership of a dean and leadership was subsequently transferred to an assistant

professor of sociology. This was necessary because the dean was promoted to direct a

university center and could no longer allocate the time needed to run the project. This

change happened early in the funding period, so for the majority of the time the project

was run by a fairly new assistant professor in the institution. While the impact of the change of the specific director was minimal, the impact of the change from a director in a more prestigious position to director in a less prestigious position was significant. As an assistant professor the second director found it more challenging to run the program. The project director of the Brazilian Lead institution noted that the lower ranking of the secondary institution project director posed some difficulties for her as well as for the other partner institutions. These problems did not prohibit implementation, rather they complicated it. The Brazilian Secondary Institution project director did alone, for the most part, what the Brazilian Lead Institution has three or more staff members to do. While the Brazilian Secondary Institution project director did not have formal staff assistance as a part of the grant, she did make use of colleagues and students when possible. One example of this was, enlisting Brazilian students who had already returned from the United States to serve as a welcoming committee for the American students. This alleviated some of her workload in the same manner as the American Secondary project directors were able to alleviate their workload. Still, the Brazilian Secondary project director, as an assistant professor, did not have access to an administrative staff, and therefore had no one to assist with administrative tasks. This project director coordinated student selection, program marketing, documentation, and student orientation primarily on her own.

Despite any difficulties, the Brazilian Secondary Institution was able to host the Summer History program and send 17 students to the U.S. during the consortium project. Seven of its students went to American Lead Institution and 10 went to American

Secondary Institution. It received five students from the American Lead Institution and six from the American Secondary Institution.

About the National Consortia Program and Institutional Consortium Project Staff

  FIPSE Senior Official. The FIPSE Senior Official has had a long history of public service in the areas of national and higher education in the United States. Most recently, he led the Department of Education's Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) for four-and-a-half years. Some of his previous positions have included Special Advisor to former Secretary of Education Rod Paige, Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, and Director of Academic Programs for the former U.S. Information Agency. In addition, he has held senior administrative positions at American University and Grambling State University. He earned his bachelor's degree in History from Southern University. He earned a master's in American history from Carnegie Mellon University.

  New FIPSE Senior Official. The New FIPSE Senior Official joined the FIPSE staff during the last year of the consortium project. Prior to his assignment to FIPSE, he served as Director of the U.S. Department of Education's International Education Programs Service. In that role he managed the major federal programs dedicated to the maintenance and development of a national capacity in foreign language, area studies, and international business. He has held a variety of administrative, programmatic, and management positions during his 37-year tenure with the International Education Programs Service. He holds a bachelor's degree from Norfolk State University, a

master's degree from The George Washington University, and Senior Executive Fellows certificate from the John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

New FIPSE National Program Coordinator. The New FIPSE Program Coordinator arrived in the last year of the consortium project. She was previously Team Leader of the International Studies Team in the International Education Programs Service. As such she directed discretionary grant programs to improve the academic teaching of area studies, foreign languages, and international business. She earned a bachelor's degree in Business and Economics from the College of New Rochelle a master's degree in International Studies from George Mason University.

CAPES Senior Official. The Brazilian Senior Official has more than a decade of public service to education in Brazil. He began his career as a staff member in the Brazilian Ministry of Education. Within two years, he began working for CAPES and, shortly after, he moved into the Division of International Cooperation. He rapidly moved through positions of increased responsibility including Advisor to the Presidency, Advisor to the Coordinator General of International Cooperation, Adjunct Coordinator General of International Cooperation, and Chief Auditor. He was promoted to Coordinator General of International Cooperation in the final year of the consortium project funding period and has subsequently risen to the position of Chief of the International Division of the Ministry of Education. He holds an undergraduate degree in Law from Centro Universitario de Brasília/University Center of Brasília and a master's degree in Comparative Studies of the Americas from the University of Brasília's Centro

de Pesquisas e Pós –Graduação sobre as Americas/Center for Research and Graduate Studies on the Americas.

American Lead Institution Project Director. The American Lead Project Director is the most seasoned of the project directors. Currently, he serves as a Vice Provost American Lead Institution. He has held other positions at the University, including dean and interim vice president. In addition, he has served as faculty or as a visiting scholar at several other American institutions. He is a national leader in graduate education within his discipline and has served as a member of numerous national boards. He is also a Past President of the Northeastern Association of Graduate Schools and the National Communication Association. Currently, he is a member of the Board of Trustees of the University Corporation for Atmospheric Research and the Oak Ridge Associated Universities Board of Directors. He earned a bachelor's degree, master's degree, and a doctorate.

American Lead Institution Co-Project Director. The American Lead Institution Co-Project Director is a professor at The Graduate School. He has chaired or has been a member of numerous professional societies at the American Lead Institution and has been the recipient of many grants and contracts, several of the international in scope. He is widely published in graduate education and research, computer science, and other scholarly interests. He holds a master's degree in mathematics, a master's degree in computer science, and a doctorate in mathematics.

American Lead Institution Graduate Assistant. The American Lead Institution Graduate Assistant was a Ph.D. candidate in The Graduate School during the

implementation of the U.S.-Brazil Program. Throughout her doctoral program she worked in The Graduate School. She earned her doctorate in 2008 and currently serves as a technical writer at American Lead Institution.

Brazilian Lead Institution Project Director. The Brazilian Lead Institution Project Director is a dean at the Brazilian Lead Institution. He holds a master's and a doctorate in Economics from the Brazilian Lead Institution and completed post graduate studies at Cornell University and post-doctoral studies at the Ohio State University. His main research focus is on regional economic inequality and income inequality. He is a member of an international scientific advisory association and founder of the Brazilian Association of Regional Studies. He sits on the editorial boards of several international and national journals and has reviewed numerous books, chapters, articles for international and national publications.

Brazilian Lead Institution Academic Advisor. The Brazilian Lead Institution's academic advisor is a journalist and a researcher. She was contracted by the Brazilian Lead Institution to provide academic services to the Social and Economic Development Consortium Project. She has received multiple fellowships for graduate study and professional development. At the Brazilian Lead Institution she was a researcher for a group that focused on the intersection of interdisciplinary studies and the Afro-Brazilian.. She holds a Ph.D. in Communication Sciences and a master's degree in Latin American Integration both from the Brazilian Lead Institution.

Brazilian Lead Institution International Student Advisor. For more than 10 years, the International Student Advisor for the Brazilian Lead Institution has been responsible

for international programs and international student issues for The Professional School at the Brazilian Lead Institution. In this role, she manages different international exchange programs and organizes international and national conferences at the institution . She has ample experience abroad having travelled outside of Brazil for professional development, site visits, and conferences. She holds a Bachelor of Business and an MBA Certificate for Executive Assistant from the Brazilian Lead Institution.

American Secondary Project Director. The American Secondary Project Director is an associate professor, former associate dean, and past director of an area studies center at the American Secondary Institution. Her research focus includes the history of colonial Latin America, the Atlantic World, the Afro-circum-Caribbean borderlands, comparative slave systems, and women and gender in colonial She has taught courses on the Iberian Atlantic Empires, Colonial Mexico, Sub-Saharan Africa, comparative slavery, among others. She has authored a book and several essays on slavery, and serves on the editorial boards for several historical journals.

American Secondary Institution Co-Project Director. The American Secondary Institution Co-Project Director joined the program in its second-to-last year. He is a professor of history specializing in Latin America with an emphasis on Brazil at the American Secondary Institution. He has taught classes covering the history of Latin America, Brazil, Central America, the Portuguese empire, slavery, the Amazon, film and history, and the evolution of modern technology. For several years he has been the executive director of an interdisciplinary, international organization that promotes the study of Brazil. He has earned many awards and grants, including ones from the National

Endowment for the Humanities, the Tinker Foundation, and Fulbright-Hayes. He has authored two books on Brazil and co-edited two others. He has also published many articles and book reviews. He holds a bachelor's degree in history and anthropology, a master's degree in Latin American history, and a doctorate in Latin American history.

Brazilian Secondary Institution Project Director. The Brazilian Secondary Institution Project Director is the newest professional of the project directors. She has recently assumed the position of director of the University's center that focuses issues of Afro-Brazilians and is an adjunct professor at the University. Her research focus is the sociology of inequality with an emphasis on racism, culture, and identity. She holds a master's degree in sociology from the Brazilian Secondary Institution and a doctorate in sociology from the Brazilian Lead Institution. She completed post-doctoral studies at the American Secondary University.

Brazilian Secondary Institution Former Project Director. The Brazilian Secondary Institution Former Project Director worked with the Social and Economic Development Project for only the first year. He left the program to direct a center for ethnic studies at the Brazilian Secondary Institution's center and is currently an adjunct professor at the Brazilian Secondary Institution. His research focus is on Afro-Brazilian religiosity, affirmative action, and higher education. He is widely published in areas concerning race relations, affirmative action, and Brazilian culture. He earned master's and a doctorate in Anthropology from the Brazilian Lead Institution.

Conclusion

Chapter Four presented the key actors in the study to the reader. By providing background information for the two national sponsoring agencies, including a brief history and their modern day scope of work, it allows the reader to understand the organizational context in which the US-Brazil Program was developed. This chapter described the Social and Economic Development Project and the activities that were accomplished during the grant period which allows the reader to envision the programmatic demands confronted by the project staff. Finally, it introduced the individual participants who were responsible for the national program and the institutional consortium project. This gives the reader an image of who is implementing the project. With regard to the institutional staff, it enables the reader to connect his or knowledge of the participants' regular professional roles with their additional responsibilities as consortium project staff.

CHAPTER FIVE

PARTICPANT EXPERIENCE AND FACILITATIVE CONDITIONS

This chapter reports the findings of the study and is divided into two parts. In the

first part, I report findings that describe how each participant experienced the program,

answering the specific research questions posed. In the second part, I report findings that

address the overall study question, "What factors influence the successful implementation

of collaborative international higher education programs?" The findings in Part Two have

been organized into six different themes that represent the conditions that facilitate the

implementation of and collaboration in the U.S.-Brazil Program and the selected

consortium project, the Social and Economic Development Project.

Part One: Participant Experience

Research Questions

The research questions addressed in this section are:

1. How did the participants experience the program in light of their perceptions of

   the program goals, implementation process, and accomplishments?

2. How do these perceptions differ between American and Brazilian participants?

3. How do these perceptions differ across consortium partners?

Because each institution existed in a different context, each individual contributed

a different perspective of the experience. Both American and Brazilian partners

communicated they were pleased with the program and their partnership relationship.

Neither between national partners nor between regional partners was there a significant

difference in opinion about their overall partnership experience. All of the participants

were in agreement with the goals of the program, which were to exchange students and

faculty and to co-create curriculum materials, and there was general agreement of what

was successfully accomplished during the project period. There was great variation with

regard to perception of the implementation process, which is in accordance with the

concept of each individual experiencing the same stimuli differently. To address the

research questions in more detail, I have summarized each participant's responses in

direct relation to the questions.

How Each of the Participants Experienced the Program

    CAPES National Program Coordinator. The CAPES National Program

Coordinator felt good about the program and perceived the relationship the two

government offices had to be an easy and informal one that benefits from similar

institutional cultures and in which the coordinators communicated well. The only

difficulty with the coordinators working together that she identified was that CAPES was

not as technologically advanced in its application process as FIPSE. She struggled to

determine what may have been unsuccessful about the program but finally offered that

certain logistics such as handling elective courses and credit recognition were, indeed, not

successful. She also commented that it was difficult to find American students to

participate in the consortia project and this was a challenge for the program. She

remarked about the "organized, focused, flexible, and objective" way in which the

Americans went about their work. Recognizing that each country is very different, she

perceived their relationship to be an equal one, citing the ability for each country to work

within its own guidelines. Overall, she felt that with the promotion of undergraduate

student mobility in the CAPES-FIPSE program, that CAPES has been able to challenge

and overcome traditional thinking and practices in the Brazilian higher education

community regarding who studies abroad and at what time in one's academic career that

international experience takes place.

CAPES Senior Official. Recognizing the centrality of the Brazilian higher

education system and the independent nature of the American higher education system,

this senior CAPES official felt that, at the time, the partnership between the two

governments was going well. He credits this to the ability of the government

representatives to communicate with each other, equivalent objectives, and flexibility. In

terms of program success, he felt that student mobility was well effected and that the

program was able to stimulate opportunities to modernize curriculum. In opposition to

the program coordinator, he felt that credit recognition was well done. He agreed that it

was a challenge to achieve equal American and Brazilian student participation. He

attributed that challenge to the American students' difficulty with the Portuguese

language and their lack of familiarity with Brazil and its educational system. In addition

to an inequality in student mobility between the two countries, he was aware that there

was an unequal geographical representation of participating Brazilian institutions and

considered it important to have participating institutions from all over Brazil, rather than

the more heavily involved South Eastern region of the country.

He believed that technology's impact on global communication facilitated the

implementation of the program but that a lack of structure in international affairs

departments in Brazilian institutions hindered the facilitation of logistical matters such as housing, orientation, and Portuguese classes for American students, and that tuition and fees on the American side hindered Brazilian students ability to participate.

FIPSE National Program Coordinator. For the FIPSE National Program Coordinator, it was an overall positive experience working with CAPES and implementing the program. Something this experience provided her is a better understanding of the cultural differences between the American and Brazilian educational systems. She, like the CAPES Senior Official, noted the centralized nature of the Brazilian system and the decentralized nature of the American system. However, she observed that the CAPES and FIPSE staffs, despite differences, displayed a mutual interest in working together and addressing educational issues that would benefit both countries. Concerning their working relationship, she perceived that each country approaches efficiency in a different manner, remarking on the more "accelerated, stressed, tense" work style of the Americans, and attributed this difference to culture. She also found that there is more bureaucracy on the American side and that the American bureaucracy, unfortunately, negatively counteracted the openness and willingness that CAPES demonstrated in expanding their programmatic involvement with FIPSE. She felt that her and her some of her partners' focus on language acquisition positively contributed to the collaborative relationship. In terms of challenges, she indicated that travel restrictions by the U.S. government prohibited American grantees from meeting with Brazilian counterparts on one occasion and that resulted in minor embarrassment on the American side. Aside from this, she felt that FIPSE, for their part, was able to run the

program satisfactorily. She suggested that one factor that has contributed to that is the accumulated learning from prior FIPSE programs that was applied to the CAPES-FIPSE program. According to this program coordinator, the CAPES-FIPSE program also benefited from organizational similarities that facilitated program implementation such as equivalent funding, similar institutional interests in project topics, and certain historical, economic, and cultural parallels between the countries that facilitated specific projects, particularly the project that is the focus of this study. Concerning program success, she believed that the program was particularly successful in forging the collegial connections needed to promote professional cross-cultural curriculum innovation, but recognized the need to create formal assessment measures of the outcomes of those connections.

American Lead Institution Graduate Assistant. Overall, this graduate assistant felt the consortium worked well and attributed that to a shared vision and mission and individual personalities. Charged with several tasks related to the daily coordination of the consortium project, she experienced the implementation on a more intimate level than some of the project directors. Something that she observed in the project that she felt negatively impacted implementation was the shifting responsibilities of project staff in American Lead Institution. She observed that shifting responsibilities, caused delays, at times, in the accomplishment of tasks as well as misunderstandings about the appropriate staff member to direct a inquiry. She felt that her status as a graduate student affected her experience with the project in ways that it did not affect the project directors. For example, she was uncomfortable working with other students' sensitive personal information and she was unable to make certain important project decisions. In addition

to being close to the daily work of the program, she was also close to the participating students. This affected her perception of implementation in that it made her aware of differences in how the two American partners addressed components of the project and the impact those differences had on the project. To this graduate assistant, communication was an important factor in the implementation of the project, and she felt that improved communication would have enhanced progress throughout implementation. Contrary to the program coordinators' experience, she felt that language issues posed a communication problem and resulted in miscommunication and misunderstanding. This perspective, was, no doubt, a result of being project staff needing to communicate frequently but having limited capabilities in each other's language.

FIPSE New National Program Director. The New FIPSE National Program Coordinator began working with the program at the end of the grant period. Based on her limited experience, she felt the government partners were successful at forming the relationship between the U.S. and Brazil, developing trust and respect, creating open lines of communication, being able to work through issues, and achieving cultural understanding. She believed that certain factors led to the successful partnership, among them flexibility displayed by both partners, the fact that both U.S. and Brazil are large democracies, the manner in which each government allocates funding, how they work together, and their use of strategy sessions and regular meetings. She does not speak any Portuguese, and felt that cultural understanding is more important than language proficiency in working across borders.

American Secondary Institution Co-Project Directors. (These project directors were interviewed jointly.) For these American co-project directors, participation in this project was a learning experience, especially in terms of understanding what it takes to accomplish certain collaborative endeavors and understanding the amount and type of resources needed to facilitate an exchange program. Admittedly, they were naïve about the logistical complexity of the electronic course created during the project. As highly involved faculty members and administrators at the university, these two directors felt the time crunch between their regular university responsibilities and the attention they needed to give to various aspects of the consortium project. They also felt strongly the institutional differences between them and the American lead institution as well as different disciplinary expectations between the sciences and the humanities. They felt "the programmatic fit was not as good as the personal fit." Similarly to their counterpart, the Brazilian Secondary Institution, these two project coordinators ran the program without support staff and therefore found themselves taking on tasks they felt "were not an efficient use of a high level administrator's time." They also recognized the importance of joint collaboration between faculty and administrators of the same institutions, stating that the combination of their role-specific functions was what makde this type of project possible. They considered that the project succeeded in the accomplishment of its main purpose, which was to exchange students. The American Secondary Institution Project Director specifically, felt that all of the participating institutions experienced a change in the campus environment because of the infusion of

international students and that her particular institution administration enhanced its interest in doing more international activities because of the program.

Former Brazilian Secondary Institution Project Director. This project coordinator was only involved for the first year of the project because he was appointed to direct a center at his institution. He was not able to effectively direct both the center and the CAPES-FIPSE project. He felt that the process of creating the proposal for the project was well done, especially considering that most of the directors didn't know each other and that the process took place completely on-line. He believed that the specific thematic nature of the consortium and the context in which it took place positioned it for success at the beginning of implementation and resulted in it being a more successful consortium than others he has known. With a strong proficiency in English, he did not feel there were any communication difficulties between the project directors, pointing out that initial communication was written and on-line. One area of implementation that did pose a difficulty for him was the bureaucracy he experienced on the American side, specifically the amount of time it took for one American institution to process paperwork and the resulting visa problems for the Brazilian students.

Brazilian Secondary Institution Project Director. This project director moved from being a co-director with the Former Brazilian Secondary Institution Project Director to working by herself. She was the only director in this consortium project who did not have the assistance of a co-director, project staff, or an international students office. She found herself undertaking many of the administrative, academic, and student-focused aspects of project coordination. In addition, as an assistant professor, she was the lowest

ranking of the directors, and confronted challenges because of her status. Whereas her Brazilian partner was able to draw on the human and financial resources of the school he leads, she was not in the same position. From her perspective, dynamics between the partners were good from the beginning, there were no conflicts between them and everyone was supportive. She also felt that each partner put forth an equal effort and that everyone showed interest in and valued the project. While during the project period she had a good command of English, she was not fluent and felt that a complete reliance on English in the consortium limited communication for her somewhat. She felt that project implementation went well and stated that she didn't perceive many inequities. Working with CAPES also went well for her and noted that CAPES always provided funding on time and that their staff was available and efficient.

