

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF A
CONTEXTUALISED SET OF EVALUATION
CRITERIA FOR STUDYING
INTERNATIONALISATION AT A VIETNAMESE
PUBLIC UNIVERSITY**

**A dissertation presented in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of**

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Education

at Massey University, Manawatū, New Zealand

NGUYEN THI HONG NHUNG

2018

ABSTRACT

The aim of this thesis is to explore the development of a contextualised set of evaluation criteria for studying internationalisation at a Vietnamese public university. The literature on internationalisation has so far paid little attention to Vietnam, a context which is at an early stage in conceptualising a plan for its internationalisation. This thesis, therefore, will assist Vietnamese universities in this effort in order to become a part of the global higher education system. Having access to a set of relevant evaluation criteria will not only enable them to better understand their current level of internationalisation but also inform their future internationalisation strategy.

The research process was supported by two conceptual frameworks: practical participation evaluation and utilization-focused evaluation approaches. A mixture of qualitative and quantitative research methods was employed to conduct the three-phase development of the contextualised set of evaluation criteria. A collaborative partnership was also developed with the institutional stakeholders from a key university for which the set of criteria was contextualised for evaluating the internationalisation process.

The findings from this study indicated that the development of a contextualised set of evaluation criteria for internationalisation at a Vietnamese public university was informed by a complexity of contextual factors. In particular, the domestic-focused nature of institutional internationalisation was found to be shaped not only by national economic and political rationales but also the institutional structure of single focus on teaching. The complexity was further expanded to (national) cultural relevance, institutional purposes for the evaluation, and the institutional mono-disciplinary structure when it came to the evaluation of that internationalisation. As a result of the study, a modelling process for developing a contextualised set of criteria for internationalisation at Vietnamese public universities was established.

Insights into the complexity of the process for contextualising a set of evaluation criteria to study internationalisation at a Vietnam university also led to implications and recommendations for institutional stakeholders at the key university in the study (policy implementers and senior leaders), other universities, and policy makers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my gratitude to the Vietnamese public universities and their staff who agreed to enthusiastically participate in this research by sharing their knowledge, experience, and concern about their institutional internationalisation effort. Without their contribution, our understanding of internationalisation at Vietnamese public universities would have been less insightful.

I also wish to express my sincere appreciation to my research supervisors, Associate Professor Penny Haworth and Professor James Chapman. They have been a constant source of important critique and support, patiently reading all my rough writings and answering my questions while offering thoughtful and clear guidance. Without your tireless support, this research would not have been completed with such an insightful and rich knowledge for the internationalisation of Vietnamese higher education. The time of working with you both have also been valuable to me in that I kept realising how much I have been moving up in the academic escalator.

I also wish to thank the staff of the Institute of Education, the librarians for their timely and enthusiastic assistance throughout the study. My sincere acknowledgement also goes to Sarojinie Fernando and Natcha Mah for their sincere and helpful coaching me on SPSS software. Their support has been valuable in helping my study go on smoothly. This journey has also been enriched by my fellow doctoral colleagues from Thailand, India, Malaysia, Indonesia, and Tanzania. You have been a great network of support and friendship.

To my husband, Minh and my two kids, Tom and Na, I truly appreciate the constant love, support, understanding, time and space you have given me to complete this work.

I am also thankful to my mother and my extended family for their continuous support and encouragement during this long journey.

Finally, I am indebted to the Program 165 of Vietnamese government for granting me a full-time doctoral scholarship, making it possible for me to complete my PhD studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
LIST OF APPENDICES	xiii
LIST OF FIGURES	xiv
LIST OF TABLES	xvi
Chapter One INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. Introduction.....	1
1.2. The context of Vietnamese higher education	2
1.2.1. Influences of foreign education models	2
<i>Historical influences of foreign models</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Contemporary issues of the Soviet model</i>	<i>4</i>
1.2.2. National reform of higher education towards international standards	5
1.2.3. Globalisation pressure on Vietnamese higher education	6
1.3. Rationale and significance of the study	7
1.4. Overview of the Thesis	8
Chapter Two LITERATURE REVIEW.....	11
2.1. Introduction.....	11
2.2. Definitions of internationalisation in higher education	11
2.3. Globalisation and national/local contexts in internationalisation of higher education	15
2.4. Internationalisation of higher education trends in different contexts	19
2.4.1. Comprehensive internationalisation with globally oriented higher education in U.S.....	19
2.4.2. Internationalisation and regionalisation of higher education in Europe	22
2.4.3. Internationalisation versus Westernisation of higher education in Asia	24
<i>Internationalisation in Japan: Strengthening national identity.....</i>	<i>25</i>
<i>Internationalisation in China: Promoting influence.....</i>	<i>27</i>

2.4.4. Internationalisation of higher education in Vietnam	30
2.5. Review of evaluation tools for institutional internationalisation.....	33
2.5.1. Selection of evaluation tools for studying institutional internationalisation	33
2.5.2. Overview of selected existing evaluation tools for studying institutional internationalisation	34
2.5.3. Dimensions and criteria for evaluating institutional internationalisation	38
<i>Institutional commitment</i>	38
<i>Management</i>	40
<i>Administrative structure</i>	41
<i>Financial matters</i>	41
<i>Services and facilities</i>	42
<i>Research</i>	43
<i>Education programs</i>	43
<i>Academic staff</i>	47
<i>Students</i>	48
2.5.4. Considerations in the development process of