Brazilian Lead Institution International Student Advisor. This project staffer was responsible for various aspects of project coordination. She was involved with student recruitment, selection, and orientation. She assisted with visa issues, conducted site visits to the American partners, and promoted the program. In her opinion, all the partners gained from the consortium experience, however, she feels the Brazilian partners gained more from this project because they sent more students abroad. She indicated certain areas in which project implementation enhanced her own knowledge including the provision of student support, administration of government sponsored grant programs, and institutional awareness. She also experienced bureaucratic challenges with the American institutions and with one more so than the other. At times, her workload was made heavier by the need to address financial issues faced by the students, making her

realize the necessity for more student funding and its impact on project coordination. She recognized the importance and process of a consortium relationship over time, commenting that, from her perspective, implementation was harder in the beginning before they got to know each other. She feels that one outcome of international programs of this nature is enhanced understanding of the field of international work itself.

Brazilian Lead Institution Academic Advisor. This project staffer's role in the project was to work with academic matters. She was contracted to provide support to other staff who were involved in the project's academic component. In her opinion, the academic portion of the project created a heavy workload for her and others. She felt very strongly about the significance of the project in terms of its racial and social justice themes and its unique purpose of comparing two national realities. In addition, she emphasized the importance of the project having great representation of black Brazilians in its coordination. This may be due, in part, to her identity as a black, female, Ph.D at the Brazilian Lead Instituion. In addition, her experience in the program was affected by needing to attend to the American students' social concerns. At her institution, the students relied on her as well as the International Student Advisor to provide them with not only project and academic orientation and support but also social orientation and support. Certain of her preconceptions of the American institutions were challenged and she developed new impressions of them throughout the process. She felt that the demand and the desire for the program activities were greater on the Brazilian side.

FIPSE Senior Official. This senior American official at FIPSE feels that the relationship between CAPES and FIPSE was an excellent one and that they were able to

solve any problems that have arisen. Although he does not speak any Portuguese he

didn't experience any language barrier in working with his counterparts. Contributing to

this may be that he was not as close to the daily work interactions as the American

program coordinator during his tenure with the program. Also with this in mind, he

perceived a major challenge to be the anticipation of program funding.

New FIPSE Senior Official. The New FIPSE Senior Official also came on board

toward the end of the project period. Recognizing the multiple changes in leadership on

the American side over the life of the program, he felt that the FIPSE staff has done a

good job of working with each other in times of transition. He felt that CAPES and

FIPSE was able to continually resolve issues and refine their process of implementing the

program. He credited regular face to face meetings with their ability to establish open

lines of communication and forging a strong relationship.

He also recognized similarities between the United States and Brazil including

historical development, the slave trade and issues resulting from it, and a focus for

providing on disadvantaged peoples. He considered it important to have individuals

implementing the program or a consortium project that understand each national context.

Also not proficient in Portuguese, he felt that good will and cultural sensitivity were more

important to the partner relationship.

American Lead Institution Project Director. The American Project Director a

also served as dean and vice provost of the Graduate School at his institution. He had an

overwhelmingly positive opinion of the working relationship between the partners. He

emphasized the enhanced cultural, educational, and professional knowledge that arose out

of the partnership. From his own institutional perspective, he felt the project was especially successful in raising interest around Brazil and in motivating graduate students to study abroad. As a member of a large research institution, he recognized the students' and faculty's initial bias to engaging the Brazilian Lead Institution which was also a large research institution, versus the secondary Brazilian institution which was similar to a small regional institution. Also not proficient in Portuguese, he felt a sense of embarrassment and a reminder of American linguistic illiteracy. He felt that the Brazilians, however, were comfortable with the language dynamic between them and Americans.

American Lead Institution Co-Project Director. What this project director communicated most emphatically about his experience with the project was the necessity to establish a trusting relationship with the partners, which he is confident existed within the consortium project. One way of establishing this trust if for the partners to make concessions to each other. He observed that it was very easy for the partners to agree on project-related decisions. Like his colleagues at his institution, he was not fluent in Portuguese and, while he made an effort, he expressed some guilt in not being able to communicate in Portuguese to any great extent. He appreciated the generosity the Brazilians showed in communicating in English. He found some aspects of working with the project to be surprising including the great effort it took to complete the distance course, the lengthy process the American Lead Institution lawyers went through to arrive at a memo of understanding, and a realization that his university had not had a educational presence in the Bahia region of Brazil in over half a century. He experienced

difficulties in dealing with the Brazilian consulate in Washington, DC, and perceived racism to be at play when certain of his institution's students applied for their visa to travel to Brazil. He was also aware of and sensitive to difficulties the Brazilian students experienced in acquiring visas and felt the process was "quite onerous." He felt good about working with FIPSE, that they were responsive, encouraged flexibility and innovation, and were open to the ideas of the project directors. He developed strong friendships with some of the partners and indicated that others developed strong friendships as well. These friendships he said were indicative of the comfort level that existed between the partners. Overall, he was pleased with the number of students exchanged during the project period and felt that the partners produced a unique educational tool that is of good quality. He feels a strong sense of commitment to continuing the academic relationship with the Brazilians and believes this sense of commitment is felt by others as well.

  Brazilian Lead Project Director. Overall working on the consortium project was an enjoyable process for this project director. He was a sole project director, however, his role as dean within the institution gave him access to several institutional personnel who provided support to the project. He enjoyed his partners and had fun both working and socializing with them. While it was a positive experience for him, he felt that collaboration was more effective with the partners who held higher rank at their institutions because they had more decision making authority and could more easily accomplish certain implementation tasks. Something that stood out for him in the process was the need for the directors to be effective problem solvers and to work in concert to

116

achieve certain results. He considered that the American institutions were more corporate-like and profit-centered in their approach to education than the Brazilian institutions which he feels are more socially-oriented. These differences in philosophy did manifest in problems with certain aspects of the project such as credit recognition and tuition arrangements for Brazilian students studying in the U.S. He felt the partnership was a success and indicated several concrete accomplishments to demonstrate this including the number of exchanged students, publications and conferences created, and student feedback. In addition, he indicated a change in student demographics to include more black students and more poor students as an indicator of success as well.

Part Two: Facilitative Conditions

This part of the findings chapter is devoted to the participants' responses that answer the overall study question, "What factors influence the successful implementation of collaborative international higher education initiatives?" These responses reveal the conditions that facilitated the successful implementation of the national program and the selected consortium project. Much of the international higher education collaboration and international strategic alliance in business literature addresses outcomes of collaborative activities, rationales for collaborating, contexts in which collaboration takes place, benefits and challenges of collaboration, ways in which institutions have collaborated, collaboration as a response to globalization, and specific thematic collaborations. This research study examined the process of collaborating and the experiences of those collaboration agents who participated in the process. It specifically highlights the conditions that facilitate the process of collaboration and implementation in

the context of an international higher education initiative. The purpose of this chapter is to present those facilitative conditions as they were derived from the governmental program coordinators and institutional project directors of the U.S.-Brazil Higher Education Consortia Program.

The overall question that this research study to answer is: "What factors influence the successful implementation of collaborative international higher education initiatives?" To address this overall question, I posed the following main questions about the United States-Brazil Higher Education Consortia Program:

1. *How do the government and academic personnel in the United States -Brazil Higher Education Consortia Program experience the program in light of their perceptions of the program goals, implementation process, and accomplishments?*
2. *How do these perceptions differ between American and Brazilian participants?*
3. *How do these perceptions differ across consortium partners?*

Using a qualitative approach based on interviews, document analysis, and observation, I collected data from 16 participants at the four consortium project institutions and the two government education agencies. After crafting a basic description of the partners and the phenomenon they experienced, I further analyzed the data and constructed categories and themes that represent patterns found (Merriam, 1988). The findings of this study largely fit into one overarching category of conditions that are relevant to the overall study question and specific research questions I posed. I call this category, "facilitative conditions." The facilitative conditions are organized into several themes. The six most significant of these themes are: 1. partner equality and

mutuality, 2. partner characteristics, 3. partner relationship, 4. finances, 5. strategies, and 6. staffing.

While some of these themes were addressed by each participant, none was universally indicated to the same degree of importance by all of the participants. There was agreement between participants in their experiences and perceptions, however, each participant focused more intensely on particular occurrences, circumstances, or factors. I see this variation in focus as representing two concepts. The first is Bennett's (1998) idea that not everyone experiences the same stimuli in the same way. The second is that each participant's experience was influenced by the different contexts in which he or she functioned, the contexts being national, institutional, or individual. The different contexts resulted in the participants at each institution focusing, to varying degrees of intensity, on different aspects of implementation and the collaborative relationship.

In this section, I continue to present the findings of the study organized into facilitative conditions. The facilitative conditions are divided into the six themes that were derived from the findings and integrated with supporting data from interviews. It will be evident that the six themes are interrelated to an extent. The first to be presented are partner equality and mutuality. Its placement as the first theme on which to be elaborated is reflective of the high level of importance placed on it in the literature as well as by study participants. The remaining five sub-categories are not presented in any particular order. All of them are considered important as individual factors as well as being integral components of a strategy for achieving a successful international higher education collaboration.

Partner Equality and Mutuality

Equality is the state of being equal, having rights, treatment, quantity, or value equal to all others in a given group. Mutuality is being done, felt, or expressed by each toward or with regard to the other (Encarta Dictionary, 2004). The study participants raised the issue of equality and mutuality in several aspects of collaboration including the philosophy and nature of the relationship, institutional infrastructure and resources, funding, participation, thematic interests, and language. For the majority of the participants in this study the principles of equality and mutuality surfaced early in their interviews. They associated the achievement of equality and mutuality with a successful collaboration. Overall, the participants indicated few inequalities program wide. While not each interviewee raised the issue of equality, 11 of the 17 participants communicated its importance related to the areas mentioned above. These included one American government program coordinator, one senior Brazilian official, one Brazilian government program coordinator, one Brazilian project director, two Brazilian support staff, one American project director, and one American support staff.

Equality in partner relationship. The participants didn't embellish their comments related to equality in the nature of the partner relationship. They answered succinctly and emphatically, demonstrating the unequivocal importance of the presence of those characteristics. In their responses to being asked about their definition of a successful international higher education consortium a senior Brazilian official in CAPES and an American lead co-project director unhesitatingly responded:

Must be a win-win project, it has to be reciprocal, everyone has to gain.

(Senior Brazilian CAPES official)

All members are equal and are peers. There must be meaningful levels of

reciprocity. Everyone must contribute and everyone must receive. (American

Lead Institution Project Director)

Several participants highlighted the importance of avoiding a tendency towards a

relationship characterized by an imbalance of power due to the nature or status of the

partners, such as a traditional North-South relationship in which the Northern country is

placed in a position of superiority, an HBCU taking a secondary position to a

predominantly white institution, or a well-endowed and sizable research university

overshadowing a smaller, less financially solvent university. This collaboration avoided

that tendency. A Brazilian program coordinator from CAPES proudly stated:

Past relationships have been North-South, this relationship is symmetrical,

they are receiving and sending on both sides.

The American Lead Institution co-project director shared his thoughts pertaining

to the historical coupling of HBCUs and PWIs with regard to his institution's criteria for

inviting another American institution to be a partner:

I think because of [our institution's] sensitivities and the history of association

of historically black colleges and universities and predominantly white

universities that the black university is just there to tag along and to legitimize

121

the other institution. So we told [our prospective partner] in our first

conversation that if we weren't the lead we weren't interested, so that was

kind of risky but they bought it, they went along with it. It was an enormous

leap of faith for them and for us.

The characteristics of equality and mutuality can also be seen in the working style

of the participants, especially the government partners. They stated that there was a

similarity in their working style and organizational philosophy. In addition to having

similar working styles they were willing to work together and to accommodate one

another when necessary. For example, a senior CAPES official informed that in the

initial stages of establishing the program they found that CAPES and FIPSE each had a

model for collaboration. The models were similar, therefore CAPES modified the FIPSE

model to adapt to the rules at CAPES. They integrated the two models to create the

CAPES-FIPSE program.

Along with the participants' interview responses, the Agreement of Academic

Cooperation between the four partner institutions includes a clause titled "Independent

Contractor" that addresses the issue of equality in the exchange relationship. This clause

specifically sets forth the nature of the relation between each of the four institutions and

positions them as independent entities not under the control or leadership of any other of

the partners. The clause states:

> In the performance of the services and programs contemplated hereunder the
>
> host institution shall not be considered an agent of the home institution but
>
> shall be an independent contractor. The undersigned parties hereby agree that

the home institution shall have no control over the day to day operations of the academic programs contemplated hereunder. The host institution shall control the manner, means, and methods of the performance of its obligations under this Agreement.

Equality of infrastructure and resources. The participants reported few inequalities or imbalances, however, those they indicated were the result of institutional differences and, specifically, differences in infrastructure and human resources. These imbalances affected the project directors as well as the students. Demonstrating this, several participants reflect on imbalances they observed.

> The infrastructure was not the same [in the two Brazilian institutions]. There was an uneven relationship between the two Brazilian institutions and the level of support and infrastructure for the [American] students they are receiving. That was the most marked inequality noted by all and we had to have some discussions about it. (American Secondary Institution Project Director)

As I will address later, project staffing proved to be one area in which marked inequality could be seen. The academic advisor at the Brazilian Lead Institution noted of the Brazilian Lead Institution:

> I had the impression that [their coordinator] created a series of plans and implemented them well but she often didn't have anyone to help her. So, [our director] sent someone to help her with the taping for the electronic course.

Imbalances in the implementation of the project pertaining to the provision of student housing and communication of project expectations existed between the American partners.

> There was some level of inconsistency but that may have just been flexibility that was required. For example, housing, the [American Secondary Institution] covered housing, but the [American Lead Institution] provided supplements. Just a different circumstance based on a different level of resources at the institutions, so it was an imbalance for the students. It was great to have that level of flexibility but students left with different experiences, and I don't know what their take was on that. (American Lead Institution Graduate Assistant)

> I don't know if this was necessarily an inequity, but it's an imbalance with what had been communicated to students about the program, about their expectations of the program. I was surprised. It kind of goes back to how much flexibility versus kind of consistency you would want. The summer program for instance, what [the dean] wanted to have happen was for the students who had been selected to go from the [American Lead Institution] to field test the course. So that not only would we be able to get feedback about the course but that they would have some orientation and exposure to some of the content and be prepared. We met once a month, so not only were we able to meet the objective of getting them up to speed but were in regular

communication with them about what had been going on in the program and what they should expect so that by the time they left they had reading materials, they were ready to go. The students from [American Secondary Institution] got there and seemed to respond like, "Why do we have to do all of this?" or "There's such a tight schedule." I had heard anecdotally from some of [our] students, that the [American Secondary Institution] students were basically like, "Well, we just got this money to go to Brazil." I don't know how much of this was students not reading what was given to them or what was not communicated to them. (American Lead Institution Graduate Assistant)

Equal participation and effort. The study participants expressed that without comparable amounts of effort and dedication to the collaboration, and the resulting consortium projects, it could not thrive.

You can have a partnership where you may see advantage but it's not truly a two way partnership, and that's the genius of the FIPSE program, it wasn't us, but the fact that [CAPES and FIPSE] devised it so you have basically an equal number of students going each way means that everyone feels that their level of participation is the same as everyone else so the fact that its not a one way street is also an enormous factor. (American Lead Institution Co-Project Director)

Equality in thematic interest. The government participants spoke of the importance of equality in thematic interest as being important to the success of the bi-national partnership. Program wide, the consortium projects addressed a variety of themes including education, science, music, environment, social justice, geography, and more. There was symmetry between the interests of the Brazilian institutions and the American institutions. This demonstrates certain similarities between the countries and bolsters the rationale for their national partnership. With the Social and Economic Development Consortium Project, the partners were well-matched in terms of institutional and individual interests and therefore each partner was interested and engaged in the project theme and brought strengths to it. Of the program as a whole, the FIPSE National Program Coordinator remarked:

> But by and large I think on both sides, especially the U.S. side, there is a great interest in trying to decide to how come together, how to bring people together, how to deal with issues in engineering, in business, in the arts and social sciences that would benefit both countries. There's been a mutual interest.

Equality in communication and language use. Neither the American nor the Brazilian participants considered language an impediment to equality for the CAPES-FIPSE program because most of the Brazilian participants spoke English. However, that, at the institutional project level, most of the communication was done in English, did affect the achievement of equality according to certain participants. Instead of a mutual understanding and use of both languages, one partner's language was favored over

another. An example of this threat to equality is communicated by the American Lead

Institution Graduate Assistant in her discussion of challenges experienced during project

implementation:

> None of the key actors at [this institution] was fluent in Portuguese so we
>
> relied on our partners facility with English, which was unfair, an unfair burden
>
> on them. I think that stymied some of the communication, both over the
>
> phone and in e-mail. I think things can be taken in different ways. I think
>
> communication is a big part of it.

This discrepancy in language proficiency appeared to be more of a concern for the

supporting staff whose language proficiency in either English or Portuguese was not as

strong as that of the bilingual project directors. When asked if project director language

ability ever affected collaboration and implementation of the program, FIPSE National

Program Coordinator felt it had not been a problem, responding:

> No, only because the Brazilians were sufficiently proficient in English to
>
> assist with any translation of materials. For example, we were given materials
>
> on the structure of higher education in Brazil and it was in Portuguese, it had
>
> not been translated, that would have been a difficulty here because there was
>
> no one here on staff who would have had the capability to do a quick
>
> translation, so it was done for us, but the people in the ministry, because of
>
> their proficiency in our language, there never was a problem. As is the case
>
> with many other peoples around the world, because of their graciousness in
>
> speaking English, realizing our lack of proficiency in Portuguese.

Linguistic inequality can also be viewed as a failure of mutuality. The Brazilians, because of their relationship to English as a dominant world language made an effort to speak English throughout consortium activities. They were, in actuality, obligated to communicate in English, because it is relatively rare, the Brazilians felt, for Americans to have proficiency in Portuguese. Because of this, it was often the case in their relationship that the Americans could not be mutual concerning language used in formal or in informal settings. During the lifespan of the program, FIPSE has had program coordinators with varying degrees of proficiency in Portuguese who were willing to speak the language, however, because the Brazilians' fluency in English was stronger, English prevailed. In this consortium, the American Secondary institution partners were, indeed, proficient in Portuguese, however the American Lead Institution directors were not. The American Lead Institution co-project directors admit to a lack of mutuality in this aspect of communication stating:

> The Brazilians spoke English. I felt a sense of embarrassment and a reminder of the linguistic illiteracy of the United States and that bothered me. I was reminded of the ethnocentric views of Americans. I never liked that. I felt that the Brazilians were comfortable with that dynamic because they were used to working with Americans. (American Lead Institution Project Director)

> I think [at our institution] we were probably the weakest [in Portuguese proficiency] in terms of the leadership. Our students were able to develop a functional level in Portuguese, but we don't have a big Portuguese program, I

think we had usually one person on our faculty committee who was really a

Portuguese speaker. But [my co-director] and I really had to struggle. I would

get up to a certain level when I was visiting there but when I got back it would

drop off. Our Brazilian counterparts went far too far in the direction of being

generous to us in terms of working with us in English. And that was very kind

of them. (American Lead Institution Co-Project Director)

However, while the practice of using the partner's language may not have been

mutual, the Americans did make an effort. The American Lead Institution Co-Project

Director shared his attempts at communicating in Portuguese and the effect he felt they

had:

So, I've always tried when I go to Brazil to be able to prepare remarks in

Portuguese. I did start for the first 3-4 meetings that we had to prepare all our

notes in English and Portuguese, after a time, I think the Brazilians thought

my Portuguese was too rough anyway and it didn't seem useful to have

agendas and notes in English and Portuguese.

Partner Characteristics

This theme focuses on the individual and organizational characteristics needed to

make partnerships work. Fourteen of the 17 participants shared their thoughts on partner

characteristics they felt were important for their partners to possess including three

Brazilian project directors, two Brazilian support staff, one American government

program coordinator, one American government senior official, all of the American

project directors, one American support staff, one Brazilian government program

coordinator, and one Brazilian senior official. At the individual level, participants

expressed both desired professional characteristics such as rank and institutional capital

and interpersonal characteristics such as likeability. At the organizational level,

including both the government funding agencies and the consortium institutions,

participants indicated characteristics pertaining to the general tenor of the working

relationship, and organizational mission and philosophy. The impact of these

characteristics can be seen in both the working relationship between partners and in the

overall implementation of the collaborative initiative. The program coordinators and

project directors indicated several desired characteristics including possessing mutual

interests, respect, recognition, empathy, affinity between members, open-mindedness,

willingness to try to understand, a collaborative disposition, ability to see things from the

other person's point of view, a helpful disposition, and an ability to problem solve.

Several characteristics emphasized by the participants in the interviews, and that

were indeed present in the Social and Economic Development Project include,

institutional rank, willingness, well-connectedness, flexibility, likeability, sensitivity, and

commitment. I present findings relating to these seven characteristics in this section.

Institutional rank. Institutional rank surfaced as a professional characteristic that

both poses challenges and offers benefits. The issue of rank is relevant to both the

categories of partner characteristics and staffing yet will be addressed differently in both

sections of this chapter. Several of the participants felt that institutional rank wielded a

great deal of power and influence relevant to the initial negotiation and creation of the

collaboration, garnering acceptance and support for the project, and managing the daily

implementation of collaborative activities. The Brazilian Lead Institution project director

emphasized the issues surrounding institutional rank throughout his interview and felt

that rank was an integral factor influencing project coordination. He asserted:

> In this specific consortium project, each of the universities had difficulty
>
> working with the institutional partner that was run by a low-ranking
>
> representative.

> In this consortium – the [American Lead Institution project director] was a
>
> dean, the [Brazilian Lead Institution project director], a dean, the [American
>
> Secondary Institution project director], a department head, with the dean
>
> involved, but the [Brazilian Secondary Institution project director] didn't
>
> 'have a rank'. It worked better between the two leads, but a little less well
>
> between the two secondary partners, but also well, and each had difficulty
>
> with the [Brazilian Secondary Institution], because [she] wasn't in a position
>
> to make certain decisions and couldn't do everything she needed to do, she
>
> didn't have the access she needed, she couldn't enlist staff to help her.

Another benefit is the influence the person with a high institutional rank can exert

toward accomplishing certain implementation tasks. To illustrate this point, it is helpful

to understand the challenge of occupying a lower position in the university, in terms of

authority, such as that of American Lead Institution graduate assistant. This participant

first communicates the challenges she personally experienced in attempting to

accomplish tasks as well as how faculty in similar situations have also experienced

problems:

> I think it's really helpful to have someone who serves in my capacity, but I am
>
> not in a position to make certain or important decisions. So getting those
>
> decisions made can sometimes cause things to slow down and may be
>
> frustrating at times for different people, and I think may have created some
>
> tensions in the consortium, nothing that I thought was too overwhelming,
>
> though.

> A professor who serves as a coordinator for another FIPSE program, another
>
> partner in the European exchange who was a dean and then stepped down to
>
> become a professor. Now he doesn't have the discretionary power about
>
> certain things. Things certainly seem to go a lot further when you have some
>
> administrative authority. Getting paperwork through, travel, getting students
>
> stipends, already that stuff takes longer to get done then we want. For a
>
> faculty member I can see that being such a nightmare, *such* a nightmare.
>
> Fortunately, I'm able to bypass some of this because the authority comes from
>
> [the dean].

The participants felt it was especially important to have the influence of someone

like a dean, however, they offered, one challenge posed by a high level of rank is a time

crunch. While the project directors of high rank could be more effective in facilitating

certain project tasks, they also had more responsibilities necessitating their attention and

this detracted from the program. The Brazilian Lead Institution project director offers this in response to the challenge of time, "One way to mitigate this time crunch is to use the staff members often available to the higher ranking professional."

Having a project director with higher institutional rank allows access to additional resources, especially human resources. A common misperception in bi-national partnerships is that the Northern partner may have more resources and be more efficient. In the case of this consortium project, the partner with the access to the most human and institutional resources that could be dedicated to the consortium project was the Brazilian Lead Institution. With a dean of a major university faculty as the project director, that institution was able to benefit from the school's international services unite and the staff of that unit to provide a variety of student services to the incoming American students. The project directors of the American Secondary Institution, for example, run by a professor and a department head, both with a moderately high degree of institutional capital, struggled with time conflicts. It fell on the two of them alone to provide both student and academic services to the incoming Brazilian students. Whereas the Brazilian Lead Institution project director was able to delegate responsibilities in order to diffuse the workload. This exchange during the joint interview with the American Secondary Institutions project directors reflects this situation:

> For a faculty member at our level of demand…it gets kind of hard. (Referring
> to the additional duties such as going to the airport and helping with housing).
> (American Secondary Institution Co-Project Director)

The logical thing to do, would be to write in part of a salaried position for

someone already on staff or a graduate student. The important thing is to have

someone the students can have a personal connection with to walk them to

bank, to get internet, to get a library card, to get health insurance, show where

places are to eat - these are the types of things that person's position would

handle. It is not an efficient use of a high level administrators time to do tasks

like going to the airport. (American Secondary Institution Project Director)

Willingness. This characteristic includes a willingness to compromise, the

concept of institutional goodwill, and a willingness to be open-minded about project

ideas. In relaying his three main ideas of what constitutes a successful international

collaboration, the American lead institution co-project director began with discussing

compromise.

Anytime you enter into a partnership there is something you have to give up,

you can't necessarily expect that everything that goes toward the partnership

might be immediately viewed as in the best interest of your institution, so you

have to develop a mindset that in order to gain some higher level through the

partnership, in cooperation, you have to be willing to sacrifice some things

that might be in your university's interest.

The participants also introduced the concept of institutional goodwill. The

Brazilian Lead Institution academic advisor made the point that with a project concerning

a sensitive topic such as that of the Social and Economic Development project, it was

necessary to gauge institutional good will. Because issues of race were inherent in the

project activities and because the Brazilian Lead Institution, according to its academic

advisor, has not historically embraced Afro-Brazilians or Afro-Brazilian social or

academic matters, having supporters who wanted to see the program succeed was

essential. She felt that those supporters and that institutional goodwill did exist at the

Brazilian lead institution.

> The participants felt a sense of willingness from the government sponsors as well
the institutional partners was important. The American Lead Institution project director
also spoke to this point in reference to FIPSE:

> > They always responded very quickly if we had a question of how to interpret
> > the rules. I think there's a spirit in this program they wanted to try to
> > encourage flexibility and innovation and were willing to go along with us on
> > things that were not off the wall.

> *Well-connectedness.* The characteristic of being well-connected pertains to one's
recognition and influence within the institution. The American Secondary Institution
project directors referred to this as institutional social capital. This type of influence
affects one's ability to access certain audiences and resources. It can also be related to
the nature of one's position, number of years and amount of exposure at the institution,
and the regard others have for them. This influence within the institution was recognized
by both American and Brazilian counterparts and at both the director and support staff
level. As the Brazilian Lead Institution International Student Advisor informed me of her
various roles and responsibilities with international students and programs on the campus,

I concluded and confirmed with her that she is well-positioned within the university in terms of her relationship with other staff members which is important to her ability to promote and gain support for the program.

The American Secondary Institution Co-Project Director felt strongly that this institutional social capital had a great impact on institutional leadership accepting the idea to apply for a FIPSE-CAPES grant at their institution and how it is also important for the partnership relationship. He commented that:

> My co-project director was an Associate Dean when this started, I was Director of the Latin American Center so we were well-connected institutionally.

> If an assistant professor who was just starting had come forward they wouldn't have known...who is this, can we trust him, part of that institutional social capital that we had was helpful.

> Important to have partners with institutional clout.

Flexibility. Flexibility was the most commonly stated desired characteristic and it was seen as important for all three entities: funding agency, institution, and coordinating staff. Some of the interview responses related to flexibility include:

> The mission. The statute allows us to be very flexible. FIPSE's 30 year history of being considered one of the leading discretionary grants programs

of the U.S. Government. That's been a tremendous asset. (FIPSE Senior

Official)

We need, all the way up the totem pole, for people to support and be flexible

so outputs can be strengthened." (FIPSE National Program Coordinator)

CAPES and FIPSE each had a model for collaboration, they were similar, and

they integrated the two to arrive at this program, CAPES modified the FIPSE

model to adapt to the rules at CAPES. There was a good deal of flexibility in

the agreement and flexibility was a philosophy of the program. (CAPES

Senior Official).

Flexibility is important - Rules are not the same between university partners,

the decision making processes are different, must be able to adapt rules and

processes. (Brazilian Lead Institution Project Director).

Likeability. In terms of the interpersonal nature of running a collaborative

initiative the Brazilian Lead Institution Project Director believes that the personal

relationship is just as important as the working relationship. He felt that the project

directors had fun both working and socializing together and commented that:

The chemistry between the international partners is important as well as the

individual personalities that are involved. There must be an affinity between

people who run the partnership because it's people who are behind the partnership.

Sensitivity. This study highlights the importance of including the right people to develop and run the collaborative project in its specific context of time and place. The topic of the consortium project dealt with race. The students being exchanged from the HBCU were students of color. Many of these students chose to study at the lead Brazilian Lead Institution, which, by American terminology, could be considered a PWI in terms of faculty, staff, and student demographics. The American students found themselves in unfamiliar territory not just because they were learning and living in a different national context, but also because they were negotiating a different environment in terms of racial composition. The Brazilian Lead Institution Academic Advisor highlighted the importance of having a project director who was sensitive to the cultural context of his or her institution and how the exchange students would interact and be interacted with in that context. She, rather insightfully, points out:

> The project director had the sensitivity to perceive the necessity of creating a network of people to take in the students. Why am I saying this? Because racial matters are very polemic, if you have an administrator that doesn't take this into consideration, the students will come here to do research and not be connected to the people they really need to connect with.

Commitment. Commitment surfaced in a number of different ways, however, as with equality, the participants didn't speak at length about this concept. With specific reference to the individual in a coordinating position he remarked that, "The director

must have authority and must be invested in the project." The American Secondary

Project Directors both mentioned the importance of commitment with regard to

institutional leadership, institutional financial support, and in defining a successful

collaboration. Developing a sense of commitment in institutional leadership was one of

the objectives in taking their institutional leaders to Brazil. They felt that commitment

was shown when their "Administration committed real dollars (not paper money) to the

budget." And they believed that an important criteria in creating a successful partnership

was "Finding someone who will put in as much effort into the project as you will."

The Brazilian Lead Institution Project Director felt commitment was an essential

characteristic of a project director and stated that, "The director must have authority and

must be invested in the project." The Brazilian Secondary Project Director communicated

her belief that the partnership would not go well without a sense of commitment.

Drawing from her observations of other consortium projects, she commented that, "You

need to see that both sides consider the partnership important. Sometimes there's an

imbalance. It seems that the partnership is more important for one side."

Partner Relationship

The partner relationship can be examined from different perspectives, two that I

will attend to here are the structure of the relationship and the interactions between

consortium project counterparts. In reporting on the structure of the relationship, I will

include the design of the CAPES-FIPSE consortia program and the design of the

individual consortium project. The design of the partnership can be considered a strategy

as well, however, for this study, I will address design in the relationship section and other

aspects of the partnership in the strategy section. In reporting on the interactions between the consortium partners, I will concentrate on the dynamics of the relationship and participation of the partners. The participants spoke to the importance of both the formal and informal aspects of their collaborative relationship. Seven of the participants offered comments on partner relationship including one Brazilian project director, two American project directors, one Brazilian program coordinator, one American program coordinator, one American support staff, and one Brazilian support staff.

The formal structure of the relationship at both the program and project level is based in equality. Each national agency provided equivalent amounts of funding to the grantees which, in theory, placed them on equal budgetary footing. Each national agency was allowed to operate their side of the partnership within their own national and organizational guidelines, which allowed each nation to govern their activities in a familiar manner and prevented the imposition of different rules and regulations on the partners or the dominance of one national or organizational philosophy over another. Each agency required equal numbers of students to be exchanged between the partner institutions, and any teaching or research activities carried out toward the goal of jointly developing curriculum were to be developed with the philosophy that each country offered expertise. This, as was referred to earlier, avoided the perception of a traditional North-South relationship in which the Northern country assumes the position of expert. The consortia program application guidelines and the academic cooperation agreement Sclearly communicated this formal structure in writing. In addition, program officials reinforced this information orally and in person at the annual project directors' meeting.

The participants confirmed agreement with and commitment to these structural requirements by signing the academic cooperation agreement.

Pertaining to the informal relationship, the lead Brazilian project director summed it up in one concise sentence in Portuguese, "Não consegue com pessoas chatas." This translates in English to, "It's just not possible with unpleasant people." At the 2007 Annual Project Directors Meeting in Nashville, TN, I observed that a genuine friendship had developed between the consortium partners. A component of the annual meeting is for the partners from the individual consortium projects to hold a meeting to discuss any matters of importance. There is time built into the schedule to do this, indicating the value and seriousness the sponsoring agencies place on it. I was invited to join the meeting for Social and Economic Development Project and the project directors informed me that even though they were in their last year and had effectively ended all project activities, they were going to meet anyway, just for the sake of getting together. This demonstrated a sincere affinity for one another. The Brazilian Lead Institution Project Director emphasized the importance of the informal relationship in saying,

> The chemistry between the international partners is important as well as the individual personalities that are involved. There must be an affinity between people who run the partnership because it's people who are behind the partnership.

The American Lead Institution Project Director further stresses this point by revealing that

….any partnership has to be based on sort of a real level of comfort, and I think probably at least 15-20 to two dozen of us, divided amongst the institutions, have developed strong friendships. Carlos and I are going to be putting on a symposium together.

Finances

The financial aspect of a higher education collaboration is essential to the structure and functioning of the overall program and consortium specific activities. Four of the participants commented on funding related issues and their impact on students and program implementation including one American government program coordinator, one American project director, and the two Brazilian project directors. This study emphasizes that funding can be an incentive to initiate an international collaboration as well as a mechanism to equalize the partner relationship. In a multifaceted collaboration such as this one, finances impact various aspects of the collaboration at the national, institutional, and individual level. The bulk of the funding for the U.S.-Brazil Program was provided by the American and Brazilian governments, however, in some cases partner institutions supplemented this funding with institutional resources of their own. This supplementation was a beneficial action for the recipient project directors and students, however also an action that, while not deliberately harmful, affected the ideal of equality between partners.

At the national level, the design of the U.S.-Brazil Program dictates that each national sponsoring agency fund institutions only within its own borders. Therefore, each sponsoring agency provided funding in its own national currency. Because of this, the

funding amounts were not identical between countries, rather they were comparable. Commenting on this funding structure and affirming the importance of equal funding, the FIPSE National Program Coordinator states:

> One of the good things about FIPSE-CAPES has to do with the balance in funding and this isn't true with some of the other programs FIPSE runs internationally, these are four year grants and over a four-year period the U.S. institutions cumulatively get roughly $200,000. The amount they get from CAPES on the Brazilian side is about the same and that's very good because it allows for a balanced approach to travel between and among faculty as well as the exchange of students. So that has been a very good thing.

A review of the consortium budget included in the Final Report submitted to FIPSE by the lead American institution reflects that American government funding to the consortium project paid for salaries, benefits, travel, equipment, materials, mobility stipends, indirect costs, and "other" for the two American partner institutions. According to the report, three faculty members who participated in the academic component of the project were compensated for their services and received the faculty benefit rate applied to their project salaries. Travel costs included two domestic and two international trips per year, materials and supplies included the costs for the development of the online course (video production, transcription, translation, and subtitling), promotional materials and sponsored events, mobility stipends were provided for 14 students, and the services of an outside program evaluator were used to assess achievement of program goals. The American Secondary Institution accrued similar costs related to project salaries, travel,

143

promotional materials, and events, however they did not contract an evaluator. The

American Secondary Institution submitted these costs to the American lead institution for

reimbursement. Between September 1, 2002 and August 31, 2007 the American partners

of the consortium project expended $210,830, the same amount they were budgeted. I

requested an equivalent final report from the Brazilian partners, however was not

available.   The Brazilian partners' expenses were similar to the Americans's, one

difference being that their funding was not used for student mobility. CAPES paid the

Brazilian students directly, therefore, the money allotted to the Brazilian partners was for

only for implementation and travel costs.

Although the government agencies designed the program to be comparable in

funding, there were financial aspects of implementation that were experienced differently

between the national and institutional partners. The Brazilian Secondary Institution

Project Director indicated limitations CAPES placed on the use of funding that FIPSE did

not place on its institutions. She informed that:

> In our case it was a bit different. There were restrictions on the money
>
> imposed by CAPES, the money was basically for travel to meetings - local
>
> and international. There were no resources to help students with their costs,
>
> none to help a low-income family with VISA issues for example. At [the
>
> Brazilian Lead Institution], the staff person that helped with this was not
>
> compensated by CAPES funds, she simply took on project activities as a part
>
> of her regular job.

At the institutional level, differences in funding availability made a substantial impact on implementation. One way in which these differences were evident was in the ability of one American institution to offer the Brazilian exchange students free housing while the American institution could only supplement the Brazilian students' housing costs. Not only is this an issue of which institution was willing and able to offer this monetary benefit to the students but which institutions even had the infrastructure to house students. On the Brazilian side however, they were not able to offer the American students any financial support toward housing, nor were they able to house the students for a fee, as Brazilian institutions do not offer student housing at all.

Another example of the impact of the institutions financial situation occurred when additional resources for a project activity were needed. The partners found they needed to supplement the grant funding for the development of the joint curriculum project, the electronic course. The American Secondary Institution Co-Project Director reflected on the process of developing the course and the financial assistance they received from their institution towards completing it:

> Well, I think the biggest challenge over all was the development of the electronic course. It caused us, I think, to identify resources that were kind of beyond FIPSE money, we all, I think, contributed some of our own institutional resources.
>
> Our administration committed real dollars, not paper money, to the budget. It comes out of someone's budget.

At the individual level, the students exchanged through the consortium project experienced financial difficulties that are worth mentioning, as the financial resources of the students are directly tied to their ability to participate in the program and therefore essential to the functioning of the overall bi-national program and institutional consortia projects. The project directors revealed student financial issues pertaining to language proficiency, travel, and, as raised before, housing.

The lack of language skills proved to be a complicating issue for both the project directors and the students. Weak language proficiency, specifically on behalf of the students from the American Lead Institution, proved to be problematic for student inclusion in their host academic setting and for project implementation. The American Lead Institution students' lack of Portuguese skills prevented them from attending courses with the Brazilian students at the Brazilian Lead Institution. The Brazilian Lead Institution project director reported that the lack of language skills from the American lead institution impacted the manner in which the American students were able to integrate themselves into the academic environment at his institution and resulted in him and his staff needing to create a separate course section for the American students. This used resources not planned for in the original academic component of the project. The Brazilian Secondary Institution did not report the same difficulties. This situation could have been mitigated by additional language instruction prior to departure for Brazil had their been additional funding to for language instruction. The American Secondary Institution and its students did not experience the same difficulties because that institution

offered more Portuguese language instruction as a part of their regular university course offerings.

The costs of travel and living expenses abroad proved to be a challenge for both American and Brazilian students at an individual level. The American Lead Institution Graduate Assistant relayed the financial struggle some American students experienced with assembling sufficient funds to travel to Brazil and support themselves while there:

> Budget has definitely played a big part in this process. One part that was outside of anyone's control or power was the greater economic forces that made it more expensive for American students to travel abroad [than in the past]. [Our institution] supplemented some of the students who went. It was almost a situation in which it would have been very difficult to be able sustain yourself on the amount that was given with the exchange rates and also having to maintain whatever expenses you had at home.

In addition to the recurring financial matters already identified there were financial issues unique to the American partners that impacted the consortia program as a whole. These issues were inherent in the American legislative process and the FIPSE officials had no control over them. Early on the program, Congress did not approve the program's funding and through the program, FIPSE has been at the mercy of Congress to determine the funding. While FIPSE officials may know what money should be available to them in a fiscal year, they do not always have a say in how the budget is formulated. Both American and Brazilian government participants expressed concern about these issues:

One internal impediment on the American side was that in 2004 there was no call for application. This was a problem with what funding Congress approved that year. We were worried that the program wouldn't continue when this happened, but the Americans worked hard to get the money back for the program – CAPES National Program Coordinator

The difficulty has been in anticipating the kind of funding we can have to support the grants we want to engage in, we know the projected fiscal year, the budgets govern our activities but we do not always have input into the construction of those budgets, we have to work with what we get. And the same is almost true on the CAPES side too. – FIPSE Senior Official

Strategies

The program participants employed a variety of strategies that facilitated the collaboration and implementation of the U.S.-Brazil Program and this specific consortium project. Twelve participants relayed strategic actions that occurred during the overall program and the specific project that facilitated implementation and collaboration including one American government program coordinator, one Brazilian project director, one American support staff, all of the American project directors, one Brazilian support staff, one Brazilian government program coordinator and two Brazilian senior officials.

These strategies include: capitalizing on existing institutional interest and initiatives, establishing operating structures in advance, developing effective methods of

148

communication, allowing partners to function within their own national or institutional guidelines, cultivating institutional leaders, using your institutional social capital, and using prior knowledge. As with other aspects of collaboration and implementation discussed in this study, certain of the strategies are intertwined.

Capitalize on existing institutional interests and initiatives. This strategy was emphasized more by the American partners. They felt it was beneficial to engage in a project that capitalized on activities and interests already present at their institutions. Although this was emphasized in the interviews by the Americans, it was evident that the Brazilian partners were also capitalizing on their own institutional strengths by choosing to be in a consortium project that focused on an area of academic expertise. The U.S.-Brazil Higher Education Consortia Program was logical fit for the American Secondary Institution because of its history with Latin America and because of its institutional culture of openness. Specifically regarding the culture of openness, the project directors at the American Secondary Institution felt that their institution was in an period of growth and open-mindedness in terms of international initiatives. They characterized it as an "atmosphere of trying a lot of things." However, those "things" had to make sense for the institution.

> I think also it's that it's Brazil, it's a huge country, huge economy, huge
> alumni base that the [American Secondary Institution] had there that had not
> been reconnected to until we took the chancellor down to sign the agreements,
> so we found, I guess, opportunities for the chancellor to make things work for

149

him and for him to want to help us. –American secondary institution project coordinator 1.

The American lead co-project director 2 commented on the practicality of capitalizing on the strengths of each of the universities.

[The American secondary institution] had enormous strengths in one aspect of the program and we felt we had great strengths in the other especially since it dealt with race and inequality. They had enormous expertise in Latin American studies. We and the [Brazilian lead institution] had a relationship going back two-three years before that. So we proposed bringing [Brazilian lead institution] in through a common endowment that both universities have through a Japanese foundation. So 9our dean] and [their dean] knew each other personally, they liked each other, they got along. In fact we had done a small project funded by the Japanese foundation about 2 years before this possibility came up so we had built up that level of trust. We didn't know anyone at Bahia at all but the [American Secondary Institution] people had good ties to Bahia so they were confident that they could work with them.

The U.S.- Brazil Higher Education Consortia Program was also a logical fit for the American Lead Institution because of its focus on the African Diaspora and its desire to expand its knowledge of non-English speaking populations of African descent. The American Lead Co-Project Director expressed the institution's need to expand on its interests:

[This institution], I think probably, fairly legitimately can claim great

scholarship on subjects related to people of African heritage, the African

diaspora, and Africa itself. We probably have not developed or have lost the

strengths in languages other than English so that in effect [we] had kind of a

blind spot regarding the fact of the African Diaspora in the Americas being

far, far beyond the Caribbean and the United States.

Establish operating structures in advance. This study substantiates that the

manner in which a collaborative relationship is structured can have a significant impact

the level of its success. In the partner relationship section, I stated that this collaboration

was designed to be equal and symmetrical at both the governmental level and the

institutional level. The objective of the consortia program is to exchange students and to

jointly develop curriculum. Each pair of institutions per nation was required to exchange

the same amount of students. Neither country acted as expert in the formation of

curriculum projects, rather they worked collaboratively to develop a product. Neither

country had authority over the other and neither country imposed on the other partner

their way of doing things. Representatives from each country came together to jointly

select the participating consortia, each national agency funded its own institutions using

its own national currency, each national agency served as the point of contact for its own

institutions, and each country was responsible for its own assessment measures. The

CAPES National Program Coordinator summarizes the program structure in this way:

There's an agreement signed between the two countries, but each country

implements the program within its own system, its own legal norms, which

are different from the partners.

The practice of having a written agreement, a memo of understanding, is common

in the international initiatives. It is the memo of understanding, in this case, that

communicated the balanced program design of the CAPES-FIPSE program. In this

program, a memo of understanding is signed between the national governments and the

consortium institutions sign an academic cooperation agreement. The term MOU,

however, is often used to refer to either when spoken, while the formal documents use the

different terminology. These documents are a method of formalizing the relationship,

demonstrating commitment, and outlining the goals of the relationship. The document

"U.S.-Brazil Bilateral Program: A Checklist for Successful Partnership" provided to

attendees of the 2007 U.S.-Brazil Project Directors Meeting in Nashville, TN, specifies

the following in crafting the MOU at the consortium partner level:

1. Use FIPSE-CAPES MOU template
2. Discuss MOU Requirements (Exchange of tuition and fees, course credits, and credit transfer)
3. Discuss student exchange (Number of students peryear and semester of exchange, develop student exchange matrix)
4. Advise your university administrator on MOU
5. Customize the MOU content (Discuss with university administrators, obtain university legal review, translate the final text, obtain all signatures from presidents and rectors, send to all partners by express courier)

Crafting the memo of understanding was a unique process at each of the lead

institutions. In this case, the American lead institution felt it was beneficial to use a pre-

established MOU from a previous consortium to model the MOU for its consortium. This

seemed logical, considering the two consortia were part of the same overall program, however, the partners encountered challenges with the legal implications of drafting a formal document:

> We took the template for [another] agreement and just cut and pasted, but there is a distance between how academics think and how lawyers think. It was very difficult. We just thought that because the lawyers at [the other institution] and others had agreed upon this that they would just rubber stamp it, but it took us 8 months to review and they made many changes and that was a significant barrier. I mean, we had agreed upon all of the conditions, tuition, acceptance of credit, and so on but to have a document where all the T's were crossed and I's were dotted… -American lead institution co-project director.

In addition to formalizing the commitment to implement the project, it is important to clarify roles and responsibilities. The American lead co-project director included this as an aspect of a successful collaboration, however, support staff at both the Brazilian and American lead institutions also spoke to this point.

Develop effective methods of communication. Communication is essential throughout the collaborative process, both between international partners and between funding agency and funded institutions. Communication strategies can be written or oral, long-distance or in person. The MOU is one method of written communication. The MOU for this consortium detailed various aspects of the collaboration structure and the participant institution's responsibilities. Specifically, it outlined the purpose, goals and

form of cooperation, funding, obligations of academic institutions, coordination, terms of

agreement, resolution of disputes, termination, obligations of institutions receiving

students, obligations of home institutions, indemnification, insurance, and student

discipline.

An important aspect of communication is the disposition of the funding agency in

terms of availability and responsiveness to the funded institutions. The participants

overwhelmingly agreed that communication was easy between the governmental funding

agencies and both American and Brazilian government program coordinators felt in

person meetings had been beneficial.

> The main thing that has worked is bringing faculty together from Brazilian
>
> and U.S. IHEs to network, to further hone their ideas about curriculum
>
> innovation and enhancement of particular subject areas and that has happened
>
> through the project director's meetings, I think that's been extremely
>
> successful. (FIPSE National Program Coordinator)

> Remember the Sao Paolo [project directors'] meeting? Those opportunities
>
> are important not just for the project directors but for the government staff as
>
> well. It's practically the only time each year we meet in person, with FIPSE
>
> and all of their group. When held in Brazil the Brazilians all make an effort to
>
> be available and when held in the U.S. the Americans all make an effort to be
>
> available. These in-person meetings are important. The face-to-face contact
>
> strengthens understanding. (CAPES National Program Coordinator)

In an international collaboration, proficiency in the partner's language facilitates communication, however, as has been demonstrated in this case, it is not necessary for each partner to be proficient in the other partner's language. What is important is that at least one partner is proficient in the other partner's language. In situations where one partner's language will be used as the primary language of communication, for example when Portuguese is used at meetings that take place in Brazil, or vice-versa, the FIPSE-CAPES staff found it useful to have interpreters available and assisted listening devices through which non-Portuguese speakers could receive a simultaneous interpretation of presenters. I should note, however, that at the annual meeting I attended in 2007 which took place in the United States, interpretive devices were not used. They were not necessary because the Brazilian attendees were sufficiently able to understand and communicate in English. This demonstrates the discrepancy in partner language proficiency that exists between the two nations.

In addition to facilitating communication between international partners, it is important to facilitate communication between the government agencies and their national institutional representatives. A senior official at FIPSE reflects on the relationship between the government and the funded institution:

> So you gotta be up front about and be willing to engage with your program officer in DC. But also be upfront… not so much going to CAPES, because the relationship of the American institution is not so much with CAPES, it's with their institution but it's with us. But if there is something that is happening we would certainly want to know about it, so we can broker a

relationship, because if you say our partner is not working, the faculty is not

able to do what they need to do, the students are dissatisfied with the program

and with their accommodations, things on a serious level, I'm not talking

about the minor stuff, then we need to engage in some corrective action.

That's part of monitoring. We need to really monitor these programs. More so

than perhaps one might expect.

Lastly, communication between CAPES and FIPSE government program

coordinators and their respective agencies was highlighted in documents provided to the

2007 Project Director's meeting in Nashville, TN. Specifically, in "U.S.-Brazil Bilateral

Program: A Checklist for Successful Partnership" basic communication strategies were

included in a section called, "Roles of People in the Consortium." These strategies for

government personnel include:

1. Communicating when necessary
2. Calling or e-mailing if there are problems
3. Telling agency of achievements and successes
4. Writing annual report and financial report

The document also outlines more specific strategies under a section titled, "Using

Goodwill and Diplomacy in Planning Visits and Communications." These include:

1. Establishing a common e-mail discussion format
2. Use telephone calls and/conference calls if necessary
3. Attend project directors meeting in Brazil and in U.S.
4. Discuss memo of understanding provisions in consortium meetings

Cultivate institutional leaders. A concept frequently brought up in the interviews

was that gaining support from institutional personnel is critical to the success of the

program, however, it is especially important to have the support of institutional leaders. This was recognized by participants at all levels of involvement and from both nations.

> The biggest thing that I have noticed has been the commitment at the highest levels. Part of the mission of [American Lead Institution] is leadership for America in a global community. And so, the provost is certainly very supportive of international programs. Dean Taylor, the vice provost, very supportive of that and has obviously taken the leadership in making it a priority for the graduate school to be involved in international collaboration. I think that is the biggest factor. Many people seem to fall into line under that. (American Lead Institution Graduate Assistant)

The cultivation of institutional leaders can lead to increased support for the project. One way for institutional leaders to show their support was to commit the institution's financial resources to the project. The American secondary institution administration agreed to do this and the project directors responded that it was as a result of a combination of factors, one being the cultivation of institutional leaders.

> It was partly institutional history, [our institution] has 60 years of history working in Brazil, partly our roles within the institution, and partly cultivating the administration We took the administration to Brazil as a part of planning year and other meetings. So it was partly cultivating the administration this way. Part of it was taking the administrators to Brazil so they can see this is what it is, this is how it works, creating a personal experience. (American Secondary Institution Project Directors)

157

Use institutional social capital. While high institutional rank, such as the dean or provost level, was communicated as one of the biggest factors in getting things accomplished, connections and influence can be beneficial at all levels. At the faculty level, the American secondary institution project directors found it helpful to establish contact with the professors who would be teaching the Brazilian exchange students as a way of advocating for the students who were in the process of learning a new academic environment. In this situation, the American Secondary Institution project directors felt that communication from faculty peers would be more effective than from administrators:

> The fact that we were faculty members helped. Because you could sort of write your colleagues and say let me tell you who is going to be coming into your class instead of getting something from the registrars office.

The Brazilian Lead Institution International Student Advisor was also a good example of how institutional social capital is useful. She was well-connected and well-respected throughout the Brazilian Lead Institution. This enabled her to promote and seek support for the Social and Economic Development Project. At her institution, where black Brazilians and white Brazilians frequently exist in different social and professional circles, she felt that the project, which addresses issues of race, might not have been readily embraced by the mainstream population . Her institutional social capital helped to mitigate those circumstances.

Use prior knowledge. Several participants extolled the virtues of, "not reinventing the wheel," rather using that previously made wheel to construct a better one.

They advocated using knowledge and experience gained from previous international

initiatives at the partner institutions, from other institutions who have developed

international projects, or from other university personnel at their institution who have

developed projects. Using prior knowledge in this way could possibly improve upon

collaboration structure and provide a more useful model for how to successfully

maneuver the various aspects of implementation. The FIPSE National Program

Coordinator spoke most directly to this point:

> This program started out on a 4 year mode unlike some of the other
>
> international programs that FIPSE has run that started out as 3 year programs,
>
> and we saw the need to move them to 4 years so that the college and
>
> university faculty on both sides could work out the administrative matters
>
> related to moving students from one country to another meaning tuition,
>
> reciprocity, arrangements, housing, credit issues, this program has not had to
>
> undergo any of that because of other program that FIPSE has run we have
>
> been able to hit the ground running, the North American Program and the
>
> Atlantis program we were able to hit the ground running much more quickly
>
> in this program.

The underlying notion in using prior knowledge is that one must draw on past

experience. Participants felt that experience in international collaboration was an

important factor leading to successful implementation. Already being internationally-

oriented was seen as a positive characteristic contributing to ease of collaboration. These

ideas were most insistently expressed by personnel at the American Secondary Institution

159

and the Brazilian Lead Institution who included international education experience in their response to being asked about what makes for a successful international collaboration.

Staffing

This theme includes several topics and primarily addresses staffing concerns at the project level. The topics are type of staffing, symmetry or asymmetry in staffing configuration, the effect of project director rank, and turnover in staff. Seven participants commented on issues related to staffing, three of them were support staff, one a project director with no support staff, one a government level program coordinator, and one senior government official.

It is evident in the design of the consortium project, the nature of study abroad, and in the interviews for this study, that there are administrative, academic and student life components of the consortium project. Because of this, it is necessary to consider staffing needs and have project staff who are knowledgeable and functional in all of these areas. This study shows that having multiple staff members share the implementation tasks reduces the burden and workload placed on the project director, allows for specialization of responsibilities, and can increase efficiency of activities implementation.

The American Secondary Institution project directors questioned the type of project leadership that would be best for this type of project. They pondered between administrator- or faculty-led direction. In doing so, they emphasized the importance of dual support:

Need the administrative support in order to get the financial resources to move

students or to create programs, you've got to have the administrators involved

Got to have the researchers and teachers involved or it's not as intellectually

rich (American Secondary Institution Project Director)

All administrators have been faculty at some point, we move back and forth

between these roles. Need people who are full time administrators who know

the system and make it work but also need specialist in the field. We were

specialists in Brazil and issues of race, as opposed to people who are really

good at grantsmanship and international education. The Brazilian secondary

institution project director is more like us, there's a combination of people and

you have to have all of them to make it work. (American Secondary

Institution Co-Project Director)

The Consortia Program is meant to be symmetrical, however this symmetry is not

necessarily reflected in staffing configuration. Staff configuration, in this project, was

affected by rank of project director and institutional infrastructure. The American and

Brazilian government agencies are, indeed rather symmetrical in terms of staffing. On a

daily basis, each government agency runs the U.S.-Brazil Program with one main

program coordinator as well as administrative or program support staff. However, each

institutional partner is different and that difference extends to the human resources

available to implement project activities. These differences, or asymmetries, in staffing

are directly related to the institutional rank of the project director and therefore these two

topics are addressed jointly. The Brazilian lead institution appeared to have access to the most human resources of all of the partners because the project director is a dean and is able to enlist the support of other university offices and faculty members. At that institution, there were four staff members who were formally a part of the coordination. They included the dean as project director, the international student advisor who handled all of the international student services and her staff, a faculty member responsible for the academic component of the exchange program who did not participate in this study, and an academic advisor who also found herself involved in student matters. The American lead institution project director is also a dean and benefits from the support of a graduate assistant, administrative staff, and other professional staff in the Graduate School, however, it appeared that only three people participated in the daily functioning of the project, the dean and one professor as co-directors as well as one graduate student assistant to provide support. The Brazilian Secondary Institution project director is an assistant professor who had to run the program alone because she did not have a staff or access to other departments to provide additional support for the project. The American secondary partner, while run by two professors who had indeed gained a good deal of institutional leverage due to prior administrative roles, found themselves running the program with little additional support as well.

While the Brazilian Lead Institution benefitted from the most staff, its staff configuration is reflective of the difficulties that can be encountered in recruiting faculty members to become involved programs such as CAPES-FIPSE. The faculty member who accepted the responsibility of coordinating the academic component of the project did so

162

in addition to his teaching and research load and did not receive compensation. Therefore, that faculty member required an assistant to help balance the workload in order to agree to participate. The Brazilian academic advisor informed that:

> He accepted on the condition that he have someone to help him, because he, also, had a lot of work. Brazilian professors work full time and are expected to teach and do research and this project would be considered extra.

Staff turnover in the FIPSE-CAPES program took two different forms. Staff members left positions in the government or at the institutions or project responsibilities were shifted from one staff person to another. Staff turnover in the FIPSE-CAPES program was experienced differently between the government agencies and the institutions. For the government agencies the program personnel did not report any significant challenges from staff turnover, however, it was noted by a Brazil government program coordinator that there had been a great deal of turnover on the American government side but none on the Brazilian side. In fact, from the start of the program in 2001 to the beginning of this study in the fall of 2007, FIPSE senior leadership changed once and the FIPSE National Program Coordinator changed three times, two of those changes occurred during data collection for this study. The CAPES staff has remained the same since the beginning of the program.

The topics of staffing as a whole and staff turnover specifically were more of an issue at the consortium project level and were brought up by several of the project directors and support staff. The American Lead Institution Graduate Assistant describes how staff turnover at her institution affected it and the partners:

163

I would say another big piece was that there were shifting responsibilities

across certain individuals. And so I think it wasn't as seamless as it could

have been. And [this institution] being the United States principal investigator,

it impacted our partners, both here and in Brazil. For instance, initially, [our

co-project director] played a central role, but then he went to [an area

foundation]. He had a lot of the paperwork. A lot of stuff was centralized

with him. He had a lot of institutional knowledge. He was in a position in

which he could make a lot of decisions and get a lot of things through

administratively, through him. So when he left, the only person who could

make certain calls was [the dean]. So with his roles as dean of the graduate

school and VP of research, his energy was also pulled in many different

directions. So, it slowed down the process of being able to move some things

forward.

Conclusion

This chapter has outlined the facilitative conditions that lead to the successful

implementation of the Social and Economic Development Consortium project funded by

the U.S.-Brazil Program. Facilitative conditions is the name for the recurring pattern of

concepts that is present in the study data. The facilitative conditions were organized into

six sub-categories that represent the findings of this study. Those sub-categories are

partner equality and mutuality, partner characteristics, partner relationship, finances,

strategies, and staffing. From those six sub-categories, specific topics introduced by the

participants were shared. These categories and topics reflect the government and

164

institutional participants' unique perspective as it relates to their institutional or

organizational context. In Chapter 6: Discussion, I will compare the major themes

produced in the literature review to the national program and the consortium project,

analyze the role of culture in the implementation and collaboration process, and provide

some overall observations.

CHAPTER SIX

DISCUSSION

This chapter furthers the analysis of the US-Brazil Higher Education Program and the Social and Economic Development Project in three ways and is divided into three parts. In Part One, I compare the major themes produced in the literature review that comprise the study's descriptive framework to the national program and the consortium project. In Part Two, I discuss the role of national culture in the implementation and collaboration process. I based my study on the idea that national cultural differences would have a significant influence on how the government and institutional personnel experienced the program, especially with regards to their working relationship. This part of the chapter addresses why that may not have been the case. Lastly, Part Three offers additional observations about issues significant to the experiences of the participants.

Part One: Descriptive Framework

When I designed this study, I used a descriptive framework built on themes and subthemes identified in the collaboration literature. The literature revealed that there were certain motivations, challenges, benefits, and strategies for success, and structures that many previous and existing collaborations had in common. The purpose of this part of the chapter is to compare the CAPES-FIPSE program and the Social and Economic Development Program to the international collaborations highlighted in the literature review and to specifically compare them to the themes that comprised the descriptive framework

This part of the chapter is organized with the same categories of the literature review and elaborates on how the consortium project was similar or different to other higher education collaborations studied. The categories that will be examined are terminologies, collaboration objectives, administration and collaborative structure, collaboration rationales, challenges, benefits, success factors and strategies

Terminology

The literature review provided an overview of the different ways in which to refer to the collaborative arrangements between international institutions. FIPSE's FY 2006 Application for the U.S.-Brazil Program states that the program is "administered jointly" by both FIPSE and CAPES. Both FIPSE and CAPES use the word "consortium," or its Portuguese translation, to refer to the groupings of institutions funded by their program. FIPSE uses the term partners to refer to the individual institutions constituting a consortium in its formal publication. The government and institutional personnel refer to their counterparts as partners. The Agreement of Academic Cooperation, signed by all institutions in a specific consortium project, clearly states that "the Agreement does not create a joint venture or a partnership between any of the parties or for any purpose." This document is generated by the government sponsors and the disavowal of the term partnership, or a partnership arrangement, as explained by the current FIPSE New National Program Coordinator, is for protection against any "formal bond" to the partner in the event that a new administration chooses not to continue the program or, as was actually the case with this program, if Congress does authorize funding. Whether

formally recognized or not, it is accepted in the FIPSE-CAPES program to call one's counterparts "partners."

It has already been established that the term joint venture is not applicable to the CAPES-FIPSE program because it entails the creation of a new, separate entity. Neither the national level program nor the institutional consortium project are autonomous entities. The Social and Economic Development consortium most aptly meets de Wit's (2004) definition of an academic consortium defined as "a group of academic units that are united for the single purpose of fulfilling a contract based on bringing together a number of different areas of specialized knowledge." (p.35)

The goals of the FIPSE-CAPES Program are consistent with international higher education collaboration goals found in the literature review. Those goals included providing both students and faculty with overseas educational experiences, promoting intercultural working relationships that lead to intercultural understanding, and structuring partnerships that yield internationally relevant curricular materials. The goals of the FIPSE-CAPES program are development of sustainable agreements on mutual recognition and portability of academic credits among U.S. and Brazilian institutions; development of sustainable shared curricula among U.S. and Brazilian institutions; acquisition of the languages and exposure to the cultures of the United States and Brazil; development of student apprenticeships or other work related experiences; and development of sustained cooperation and exchange among academic personnel at U.S. and Brazilian institutions.

Using characteristics highlighted by Godbey and Turlington (2002) and Neave (2002), the Social and Economic Development Consortium is structured by a bilateral governmental accord, and can be described as long term, curricular, government-funded, and staffed by limited faculty at the institutional level. While the consortium project is primarily government-funded, the partner institutions in the consortium also provided financial support to facilitate project activities. The consortium project is representative of Chan's (2004) most common characteristics of an international collaboration. Specifically, it is an academic exchange initiative with the goal of developing curriculum materials and joint course delivery

In a departure from what Saffu & Mamman (1999) found regarding the multi-level initiation of alliances between senior management, faculty, and staff, this particular consortium program was initiated by institutional personnel who were all directors or deans. One of the original Brazilian directors dropped out, leaving a faculty member to run the program. American faculty members became co-project directors after the initial contact was made and the idea to collaborate was discussed. In the case of this specific consortium, this was a matter of coincidence and not of programmatic policy. Institutional personnel of other combinations were present among the other consortia present at the 2007 FIPSE-CAPES annual meeting where I gathered information to inform this study.

This consortium can be described as a traditional collaboration as outlined by de Wit (2002). de Wit characterizes a traditional collaboration as having been formed by bilateral agreements, memoranda of understanding, and letters of intent. In this case,

there was a memoranda of understanding and a bilateral agreement between the sponsoring nations and an Academic Cooperation Agreement and a Work Plan between the institutional consortium partners. The national consortium program fits his descriptors of "multipurpose character" and "general framework." The multipurpose character of the program is evident in the nature of the objectives as well as in the variety of thematic areas represented by the various institutional consortium projects. The general framework is seen in the operating structure and practices of the program. While there are general guidelines for how the program and the resultant consortium projects are to be developed, there is also leeway for individuality and specific institutional context.

Collaborative and Administrative Structure

The Social and Economic Development consortium Project and the U.S.-Brazil Program are North-South collaborations. However, they differ from the descriptions of North-South collaborations depicted in the literature by Godbey &Turlington (2002). They are not focused on some of the common activities implemented between developed and developing countries such as establishing a private university, facilitating development activities, developing an educational infrastructure, sustaining a community college system, developing the tourism workforce through faculty and student exchanges, or addressing critical needs in sustainable development resource management, human resource development, and economic growth (Godbey & Turlington, 2002). One Brazilian government participant mentioned that it did have workforce development as a goal, this goal does not appear to be achieved from placing the developed country in the

role of expert and the developing country as knowledge recipient. Both the developed and developing countries, in this case viewed each other as laboratories in which their students could gain necessary intercultural skills and knowledge that will be useful to the professional workforce in their respective countries.

Regarding administrative structure, this consortium project is in line with Denman's (2002) views that there are certain necessary administrative characteristics international collaborations must possess including a governing body, a manager, a mission, an active commitment by member institutions, and a funding source, used expressly for the development of the consortium. The U.S.-Brazil Program is a top-down creation, having developed from an agreement between the leaderships of each national education agency. As one Brazilian government official describes it, it was mandated from the Cardoso era. The Fund for the Improvement of Post-secondary Education and CAPES serve as the governing body for institutions in their respective countries and each funds institutions within their own borders. Each national government provides a program coordinator and each institutional consortium project identifies a lead institution and a lead project director. Both CAPES and FIPSE communicate a clear purpose for the collaboration of the institutions. The consortium institutions and institutional project directors are voluntary and committed participants in the binational consortia program.

Rationale for Engaging in International Collaborations

I chose not to include an examination of rationales for collaborating within the scope of this study, rather to concentrate on the experience of working on the consortium after the decision was made to create it. However, I did ask the participants why the

collaboration was initiated. Some of their responses touched on their justification for entering into a collaboration. Some of the participants' discussed their motivation, or their respective institution's motivation, for collaborating and those responses mirrored the benefits of collaborating, which will be addressed later.

Both the FIPSE and CAPES officials offered a rationale for engaging in the national partnership. The FIPSE officials commented on the power of these types of binational collaborations to promote public diplomacy and friendly relations between countries. They informed that during the concurrent administrations of former Presidents Bill Clinton and Fernando Henrique Cardoso, the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Brazilian Minister of Education met to discuss cooperation in an educational endeavor and subsequently signed the memorandum of understanding that led to the FIPSE-CAPES program.

As mentioned earlier, the Brazilian government program coordinator stated that CAPES' involvement was very much a top-down mandate and that, in addition, it offered a collaborative opportunity that was, in Brazil, contextually different from anything they had before. A Brazilian government official noted that working together afforded both the United States and Brazil with a unique opportunity to work with each other's higher education systems. In Brazil's case, however, just the federally-funded institutions participated, not those in the private sector. The same Brazilian official communicated the need to provide students with an education that will prepare them for the globalized economy and its resulting intercultural interactions and need for cultural knowledge.

Financial profit for the sponsoring institution is often given as a reason

institutions engage in international activities. The institutions were clearly looking to

benefit from outside funding, however, their institutions did not earn a profit. The project

directors appeared more concern with student development. They sought outside funding

specifically to develop international exchange for the betterment of their students. No

participant mentioned institutional financial gain. In many cases, institutions enroll fee

paying students to increase institutional revenues. In this case, no profit was gained by

any of the partner institutions from enrolling the exchange students.

Challenges

As the literature review revealed, challenges can occur at various stages of the

collaboration process. Specific stages in which challenges occur mentioned by Saffu &

Mamman (2000) are the initiation, negotiation, and implementation stages. This

consortium experienced challenges primarily at the negotiation and implementation

stages. Initiating the consortium did not prove to be a challenge because personnel at the

two lead institutions had an on-going relationship based on prior collaborative work and

this facilitated initiating the consortium relationship. At the negotiation stage the two

lead organizations found that the process of arriving at a memo of understanding was

complicated by the legalities of crafting an acceptable document. At one point the

American lead institutions felt that they could easily accomplish this by making use of a

pre-existing document crafted by previous program participants, but soon realized that

their unique institutional context required a re-drafting of the document. During the

implementation stage, challenges encountered by the consortium institutions included a

lack of resources, institutional bureaucracy, and communication issues, and logistics, while challenges encountered at the governmental level included technical difficulties with the the electronic program announcement created by the Americans, and legislative matters on the American side. Most of the implementation stage difficulties encountered were at the institutional consortium project level. The Social and Economic Development consortium project was representative of international initiatives mentioned in the literature review. Institutional factors that existed apart from the consortium project largely contributed to the implementation challenges. The lack of resources experienced at the Brazilian Secondary Institution, for example, did not arise in the context of the consortium, rather, in the context of the institution as it has had existed prior to the initiation of the consortium project. The bureaucratic issues surrounding paperwork, timeliness, and other logistical issues were likely endemic of the American lead institution, and referring to a governmental implementation challenge, the lack of technological infrastructure which complicated CAPES' electronic program announcement was a problem outside of the binational program and affects other programs sponsored by CAPES. The main point here is that the context, resources, and efficiency of the entities prior to the collaboration will be replicated within the collaboration, and if the particular context of a particular department is able to mitigate some of the overall institutional factors, those factors may still influence project implementation.

Staffing was a scarce resource for certain of the institutions in the consortium. Regarding staffing, specifically, a lack of logistical support was the most mentioned

challenge or difficulty related to implementation. Both the scope of coordinator responsibilities and the timely completion of logistics were affected by the lack of logistical support. From the Brazilian perspective, the project director from the Brazilian Lead Institution felt that the amount of paperwork required by CAPES was great enough to demand attention from more than one staff person and that it was a challenge for a coordinator working alone at his or her institution to handle that paperwork and related logistics jointly. One participant felt that the additional workload was a burden to professors who were involved in the consortium and that this additional workload was a deterrent to their participation. In fact, at the Brazilian Lead Institution, a professor who was identified to coordinate certain components of the academic aspect of the consortium project would only do so if he could have an assistant. The project staff at the Brazilian Lead University were able to identify and provide that assistant to him, however, that additional support was not available at all of the participating institutions.

As I needed to contact and request information of the American lead institution, I learned that more people than who were formally identified were involved in project coordination. Three primary people were responsible for the project: the two co-project directors who were a dean/provost and a faculty member (who once served as assistant provost) and one graduate student assistant. However, there were at least two other people who were involved in certain aspects of the program, adding additional behind the scenes staffing. This appeared to also be a result of the extra human resources a high-ranking staff person can command.

At the American Secondary Institution, the issue of scarce resources manifested in the area of student support. There were two senior professors coordinating the program. These professors expressed that it was not an efficient use of their time to attend to some of the student reception, orientation, and support issues. While they felt those issues were important to address and that it was important for the students to receive assistance in those areas, they felt that their roles in the university better positioned them to handle different aspects of the program, namely the academic component, and that it would have been helpful to have another staff person, a graduate assistant for example, who could assist the students.

Certain of the Brazilian partners expressed that they experienced excessive bureaucracy as well as differences in culture and certain of the American respondents experienced poor communication, however, no one reported differences in goals, lack of attention to detail (Saffu & Mamman, 2000). Regarding bureaucracy, Brazilian participants revealed their pre-conceived notion that processes would be faster and more efficient at the American Universities versus at the Brazilian universities, however they realized that that was not always the case, and that in some cases, the American universities were indeed much slower procedurally than the Brazilian. This view is representative of the type of cultural stereotyping that can occur between people of other cultures when they haven't had sufficient meaningful contact. It is an example of the cultural learning that can be achieved by the professionals involved in the program. In this case specifically, it also aids in abolishing the idea that the Northern countries are

somehow better than they Southern countries and that they should be in the position of leader or expert, a view that this binational program does not hold.

Devon & Hager (1998) indicated that a weak understanding of the partner's language could slow-down the collaborative process. While all of the governmental personnel and institutional project coordinators agreed that the Brazilian's high level of proficiency in English facilitated communication between them, a staff member at the American Lead Institution primarily responsible for daily project logistics felt that a lack of both English and Portuguese proficiency impeded communication at times. This same staff member felt that a lack of consistency in roles led to difficulty in achieving certain tasks. Project director language skills may not be essential for the overhaul success of the program, however, certain responses did indicate that an ability to communicated in the partners language is useful for project staff, whether directors or support staff, who will interact with international counterparts on a daily basis.

Both Brazilian and American coordinators indicated that student participation costs such as housing (O'Meara, 2001) were a concern. While this may seem to be a student-centered issue rather than an implementation issue, financial concerns on behalf of the students could hinder future student participation which would, in turn, affect overall program implementation. The housing issue is not only a significant financial concern, it is emblematic of the type of challenges that can occur when institutions from different cultures and contexts collaborate. For the both the American and Brazilian students, the cost of housing was a concern. Identifying housing was an additional concern for the American students because most Brazilian institutions are not residential

campuses. The societal expectations of the two higher education systems are different. In the American context it is traditional to provide on-campus housing at a cost, while in the Brazilian context it is tradition for students to continue living with parents and commute to school. While a difference like this provides great cultural learning for the participants, it also proves to be a financial and implementation challenge for the project directors.

At the governmental level, the Brazilians stated that they did not have the same technological capabilities as the American government agency and responded that this was an area of difficulty for the Brazilians during the implementation of the program. FIPSE manages their grant announcements and applications completely on-line. FIPSE shares this information with CAPES, and their major difficulty is in opening and manipulating the very detailed electronic documents that FIPSE provides them. The CAPES technological infrastructure doesn't always support the electronic files that FIPSE sends. The Brazilians consider this to be a matter of strategic planning for their entity as a whole, and during the time of this study, they did not see their technology infrastructure improving in the near future.

Benefits

Just as the literature review did not produce a substantial discussion of the benefits of collaboration, neither did the interview responses. However, both U.S. and Brazilian leaders indicated the potential for development of global competency and additional "preparation for academic life" by sending students abroad which is consistent with the literature. When benefits were elaborated on they included the diversification of

participating campuses, increased public diplomacy between the collaborating nations, and the value of this experience to promote work force development

Success factors and strategies

Also directly in line with the literature is the belief that the development of a strong relationship between partners and commitment to the collaboration are among the factors that will lead to the success of the collaboration (Heffernan & Poole, 2005). Regarding a strong relationship, themes that emerged include the importance of communication, flexibility, mutual interest in the collaboration. In terms of commitment, in addition to interest and hard work by the collaboration coordinators on the ground level, interviews revealed that commitment and support at all levels of involvement and especially at the highest levels of leadership are important to the collaborative relationship.

Both Kearney (1992) and Heffernan & Poole (2005) feel the establishment of quality assurance methods is important. While this was not discussed in depth by the participants, recognizing its importance, one American government coordinator commented that the evaluation component of the program is a challenge for FIPSE. She stated that determining how to assess the effectiveness of the IHEs, faculty, and project directors (PDs) in developing curricula across institutions in different countries is important. She also informed that on the U.S. side there are evaluation mechanisms built in to the program itself. She states that the project directors on the U.S. side are required to have independent evaluators and to assess what they are doing in the short term and the long term. She thinks the Brazilian Ministry requires the same but notes that, in the spirit

of a collaborative relationship, the two governments still need to work out a joint

mechanism for assessment. With regard to assessment, there has been an emphasis on

student centered learning in both the higher education and study abroad community over

the past 10 years and expectations for student learning have moved from a focus on

language acquisition to one of intercultural learning (Van de Berg, CIHE Podcast, 2007).

Beerkens & Derwende (2007) assert that compatibility and complementarity are

critical aspects of higher education collaborations and that members of a consortium must

possess resources that are "strategically valuable" for the other members (p.76). More

participants made comments confirming the role of compatibility than complementarity,

however, this sentiment was echoed by one of the coordinators at the American Lead

Insitution. He stated that individual strengths brought by each of the institutions were

important in identifying partners at the outset.

In summary, this collaboration is consistent with others discussed in the extant

literature in terms of goals, formally written agreements, challenges, experiences, and the

importance of a strong partner relationship. It differs from some collaborations in the

diversity of institutional personnel who initiated the consortium project, in its balanced

North-South composition, and lack of an emphasis to gain financially from the exchange

of students.

Part Two: Culture's role in implementation

This section of the chapter analyzes the role of national culture in the

implementation and collaboration process of the U.S.-Brazil Program and the Social and

Economic Development Consortium Project. In doing so, I analyze why the participants

may have responded to the interview question regarding impact of national culture on implementation and collaboration in the way they did, and then apply definitions and dimensions of culture to the collaborative activities.

When I designed this study I assumed that higher education professionals from different nations working together to implement an exchange program would be affected by national cultural differences. It was my assumption that the coordinators would have different working styles, needs, expectations, and perceptions based on national origin or national context. I wanted to see if this assumption was true in the case of the Social and Economic Development Project. I found, however, that national culture did not emerge as a significant influence on implementation and collaboration according to the participants. The participants attributed matters of implementation to institutional or organizational factors such as organizational culture or institutional infrastructure and leadership style, and they attributed matters of collaboration to individual personality.

When I directly questioned the participants about the impact of national culture on collaboration and implementation, it was difficult for them to identify cultural factors that may have influenced the partnership, however, they found it easier to discuss institutional or organizational factors. When discussing institutional and organizational factors, I noticed that the participants were more likely to point out similarities between the partners rather than differences. Because I did not consider that their responses adequately addressed the issue of culture, I encouraged greater reflection on the question of how national culture influenced implementation and collaboration. In listening to their additional responses, I noticed that the Brazilian and American participants alike

responded from a "what the other culture thinks about our culture" perspective, rather than from a perspective of, "this is what our culture is like, this is what their culture is like, and this is the impact of our two cultures interacting."

The participants did share some culture related thoughts. Some of the Brazilian participants revealed that they held preconceived notions of their partner's culture and of how they felt they were viewed by members of their partner's culture. The participants did not reveal this when asked directly about national culture, rather their beliefs surfaced at other points in the interview. One such preconceived notion that Brazilian participants mentioned was their opinion that the Americans would be faster and more efficient with their project work. This opinion, in the context of this particular project, turned out not to be accurate, especially in the case of the American Lead Institution. One Brazilian staff person noted that bureaucracy on the American side slowed up implementation. This same staff person did not feel that a similar bureaucracy existed on the Brazilian side. These types of preconceived notions were dispelled during the project as the partners became more familiar with each other.

The American participants also had cultural revelations. Certain of these revelations dealt with how the Americans experienced Brazilian culture and others with how the Americans felt their nationality impacted their experience. Some American participants, for example, recognized that the Brazilian partners had "their own way of doing things", but felt that it only had a minimal impact on how they ran the project. One of the American government personnel commented on the general view held by Americans of Brazil being a place of all fun and festival, however, experiences travelling

through and working with the Brazilians in the program dispelled that myth for her and her colleagues at FIPSE.

Some American participants commented on the difficulty of being American in South America during the specific consortium project time period, which coincided with the second George W. Bush administration. They broached the topic of anti-American sentiment but felt that may have been more an issue for the students rather than for the coordinators.

Several of the participants, American and Brazilian, noted the lack of urgency for American students to go abroad versus the Brazilian students' need to travel outside of their culture for education opportunities. This was a distinct national culture difference that influenced the consortium project but didn't influence the cross-cultural interaction between the partners, rather it influenced the coordinators' ability to attract American students to participate in the program.

There are several reasons why culture may not have emerged during the study as a significant influence on the implementation and collaboration process. One reason is that several of the participants had worked with other international education initiatives on their campuses and with different institutions in other countries. This prior experience likely supplied them with knowledge and skills that assisted them in their cross-cultural professional and interpersonal dealings in the consortium project. In addition, two of the institutional partners had worked together before and all of the partners were interculturally savvy to an extent.

The participants may have responded to the question with a sense of "politeness." National cultural factors may not have actually played a large role in implementation and collaboration or participants may not have wanted to express that they did because they didn't want to appear negative about their partner or their partner's culture. It is important to note that my position as an American researcher may have influenced the Brazilian participants' responses. It is possible that the Brazilian participants were not as forthcoming with critical analysis about their cross-cultural implementation and collaboration experience because of my nationality and a desire not to offend my culture. It is also possible that the idea of political diplomacy between the two sponsoring agencies also affected the candidness of their responses.

Culture also may not have played a large role in the partnership because of the fact that each national sponsoring agency and each institution functioned within their own environment and were not challenged by adapting to different ways of functioning. In addition, the partners rarely saw each other and did not have to interact on a daily basis. They only saw each other a couple of times a year. The findings suggest, however, that successful international collaboration is more influenced by how the program is structured, the clout of the individual project directors, and the relationship that develops between the partners and less by a partner's knowledge of the other's culture or language. To better understand the impact of national cultural on the partner relationship, a discussion of national culture follows.

Culture

To inform this analysis, it is useful to have a definition of culture and a discussion of some of the aspects of culture. Towards this end, I'll briefly share two definitions of culture and state why I think they are applicable to the U.S.-Brazil Program. I'll also discuss four concepts on which culture is based and how they were reflected in the implementation and collaboration process of the national program and institutional consortium project.

Culture has been defined differently by different scholars. Two definitions that I believe are especially applicable to this study are: "Culture is the shared set of assumptions, values, and beliefs of a group of people by which they organize their common life" (Wederspahn cited in Storti, 1997, p. 8) and, "Culture is the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one group from another" (Hofstede cited in Storti, 1997, p.6). Similarl, to the Wederspahn definition, but more broadly stated, is Hofstede's notion that a group of people are conditioned or programmed to view the world from the same perspective or mindset. This motivated the question of whether collective programming would affect perspectives held, actions taken, and decisions made during the implementation and collaboration process. These definitions and concepts are applicable to this study because it is the assumptions, values, and beliefs of Americans and Brazilians that I thought might affect the working relationship between the two groups of education professionals: their assumptions about each other's culture and educational system, their values regarding the collaboration

process, their beliefs about the purpose of their specific collaboration and what knowledge or activities are important to provide the students.

The Peace Corps, in its *Culture Matters* manual for overseas volunteers, considers there are four fundamental concepts, also referred to as building blocks, of culture. They are concepts of self, personal versus societal obligations, time, and locus of control. Each of these concepts has two poles or extremes. Individuality and collectivity are the two extremes of concept of self. Universalism and particularism are the two extremes of personal versus societal obligations. The two extremes of concept of time are monochronic and polychronic, and the two extremes of locus of control are activism and fatalism.

Concept of self considers how one views him or herself in relation to a group, such as a family or a work team. Individualists are primarily concerned with self, are considered self-sufficient, and feel that taking care of self first benefits the group. Collectivists identify strongly with the group and its survival and success. They believe that the success of the group ensures the well-being of the individual. American culture is largely considered to be individualist, while Brazilian culture is considered collectivist, albeit more individualist than other Latin American Cultures (ITIM International, 2008).

In the case of CAPES-FIPSE, the Americans displayed both individualist and collective behaviors while Brazilian counterparts appeared to stay close to collectivism. An example of American individualism from the Brazilian lead institution project director's perspective is the characteristic of being strongly profit driven in the higher education system. I see this as an individualist trait, where the individual entity here is

186

not a person, rather a particular institution. In general, American institutions of higher

education differ from Brazilian ones in their philosophy of how much higher education

should cost and who should pay for it. Students and families in the United States pay for

higher education by and large, whether out of pocket or through loans, while the

Brazilian federal government has traditionally paid for students to attend federally run

institutions if they were able to meet certain academic requirements. The Brazilian

system can be seen as collectivist, recognizing, however, that it does not benefit all of

Brazilian society. In this program, all of the Brazilian institutions were federal and did

not charge their students tuition. The consortium partners found themselves needing to

solve the problem of how to accommodate Brazilian students in American universities

who were not prepared to pay for housing or tuition fees in the United States. After much

negotiation, the American partners were able to arrange for full or subsidized payment of

housing in an effort to help the Brazilian students. This can be viewed as collectivist

behavior on behalf of the Americans because it placed the accommodation of the

Brazilian students, and therefore the well-being of the consortium program as a whole

ahead of the individual institutions' standard policies and potential to earn a profit from

international students.

　　　According to Storti (1997) universalism is the idea that certain absolutes apply

across the board, regardless of circumstances or the particular situation. This means

wherever possible, one should try to apply the same rules to everyone in like situations

and treat the situation with objectivity. Particularism is the idea that how one behaves in

a given situation depends on the circumstances. There can't be absolutes because

everything depends on who involved in the situation. No one expects life to be fair. Exceptions will always be made for certain people. These certain people could be members of a family, clique, or in-group of some sort who one would favor over others. Culture Matters approaches this dichotomy of personal versus societal obligations from a perspective of favoritism, however I can apply it to the CAPES-FIPSE program and the specific consortium project being studied from a social justice perspective that takes into consideration economic and racial matters.

Using the tuition and housing example from above, we can see that the Americans initially held a universalistic viewpoint. The Americans, and in this case, American officials at the partner institution, rather than the American project directors felt that the Brazilian students should pay the same fees as the American students. The Brazilians held a particularistic viewpoint regarding Afro-Brazilian students who applied for the exchange program. This is shown in the adjustment of the English-language requirement of the Brazilian application process. In the beginning of the project funding period, the original project director at the secondary Brazilian institution found that black Brazilians were being excluded from the application process because of reliance on the TOEFL to assess English language skills. With social and economic development as the theme of the project, it was necessary to find a way to include more black Brazilians. An accommodation was made for black Brazilians that lessened the emphasis on the specific TOEFL test, but maintained a standard of English proficiency.

Storti (1997) explains the concept of monochronic time considers time as the given and people as the variable. The needs of people, such as schedules and deadlines

188

are adjusted to suit the demands of time. Time is quantifiable, and a limited amount of it is available. People do one thing at a time and finish it before starting something else, regardless of circumstances. The concept of polychronic time views time as the servant and tool of people. Time is adjusted to suit the needs of people. More time is always available, and one is never too busy. People often have to do several things simultaneously, as required by circumstances. It's not necessary to finish one thing before starting another, nor to finish business with one person before starting in with another.

American culture is considered to be monochronic. This was demonstrated by the FIPSE program coordinator as she discussed how deadline-orientated she was, how quickly she would attempt to meet those deadlines, and how working with the Brazilians made her relax and slow down a bit more. Brazilian culture is polychronic, however, in the case of this consortium project, certain of the Brazilian partners expressed a view and respect for time that is more likely to be associated with the monochronic view of time. Specifically, the Brazilian student support staff member at the Brazilian lead institution expressed frustration with the American partner about how long it took to accomplish certain tasks. The Brazilian International Student Advisor made it a point to always act in timely manner, characteristics that her Brazilian counterparts viewed as "not very Brazilian." This situation of a Brazilian from a perceived polychronic society acting in a monochronic way may be an example of a particular person's individual personality or it could be an example of how international and intercultural exposure have blurred national cultural characteristics.

The two opposites of locus of control are internal and external, also referred to as activism and fatalism. These different perspectives are based on the amount of control an individual feels he or she has to manipulate outside forces and shape their own destiny. Having an internal locus of control means that the individual feels that there are few circumstances in life that must be accepted and cannot be changed. Having an external locus of control means that the individual feels that certain circumstances are predetermined and that certain things in life must be accepted.

Americans are considered to be activists and this is seen in the popular expression, "Where there's a will, there's a way." Brazilians have traditionally been viewed as fatalist. In the case of this consortium project, I view both the Brazilian and American participants as activists, as having an internal locus of control motivated by their interest, enthusiasm, willingness and follow-through in implementing a program such as the U.S.-Brazil Program. Globalization is a major motivator in facilitating exchanges in higher education. In working together and implementing this program, the coordinators and directors responded proactively to globalization, initiated a strategy to prepare students for it, and adjusted their educational practices to adapt to it. These are activist traits. One very significant activist behavior that was exhibited by the CAPES officials was the willingness to challenge the traditional perspective on international study in Brazilian higher education being something only for post-graduate students. They initially met with challenges as they proposed international study at the undergraduate level. Some in the Brazilian education community felt that international study at the undergraduate level amounted to little more than tourism. Despite this view,

the CAPES officials and program directors were able to succeed at developing a program which gave undergraduate students an opportunity to study abroad. Some other examples of their activist actions include the FIPSE program coordinator educating herself in Portuguese and making an effort to speak the language with her Brazilian counterparts, an American lead institution co-project director typing bilingual agendas also in an effort to communicate in the partner's language, the American lead institution graduate assistant suggesting the use of Skype in order to facilitate communication with the partners, and the Brazilian lead institution student support staff person stating, "No one is excluded because they are poor." Those are all activist behaviors demonstrating an internal locus of control. However, I noticed fatalistic tendencies from both Americans and Brazilians with regard to language use, such as the American lead institution co-coordinator giving up on his bilingual agendas because they didn't seem useful and a senior FIPSE official accepting the notion that Americans will always be challenged with foreign languages and therefore using English as the operating language of the consortia program and project.

National culture plays an important role in how individuals perceive the world and interact with each other. In this particular case, the study participants did not identify national culture as a major force, whether facilitating or inhibiting, affecting the implementation of the national program or institutional consortium project. In fact, as shown in this analysis of the application of four concepts of culture, both the Americans and Brazilians made decisions and held perspectives that were not in accordance with their generally perceived cultural dispositions. This may be due to the previous

intercultural experience, knowledge, and skills held by the project directors and their staff, or perhaps to the fact that no partner had to actually operate within the other's culture to a great extent.

Part Three: Observations

In this final section of the chapter, I discuss several aspects of the collaboration experience that did not fit into the overall theme of factors that facilitate implementation and collaboration, but are also significant in understanding the experience of those involved in the U.S.-Brazil Program and their ability to acknowledge and draw upon that experience during the study. These factors include the program coordinators' and project directors' focus on students rather than on themselves as the individuals being studied, their level of involvement in the daily functioning of program and project activities, institutional and interdisciplinary differences, the program as a stimulus for behavior versus the setting or context in which the program takes place as the stimulus, and transcending conditions that hindered implementation.

Focus on Student Experience Rather than Project Director Experience

The purpose of this study was to examine the experience of the individuals coordinating the consortia program, both government and institutional personnel. Throughout the interviews I conducted, it seemed counterintuitive for the project directors to discuss their own role in and perspective of the process of implementation and collaboration. In the interviews, the study participants tended to focus on student-related matters such as academic, personal, and professional benefits of participation gained by students, student financial concerns, and program achievements in terms of

numbers of students exchanged and specific curriculum materials created. This is understandable, considering that in the higher education field, there has been an on-going attempt to understand what students are learning in study abroad programs and what the conditions are that tend to promote that learning (Van de berg, CIHE Podcast, 2007) as well as an increased focus on study abroad quality.

This tendency for the interviewees to focus on student issues brought to light that student issues were, in fact, overall program implementation issues. Students are the primary focus of the U.S.-Brazil Program, therefore, its coordinators are concerned with the program's ability to attract students, provide them with a worthwhile experience, and grow the program in regard to numbers of students exchanged. Additional student-related issues that affected program implementation include housing, language proficiency, and the visa process. These types of issues are essential for the project directors to consider prior to launching the program. Lack of financial assistance or affordable housing for the exchanged students, students who aren't able to fully understand the language of instruction or communicate in the academic setting, and students who encounter problems getting a visa to study abroad all pose considerable logistical challenges for the project directors. These issues can ultimately affect the very existence of the project because they affect the student's ability to participate in the program, and without student participation there would be no consortia program or institutional projects

However, my goal was to learn specifically about the experience of the government personnel and the project directors at the institutions, and ultimately, what in their experience contributed to the successful implementation of the program. Several

times throughout interviewing, I needed to redirect the study participants to get them to

reflect more upon their own experience of implementing the program and collaborating

with their international counterparts. This was especially so with the more senior

officials at FIPSE and CAPES. The senior officials had less involvement with the daily

program logistics and it appeared as though they were more accustomed to promoting the

program and their collaborative relationship for its successes, than critically examining

their role as program implementers. Their leaning toward program promotion and away

from a critical examination of logistics could have been a case of "the view from 3000

feet up." In other words, being more senior in the organization, they were also more

distant from the day-to-day functioning of the program and therefore less affected by and

less knowledgeable of implementation issues mentioned by some of the support staff. It

could also have been because of diplomacy and a desire to not offend their partners. This

program serves not only to provide students and educators with an international

experience, but to enhance diplomatic relations between two nations, therefore intending

to continue and grow the program, it seems logical that neither nation is going to be too

critical of the other, if criticism were necessary. It seems that in a situation like this, with

two partners and a limited number of people who run the program, forthright evaluation

may be hard to come by. It would be relatively obvious to the program coordinators who

have commented on aspects of the program, therefore, making it less probable that an

independent evaluator or researcher would receive the most open and forthright opinions.

Knowing this, it seems to me that communication between partners, a strategy for

facilitating implementation and collaboration mentioned in the findings chapter, would be

even more important throughout the life of the program. They would need to be aware of and willing to address any concerns that arise on a regular basis in the most effective and non-threatening way possible.

Proximity to the Daily Action

In general, those program or project staff closest to the daily functions were able to speak more concretely about its inner workings and to be more reflective about their experience running the program. This is the opposite of the situation of certain high level program and project staff having a "view from 3000 feet up." Where support staff existed, I observed, they were able to provide more detailed information about the implementation of activities and their experiences collaborating with the partners. Likewise, those project directors who did not have support staff and were responsible for all of the project logistics, were also able to provide more detailed information about the program, their institution's project and their involvement with it. Participants at all levels of involvement provided useful insight, however, as may be expected, the senior personnel whose role in the project was to provide leadership and direction yielded a different type of insight than those whose role was to work closely with students, counterparts, and logistics. Those in senior leadership roles, such as the deans, provided more insight on program philosophy (the big picture) while those with more direct contact were able to more easily shed light on the operation of the program or institutional project and to better address the research question focused on their experience. In terms of facilitating successful implementation, this means that it is essential to engage all support staff in the planning and evaluation of program and project

activities, especially project staff at the institutional level. Whether faculty, department

staff, or graduate assistant, it is necessary to learn the perspectives of the people who

have the most direct contact with the partners because they are the ones who are

experiencing the program most intensely. They can yield valuable insight into how to

better interact with partners, and can attest to whether or not implementation strategies

and activities are working smoothly.

Institutional and Interdisciplinary Differences

When I conceptualized this study, my focus was primarily on the international

and intercultural dimensions of implementation and collaboration. However, during the

study, the challenges of inter-institutional collaboration, whether domestic or

international, and interdisciplinary collaboration were emphasized by some of the

participants. It appears that institutional and interdisciplinary factors may impact more

strongly than international/intercultural factors. In this case, institutional factors are

significant to the extent that they signify institutional similarity or difference. For

example, the American lead institution co-project director, a dean, commented during his

interview that in the initial stages of the grant period, the students and faculty at his

institution were drawn more to one of the Brazilian partners than the other. His

institution being a comprehensive research university, students and faculty were more

attracted to the Brazilian institution that had characteristics similar to its own. These

individuals were drawn to the similarity of the other institution. The dean commented

that, to them, it seemed American, in other words, it seemed more familiar to them.

While, in the pursuit of cultural understanding, it may be beneficial to acknowledge

similarities between cultures, to me, it seems counterproductive to look for institutional similarity in an international exchange program meant to provide students and faculty with an experience different from that to which they are already accustomed. For the individuals exchanged, the greater the institutional difference, possibly, the richer the cultural and educational experience. This creates a situation in which, in order to provide the most valuable experience to those individuals exchanged, the individuals implementing the project must also learn to work with difference. They must learn to work with administrative and procedural difference and to learn to problem solve and be resourceful because of this difference. It is my view that this type of institutionally and interculturally-diverse working relationship is beneficial not only within the context of international exchange and international education, but also in the domestic context. I believe it develops within those participating individuals a set of skills and a disposition (both professional and personal) that are useful in other types of campus relationships at the home institution and with other institutions in the home country. Institutional difference, however, surfaced as the cause of implementation challenges for the project directors, while institutional similarity proved to be especially useful for them. Institutional similarity lent itself to an easier working relationship between the larger research universities that shared certain characteristics. Problems that were evident during the collaboration period seemed to stem from the one institution that was most different from the others, suggesting that for the purposes of smooth and efficient program implementation there is justification to partnering with as similar an institution as possible.

With regard to the interdisciplinary nature of the collaboration, differences in values and intellectual content were at stake with the creation of the electronic course. According to one of the American secondary institution co-project directors, everyone had a different idea of what they thought was important and what they think should be included in the course. The different academic disciplines, humanities versus sciences for example, represented in the development of the course had different expectations of what should be taught and how it should be taught. One of the project directors admitted to not fully understanding how those outside of her discipline teach and research, and that working across disciplines was not as easy as she thought it would be. Interdisciplinary collaboration was not a specific question in the interview protocol and was only discussed in depth by two of the American project coordinators, the perspectives they shared are relevant to the goal of understanding project staff experience, especially with the national program objective of creating international curriculum. In this particular consortium project, it was the project directors and their staff who developed the curriculum materials, as opposed to the students. The interdisciplinary component of this consortium project provided a rich experience for the project directors and other involved institutional staff and merits closer examination in future studies.

The Stimuli or the Setting

I emphasized the purpose of this study, which is to examine the participants' perception of their collaboration experience, by highlighting a concept based on perception proposed by Marshall Singer (in Bennett, 1998, p. 97.) Singer asserts that people behave the way they do because of the ways in which they perceive the external

world. He states that the same stimuli are often perceived differently by different individuals and groups. He emphasizes that people must exist in relationship with other humans. Being concerned with how people of other cultures work effectively together, I assumed human behavior based on cultural conditioning would play a large role in the participants' relationship with each other and how they experienced the program, however, culturally-conditioned human behavior did not surface in this study as a key factor in the implementation and collaboration experience. Through the one-one interviews, I learned that, in this case, the stimulus itself, the U.S.-Brazil Program, appears to have been received with very much the same understanding by all involved. However, their experience with that stimulus was greatly affected by the context in which the stimulus manifested, the institutional context. All of the participants agreed on the program purpose and the individual project goals, however, their level and ease of success reaching those goals varied depending on their institutional context. Behaviors formed by a culturally-conditioned world view may not have been as much of a factor because of the international experience of the program and project directors and because of their ability to adapt to international and intercultural situations. Because of this experience, they may have been able to shed some of their own national identity and culturally-based perceptions and adjust their behaviors to accommodate the international context in which they were working. One of the American project directors said of a Brazilian staff person that because of her punctuality and efficiency the Brazilian staff person did not seem very Brazilian. These characteristics of punctuality and efficiency were not seen as Brazilian. This same Brazilian staff person, commented that she had

traveled to other parts of the world and worked on several different international

programs, and that she no longer viewed others by their nationality but by their

personality. This experience and changed view of others could have affected the

Brazilian staff person's view of her own culture and cultural behaviors and caused her to

employ different behaviors, which, in this case seemed useful for the effective

implementation of the program. This suggests that possessing international or

intercultural experience may be a valid criteria in selecting appropriate project staff,

however, I would caution against only considering faculty, staff, and administrators who

do have that experience. Doing that would only capitalize on the cultural experience of

some, rather than giving others an opportunity to gain similar experience, thereby

increasing the amount of higher education professionals with international/intercultural

experience. I would instead look for personal and professional characteristics in potential

project staff that are indicative of an ability to communicate effectively with others,

interact with people of other cultures, and adapt to culturally varied situations.

Transcending Conditions that Hindered Implementation

This study examines what the project directors did that facilitated the successful

implementation and collaborative relationship of the project, however, it does not ignore

the fact that there were some factors that posed challenges for the project staff. These

factors included creation of the electronic course, personnel consistency, student-related

issues such as language proficiency, getting a visa, paying for housing, and paperwork

processing. Several project directors revealed that the electronic course was a bigger

undertaking than they imagined. One of the project directors commented, in relation to

networking with other institutional offices, that they had not anticipated the varied

assistance and contacts they would need from other institutional offices. This initial lack

of awareness took a toll on certain of the project directors who did not have support staff,

however, it did not derail them from implementing the program.

One project director commented on the difference in how the two countries view

higher education. He stated that Brazil views the provision of higher education as a social

mission, while the United States views higher education as a commercial endeavor that is

profit driven. When higher education systems operate under different philosophical

guidelines and the agents of those systems are beholden to those guidelines this can cause

some conflict in implementing an exchange program. This philosophical difference came

to the forefront in the Social and Economic Development Project as the project directors

were trying to determine how to accommodate Brazilian students, who do not normally

pay for federally provided higher education, at the American institutions. Problems arose

related to tuition and housing fees, and credit recognition. In this consortium project, the

project directors were willing to problem solve and negotiate with their institutions in

order to arrive at solutions that transcended philosophical difference.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have compared the major themes produced in the literature

review to the national consortia program and the consortium project, examined the role of

national culture in the implementation and collaboration process, and made observations

about additional issues significant to the experiences of the participants as they pertain to

their reflection on implementation and collaboration. The U.S.-Brazil Program shows

some similarities to other international higher education collaborations in goals and in formal structure, however differs in that it is a balanced partnership between Northern and Southern countries and does not have institutional profit as an objective or an outcome. In contrast to my initial thoughts, national culture did not appear to play a significant role in the implementation and collaboration process, however it did provide an interesting lens through which to analyze certain actions made by institutional project directors and other institutional staff involved with the consortium project. Finally, there were several factors not included in the major study findings that were important in understanding the experience of those involved in the U.S.-Brazil Program and their ability to acknowledge and draw upon that experience during the study. Of these factors, institutional circumstances played a large role in the implementation and collaboration process.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION

Initial Thoughts

This chapter concludes the dissertation. The interactions and experiences I have had with individuals from other cultures in the United States and abroad have reinforced in me the idea that people can learn a great deal from one another. That seems an obvious concept, but I think it is one that is sometimes forgotten or under-applied. Learning from one another is the foundation on which the U.S.-Brazil Program is built. The national government representatives, institutional project directors, and exchange students learn from one another as well as others they come into contact with through the program. They learn through work, academics, and socializing. They experience each other's environments, processes, philosophies, behaviors, and reactions. They learn as much about themselves as they do about their counterparts.

In today's professional contexts, globalization is frequently invoked as the reason why students and professionals need to be able to learn about others and how to interact with them; about other societies and how they work. Globalization is a valid reason for cultural learning, because many more professionals are finding that their work environments include interactions with people from and in other countries. It makes sense then that students, in preparation for professional careers would engage in learning opportunities designed to prepare them for their future work environment.

In the United States and in Brazil, higher education institutions, international education organizations, and government education entities have increased their efforts to

prepare students for the demands of a globalized world. Campus activities, classes, degree programs, study and internships abroad, and service learning trips are being developed and implemented to prepare students and provide them with international and intercultural experiences. Faculty, staff, and administrators are involved in delivering these international and intercultural experiences, and I believe it is equally beneficial to prepare those professionals to deliver the experiences as it is for the students to participate in them. It is the faculty, staff, and administrators who conduct the programs, sponsor the trips, advise the exchanged students, approve the credits, and collaborate with the overseas counterparts. These campus actors have considerable control over what opportunities are offered to the students and what the students will experience when they participate.

Programs such as the U.S.-Brazil Program provide funding and support to higher education professionals who desire to expand international opportunities for students on their campuses. Studies such as this one provide those professionals with knowledge that will better prepare them to do so. Acquiring this knowledge and disseminating it to international education providers or would-be international education providers, can encourage and prepare them for their undertaking. This, in turn, could enhance the quality of delivery and increasing the amount of effective international learning opportunities for students.

Summary of Findings

This study set out to describe and analyze how the government and academic personnel in the U.S.-Program experienced the implementation of the program and to

answer the overall question, "What factors influence the successful implementation of international higher education collaborations." Each individual participant experienced implementation in a different manner depending on their context but there were some similarities. There was general agreement between the all of the American and Brazilian government and institutional partners on certain aspects of the experience. These include their formal and informal partner relationship, the goals of the program, and the national program's and institutional consortium project's accomplishments. There was great variation in their perception of the implementation process for the consortium project's project directors. Three of the project directors benefitted from higher ranked project leadership and additional staff members. This facilitated their ability to accomplish implementation tasks. Three of the project directors, while still effective, had to manage implementation tasks with little extra support. This complicated their implementation experience.

Researching the Social and Economic Development Project, in particular, has yielded certain insights that could be useful to future program participants and to international education providers engaged in similar partnerships. One of these is the notion that cultural context may not influence collaborative relationships as much as institutional context. This study revealed that the participants possessed intercultural experiences prior to implementing the Social and Economic Development Project that had developed in them a measure of cultural sensitivity. Cultural sensitivity lessened the impact of cultural difference and compensated for the lack of language skills. I also found that, because of the intercultural experience and intercultural mindset of the participants,

they were not rigid with their own cultural preferences and were accepting of the ways of their participants.

Institutional context as well as organizational context proved to have a greater impact on project implementation, collaboration, and even student experience. I view institutional context in this case as the characteristics of the institutional consortium partner that have a direct effect on project implementation. These include institutional resources, staffing, and project director rank. This study found that in the case of the Social and Economic Development Project, both the American and Brazilian project directors who were deans from larger and better-resourced institutions were able to implement the project activities with greater ease. No program participant communicated any cultural trait, behavior, or worldview that positively or negatively impacted project implementation, rather they frequently attributed institutional factors to the ease or difficulty of implementation.

Another of the insights this study yielded is a set of conditions present in the Social and Economic Development Project that resulted in a positive collaborative experience and enabled the project directors to accomplish project goals. These conditions are organized into six themes including partner equality and mutuality, partner characteristics, partner relationship, finances, strategies, and staffing. Partner equality and mutuality was revealed to carry an especially high level of importance to the participants. All of the themes work together as integral components of a strategy for successfully implementing an international higher education collaboration.

Recommendations for Further Research

Considering the study's findings, I offer certain recommendations for further research. These recommendations will be provider-focused and not student-focused. The U.S.-Brazil Program provides ample opportunity to study both student-related matters and faculty, staff, and administrator matters, however, I believe that international education research needs to focus on the providers as well as the recipients.

The participants in this study each had experience coordinating similar collaborative activities, had traveled outside of their home country for professional and purposes social purposes, and many of them had some foreign language experience, even if it was in a language other than Portuguese or English. These characteristics eased their intercultural interactions and, in some cases, provided participants with country-specific knowledge that informed their relationships and guided their behaviors in the partner countries. Returning to the assumption that cultural context would affect collaboration and implementation in an international higher education initiative, it would be useful to identify future U.S.-Brazil Program participants who have very little to no prior international experiences. This would not necessarily be an institution that had never engaged in international academic collaboration, rather, a project director who had never traveled outside of his or her country before or who had never directly worked with a professional from another country. Two of the consortium project partners in this case were from large, well-resourced, research institutions. The other two were smaller institutions but well-equipped research institutions. Because institutional context surfaced as a major theme in this study, it would be interesting to learn how a consortium project

that does not benefit from any project directors with high university rank fares

implementation. Two important aspects of the U.S.-Brazil Program that were not

included in the scope of this study are the process of credit recognition and evaluation of

project outcomes. Credit recognition is both a student and provider issue. Focusing on it

from the provider perspective, researching how the partner institutions are able to work

together to determine a credit recognition process could be useful. At the data collection

stage of this study, the national partners had not developed a system for evaluating how

effective the partner institutions were in implementing the project.

Concluding Thoughts and Significance of Study

Implementing a consortium project through the U.S.-Brazil Program is not a

profit earning strategy for the institutions or the individual participants. It is not a way

for a project director to take a vacation abroad. It is not easy. It is, however, beneficial to

the professional development of faculty, staff, and administrators; the academic, personal,

and professional development of students; and it enhances the international profile and

international offerings of the partner institutions.

Challenges are inherent in any collaborative undertaking and they were present in

the US-Brazil Program. This study makes obvious the challenges posed to junior faculty

or to project directors of any rank working alone in the program and highlights the

effective strategies the project directors used to overcome or avoid those challenges. It is

important to research issues of implementation and collaboration in international higher

education initiatives because these challenges and strategies need to be emphasized in

order to facilitate successful partnerships. This study offers the type of knowledge

needed surrounding those challenges and strategies. It is particularly relevant to the international higher education community because it focuses on the project director rather than student perspective, addresses implementation factors rather than discipline-specific matters or student outcomes, and directly impacts an institution's ability to conceptualize and implement international collaborative initiatives.

Appendix A. Terminology

Academic personnel – refers to faculty, staff, and administrators at institutions of higher education.

Bilateral – refers jointly to the governments of Brazil and the United States.

Bilateral agreement – refers to the contractual partnership between Brazil and the United States.

Bilateral curriculum development – refers to curriculum materials jointly created by all partners of a U.S.-Brazil consortium project.

Bilateral initiative – refers to the FIPSE-CAPES program.

Consortium – refers to the grouping of two American and two Brazilian institutions for funded by the FIPSE-CAPES grant.

Consortium partner – refers to any of the institutions within the institutional consortium project.

Consortium project – refers to the academic theme and accompanying activities that are developed during the grant period.

Government personnel – refers to the staff of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education and of the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Ensino Superior/Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel.

Institutional partners – refers to the institutions within the consortium and the faculty, staff, and administrators responsible for the administration of the grant.

Memo of understanding – refers to the formal document agreed upon by all parties, either

   both national governments or all institutions in a consortium that sets for the

   nature, activities, and guidelines of the partnership.

National partners – refers to the American or Brazilian governments that funding the U.S.

   Brazil Program and the staff of those governments who are responsible for the

   administration of the grant

Participant – refers to either the academic or government personnel involved in the U.S.-

   Brazil Program

Partner – refers to either the American or Brazilian counterpart in the U.S.-Brazil

   Program whether at the national or institutional level.

Appendix B   Sample English Letter of Invitation

Sample English Letter of Invitation
Sent via e-mail Summer 2007

Dear…:

I hope you have been well since we met in December at the U.S.–Brazil Project Directors Meeting in São Paulo. If you recall, I was there collecting information to assist me in the development of a study for my dissertation research. Today, I am writing to invite you to participate in that study as a project director of the consortium project *Social and Economic Development Project* between American Lead University, Brazilian Lead University, American Secondary University, and Brazilian Secondary University. I have selected this consortium for the study because it is ending its funding cycle, allowing for a comprehensive perspective of the implementation process and the feasibility of my conducting research in the location of partners.

I've selected this consortium for the following reasons:

1. It was recommended as a reliable and rich source of information for the study, 2. Its funding cycle is coming to an end, which will allow for a comprehensive and immediate reflection on the collaborative activities, and 3. Its institutional composition is likely to provide a diversity of perspectives.

Study Purpose

As a result of my experience at the Project Directors meeting and consultation with my committee chair, my dissertation focus has developed into an analysis of the collaboration and implementation processes of the US-Brazil program. I've attached a one-page overview of the study purpose for your review.

Participants

I am interested in including in the study the project directors from each of the four institutions in the consortium, any key faculty or institutional staff that had a substantial role in the creation and implementation of the consortium activities as well as representatives from CAPES and FIPSE.

Data collection timeline

With the consent of the participants, I would like to collect data in Brazil during October and in the United States during November of this year. In the case American Secondary

Institution, if convenient for the participants and feasible with my research budget, I may be able to schedule interviews during the 2007 U.S.-Brazil Project Directors meeting.

Please let me know if you have any questions about the study and if you feel that you will participate. I would also greatly appreciate if you would let me know that you have received this message.

Sincerely,

Leslie A. Bozeman

Appendix C   Sample Portuguese Letter of Invitation
Sent via e-mail Summer 2007

Prezado Professor...:

Espero que senhor tenha estado bem desde que nos conhecemos na reunião do Programa Brasil-Estados Unidos em dezembro de 2006. Se o senhoro lembrar, eu estive na reunião coletando informações para agregá-las a minha tese. Escrevo para pedir a participação do consórcio Projeto de Desenvolvimento Social e Economica como o foco do meu estudo, e especificamente a sua participação.

Selecionei este consórcio porque: 1º - Foi recomendado como uma boa fonte de informação, 2º - A sua vigência está encerrando, o que provem uma reflexão compreensiva e recente das atividades colaborativas, e 3º - Sua composição institucional faz possível à provisão de uma diversidade de perspectivas sobre essas atividades.

Propósito do estudo

Da minha experiência na reunião em São Paulo e de consultas com o meu orientador resultaram uma reconsideração das minhas idéias para o estudo. O estudo tem como objetivo analisar a experiência governamental e institucional na implementação do Programa Brasil-Estados Unidos. Um documento de uma pagina descrevendo o propósito do estudo esta anexado.

Participantes

Eu gostaria de incluir no estudo os diretores de projeto das quatro instituições do consórcio, outros professores, administradores, ou pessoal que teve um papel significativo na criação e na implementação das atividades colaborativas, tanto como representantes do CAPES e FIPSE.

Cronograma tentativo de coleta de dados

Com o consentimento dos participantes e de acordo com os horários deles, gostaria de coletar dados em outubro e novembro deste ano. Primeiramente coletaria os dados no Brasil.

Coloco-me à sua disposição para quaisquer informações consideradas necessárias. Por favor, entre em contato para informar se o consórcio participará no estudo. Gostaria que confirmasse o recebimento desta mensagem.

Cordialmente, Leslie A. Bozeman

Boston College
Department of Educational Administration and Higher Education
Informed Consent (Adult) for Participation as a Subject in
"Implementation and Collaboration:
A case study of the U.S.-Brazil Higher Education Consortium Program"
Leslie A. Bozeman, Ph.D. Candidate and Principal Investigator
July 11, 2007

Introduction
I am inviting you to participate in a qualitative research study of government and academic personnel involved in the U.S.-Brazil Higher Education Consortia Program. I have selected you as a possible participant because of your role as government or academic personnel in the U.S.-Brazil Program. I kindly request that you read this form and ask any questions that you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

Purpose of Study:
The purpose of this study is to describe the experience of key actors in the U.S.-Brazil Higher Education Consortia Program, government and academic personnel from both countries, as they collaborate to foster the exchange of students and faculty within the context of bilateral curricular development. The study seeks to illustrate how the collaborative process and implementation of the U.S.-Brazil Program is experienced at both the national and institutional level, what similarities and differences are detected between the national partners, and what information can be learned from these experiences that will be useful to the continued implementation of the program and possibly applied to similar binational programs in higher education. This research will focus on the perceptions and ideas of the American and Brazilian partners at both levels regarding program goals, implementation process, outcomes, and success. This study will include representatives from the United States Department of Education's Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), the Brazilian Ministry of Education's Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Ensino Superior/Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES), and one consortium that has completed its funding cycle.

Study Procedures:
If you agree to be in this study, I will ask the following of you: to participate in an interview that will last 45 minutes to one hour, provide me with access to program materials such as memos of understanding, provide me with access to the site in which consortium activities took place, agree to answer post-interview follow-up questions via e-mail or phone, and participate in a follow-up interview if one is needed. With your permission, I will audio-tape the interview.

Study Risks
There are no reasonable foreseeable or expected physical or emotional risks from participating in this study. There is minimal risk of identity disclosure, however this will be mitigated by the use of pseudonyms and careful attention to the storage of data.

Study Benefits
In addition to contributing to academic knowledge in the area of international higher education, expected benefits of being in this study include the acquisition of information and insight that will assist in your capacity and the capacity of your institution to implement collaborative international collaborations.

Costs
There will be no monetary costs associated with this study. However, your time and intellectual energy will be of great importance.

Compensation
You will not receive any monetary compensation for your participation.

Confidentiality
The records of this study will be kept private. Participant names and names of institutions will be changed. Research records will be kept in password protected electronic files and in a secure Boston College office. As the principle investigator, I will be the only person with access to data and records you provide to inform the study; however, please note that regulatory agencies, and the Boston College Institutional Review Board and internal Boston College auditors may review these materials.

Voluntary Participation/Withdrawal:
Your participation is voluntary. If you choose not to participate, it will not affect your current or future relations with Boston College. If you do agree to participate in the study, you are free to withdraw at any time, for whatever reason. There is no penalty or loss of benefits for not taking part or for stopping your participation.

Questions and Contact Information
For questions or more information concerning this research before, during, or after the study you may contact the principal investigator, Leslie A. Bozeman, at

bozemanl@bc.edu. or 617-825-2652 (h). You may also contact my dissertation chair, Dr. Philip Altbach, at 617-552-4236 (w) or altbach@bc.edu.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, you may contact: Director, Office for Human Research Participant Protection, Boston College at (617) 552-4778, or irb@bc.edu.

Copy of Consent Form:
You will be given a copy of this form to keep for your records and future reference.

Statement of Consent:
If you agree with the following statements, please sign below:
1. I have read this consent form and understand the purpose of the study to be conducted and what is being asked of me as a participant.
2. I have been encouraged to ask questions and, if asked, I have received answers to my questions.
3. I have received (or will receive) a copy of this form.
4. I voluntarily consent to participate in this study.

Signature_____**Date**_____

Termo de consentimento
Implementação e colaboração:
O caso do Programa de Consórcios em Educação Superior Brasil - Estados Unidos
Leslie A. Bozeman, Candidata de doutorado
Departamento de Administração em Ensino Superior
Boston College, USA

Introdução
Lhe convido a participar num estudo sobre o pessoal governamental e acadêmico do Programa de Consórcios em Educação Superior Brasil - Estados Unidos. O senhor; a senhora foi seleccionado como possivel participante por cuasa do seu papel no Programa Brasil-Estados Unidos. Por gentileza, lea este documento e faça quaisquer perguntas antes de dar seu consentimento de participar no estudo.

Propósito
O proposito deste estudo e descrever a experiência de colaboração e implementação dos agentes principais do Programa Consórcios em Educação Superior Brasil-Estados Unidos. Estes agentes, pessoal governamental e acadêmico no Brasil e nos EUA, tem trabalhado em cooperação a fim de promover o intercâmbio de estudantes e professores e desenvolver projetos de curriculo em varios cursos. O estudo visa a ilustrar como os processos de colaboração e de implementação do Programa Brasil-Estados Unidos são vivenciados no âmbito nacional e institucional, quais semelhanças ou diferenças são observadas entre as experiências dos agentes americanos e dos brasileiros, e que podemos aprender das experiências que pode ser útil para a continuação da implementação do programa. Esta pesquisa têm como foco as percepções e idéais dos parceiros americanos e brasileiros sobre as metas e resultados do programa, os processos de colaboração e implementação e as expectativas do sucesso do programa. A reflexão sobre estes assuntos pode orientar a avaliação do Programa Brasil-Estados Unidos e guiar o soporte e auxilio das agencias governamentais assim como as institucionais de educação superior que participam no programa. Também pode informar e facilitar os esforços da comunidade de educação superior internacional a teorizar, implementar e patrocinar oportunidades relevantes para estudantes de graduação e pos-graduação. Este estudo é relevante porque têm o potencial demostrar a eficácia do modelo do patrocinio bi-governamental no processo de facilitação da internacionalização universitaria.

Utilização

Este estudo é parte dos requisitos para a realização do doutorado em administração em educação superior de Boston College. Esta pesquisa será utilizada estritamente para finalidades acadêmicas.

Procedimentos

Com o seu consentimento, lhe pedirá o seguinte: participar numa entrevista de entre 45 minutos e uma hora, fornecer materias do programa como o memorando de entendimento, proposta de projeto, etc., permitir access ao lugar onde aconteceu as actividades do consórcio, proveer informação para clariar respostas da entrevista o dos documentos pelo e-mail ou telefone, e participar num segundo entrevista pelo telefone ou por meios electrônicos se for necessaria. Também, com seu consentimento, grabarei (audio só) a entrevista.

Riscos

Este estudo não tem riscos fisicos nem psicológicos previsíveis.

Proteção do anonimato

Não receberá proteção do anonimato. Por causa do contexto, se considera muito facil identificar os individuos e instituições que participarão no estudo. Por conseguinte, é importante entender que usarei o seu nome e titulo verdadeiro e o nome verdadeiro da sua instituição.

Beneficios

Além de contribuir para o conocimento acadêmica na area de educação superior internacional, beneficios esperadas de participar neste estudo inclue a adquisição da informação que possa capacitar o senhor/a senhora e a sua instituição a implementar e avaliar colaborações internacionais.

Costos

Não ha nemhum costo monetário para participar neste estudo, mas o estudo conta com a sua vontade de oferecer o seu tempo e energia intelectual.

Remuneração

Não receberá remuneração monetário.

Participação/Retirada

Sua particpação é completamente voluntario. Se decidir não participar, não afetará o seu relacionmento o a relacionamento da sua instituição com o Boston College. Se decidir participar, pode parar sua participação em qualquer momento, para qualquer razão.

Perguntas e dados de contato

Estou a sua disposição para quaisquer informaçoes consideradas necessarias. Pode entrar em contato comigo através do email bozemanl@bc.edu ou pode me telefonar em casa ao 617-825-2652.

Cópia do termo de consentimento

Receberá uma cópia deste documento para seus archivos.

Declaração de consentimento

Se estiver de acordo com o seguinte, favor de firmar abaixo:
1. Tenho lido este termo de consentimento, tenho entendido o propósito do estudo, e entendo o que é que preciso fazer como participante no estudo.
2. A pesquisadora recomendou que eu faço perguntas, e se eu as fiz, eu recebi as respostas.
3. Recebi (ou receberei) uma cópia deste termo de consentimento.
4. Eu consinto voluntariamente participar neste estudo.

Nome_____

Firma_____**Data**_____

Appendix F Interview Protocol

Government and Institutional Interview Protocol

1. In general, how is the partnership going?

2. In general, how would you describe a successful international collaboration?

3. What was successful about this collaboration?

4. What wasn't successful about the program?

5. Why was the partnership created?

6. What does international collaboration mean for you?

7. What are the benefits and challenges of international collaboration?

8. How would you describe the relationship between the American and Brazilian partners?

9. What were the most positive aspects of the partner relationship?

10. What difficulties did you experience that may have affected implementation and collaboration?

11. What lessons have you learned from implementing this program?

12. What influence do you feel language had on implementation and collaboration?

13. What external factors existed that may have affected implementation and collaboration?

14. What internal factors existed that may have affected implementation and collaboration?

15. How would you describe the administrative or bureaucratic processes under which the program operates?

16. What imbalances or inequalities existed between the government agencies/institutions that may have affected implementation and collaboration?

17. What changes occurred throughout the program that may have affected implementation and collaboration?

18. How do you feel national cultural affected the process of implementation and collaboration?

19. How do you feel institutional cultural affected the process of implementation and collaboration?

References

Ayoubi, R., & Al-Habaibeh, A. (2006). An investigation into international business

    collaboration in higher education organizations: A case study of international

    partnerships in four UK leading universities. *International Journal of Educational*

    Management, *20(*5), 380-396.

Beamish, P., & Berdrow, I. (2003). Learning from IJVs: The unintended outcome. *Long*

    Range Planning, 36, 285-303.

Beck, C. (1993). Qualitative research: The evaluation of its credibility, fittingness, and

    auditability. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*, *15*(2*),* 264-266

Beerkens, E., & Derwende, M. (2007). The paradox in international cooperation:

    Institutionally embedded universities in a global environment. *Higher Education,*

    53, 61-67.

Bennett, M. (1998). *Basic concepts of intercultural communication: Selected readings*

    Boston: Intercultural Press.

Bogdan, R.C., & Biklen, S.K. (1992). *Qualitative research for education : an*

    introduction to theory and methods. Boston : Allyn and Bacon

Brazil-US Council (2007). Brazil-US trade investment overview. Retrieved August 28,

    2007 from: http://www.brazilcouncil.org/displayContent.asp?

    keyword=BrazilUSTradeInvestmentOverview

223

Brouthers, K.D., Brouthers, L.E., & Wilkinson, T.J. (1995). Strategic Alliances: Choose your partners. *Long Range Planning, 28*(3), 18-25.

Buckley, P.J. (1992). *Studies in international business.* London: Macmillan.

Buckley, P., Glaister, K., & Husan, R. (2002). International joint ventures: Partnering skills and cross-cultural issues. *Long Range Planning, 35*,113-134.

Canto, I., & Hannah, J. (2001). A partnership of equals? Academic collaboration between the United Kingdom and Brazil. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *5*(1), 26-41.

Cardoso, F. (2006). *The accidental president of Brazil: A memoir*. New York: Public Affairs.

Chan, W. (2004). International cooperation in higher education: Theory and practice. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, *8*(1), 32-55.

Cherry, A. L., Jr. (2000). *A research primer*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thompson.

Choi, C., & Beamish, P. (2004). Split management control and international joint venture performance. *Journal of International Business Studies, 34*, 202-215.

Creswell, L. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions.* Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Culpan, R. (2002). *Global business alliances*. Quorum Books: Westport, CT.

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

Davies, D., & Dodd, J. (2002). Pearls, pith, and provocation: Qualitative research and the question of rigor. *Qualitative Health Research*, *12*(2), 279-289.

de Wit, H. (2004). Academic alliances and networks: A new internationalization strategy

    in response to the globalization of our societies. In D. Teather, *Consortia*

    International Networking Alliances of Universities (pp. 28-48). Carlton, Victoria:

    Melbourne University Press.

Denman, B. D. (2002) Globalization and the emergence of international consortia in

    higher education. Retrieved on January 3, 2007 from

    http://globalization.icaap.org/content/v2.1/05_denman.html

Denman, B. D. (2004). Gestalt revisited: Spin-offs and assessment in international

    university co-operation. *Higher Education Management and Policy*, *16*(1), 65-82.

Devon, R., & Wayne, H. (1998). Student outcomes of international collaboration. Paper

    presented at the International Conference for Engineering Education in Rio de

    Janeiro, Brazil.

Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. (2005). Spotlight on FIPSE

    [Brochure]. Retrieved on June 2 from http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/

    ope/fipse/spotlight.pdf

Glaister, K., & Buckley, P. (1996). Strategic motives for international alliance formation.

    Journal of Management Studies, *33*(3), 301-332.

Godbey, G., & Turlington, B. (2002). A collaborative approach to international

    programs. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *120*, 89-98

Goerzen, A., & Beamish, P. (2005). The effect of network diversity on multinational

    enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal, 26*, 333-354.

Harrigan, K. (1985). *Strategies for joint ventures*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Harrigan, K. (1987). Strategic alliances: Their new role in global competition. *Columbia Journal of World Business, Summer*, 67-69.

Hirst, M. (2005). *The United States and Brazil: A long road of unmet expectations*. New York: Routledge

Heffernan, T., & Poole, D. (2005). In search of "the vibe": Creating effective international education partnerships. *Higher Education*, *50*, 22-25.

Hodder, I. (1994). The interpretation of documents and material culture. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 393-402), Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.

Huberman & Miles. (1994). Data management and analysis methods. In N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln, *The handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 428-444) SAGE Publications: Thousand Oaks.

Institute of International Education (2008). Open doors report: Source of funds Retrieved on January 20 from http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/?p=25183

Johnson, J.L., Cullen, J.B., Sakano, T., & Takenouchi, H. (1996). Setting the stage for trust and strategic integration in Japanese-US cooperative alliances. *Journal of International Business Studies, 27*(5), 981-1004.

Kearney, M. (1992). Managing international cooperation in higher education. Unpublished Proceedings of the 3rd UNESCO-NGO Collective Consultation on Higher Education, Paris.

Kumar, R., & Nti, K. (2004). National cultural values and the evolution of process and
outcome discrepancies in international strategic alliances. *Journal of Applied
Behavioral Science*, *40*(3), 344-361.

Lane, H., & Beamish, P. (1990). Cross-cultural cooperative behavior in joint ventures in
LDCs, *Management International Review, 30*, 87-102.

May, K. (1989). Interview techniques in qualitative research: In Janice M. Morse (Ed.)
Qualitative Nursing Research: A contemporary dialogue. Rockville, MD:
Aspen Publishers.

Merriam, S. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach.* San
Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. (1997). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San
Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Morse, J., & Richards. L. (2002). *ReadMe first for a user's guide to qualitative methods.*
Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Morse, J. (1989). Strategies for sampling. In Janice M. Morse (Ed.) *Qualitative Nursing
Research: A contemporary dialogue*. Rockville: MD.

Naveiro, R., & Young, R. (2006). Anais da 6ª reunião conjunto do programa
CAPES/FIPES, Conference Proceedings 6th annual meeting of the CAPES/FIPSE
Program. São Paulo, 2006.

Neave, G. (1992). On the contemplation of circumstances and cases: Issues for higher
education in the management of international cooperation. Unpublished

Proceedings of the 3rd UNESCO-NGO Collective Consultation on Higher Education, Paris.

O'meara, P., Mehlinger, H.D., & Newman, R.M. (2001). *Changing perspectives on international education.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods* 3rd. Ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Reilly, T. 2001. Collaboration in action: An uncertain process. *Administration in Social Work, 25*(1), 53- 74.

Saffu, K., & Mamman, A. (1999). Mechanics, problems, and contributions of tertiary strategic alliances: The case of 22 Australian universities. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, *13*(6), 281-286.

Saffu K., & Mamman, A. (2000). Contradictions in international tertiary strategic alliances: The case from down under. *The International Journal of Public Sector Management, 13*(6), 508-518.

Sandelowski, M. (2000). What ever happened to qualitative description. *Research in Nursing & Health*, *23*, 334-340.

Schott, J.J. (2003). U.S.-Brazil trade relations in a new era. Unpublished manuscript, Institute for International Economics.

Silva, M. (2007). Brazil as an outsourcing destination. SourcingMag. Retrieved on-line on August 28, 2007 from http://www.sourcingmag.com/content/c060201a.asp

Storti, C. (1997). Culture matters: The peace corps cultural workbook. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office

Strauss, A. (1987). *Qualitative analysis for social scientists*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory Approaches and techniques*: Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

The Times Higher Education (2009). Retrieved on January 5, 2009 from http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/hybrid.asp?typeCode =142&pubCode=1&navcode=105

United States Census Bureau (20007). Ancestry 2000: Census 2000 brief. Retrieved August 28, 2007 from http://www.census.gov/prod/2004pubs/c2kbr-35.pdf

Webb, C. (2003). Editor's note: Introduction to guidelines on reporting qualitative research. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *42*(June), 544-545.

Wilson, M. (2003). South-North development partnership: Lessons from a Nicaragua-Canada experience. In L. Healy, Y. Asamoah, & M.C. Hokenstad (Eds.) *Models of International Collaboration in Social Work Education.* Alexandria, VA: Council on Social Work Education.

Yin, R. K. (1984). Case study research: Design and method. *Applied social research methods series, vol. 5*. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE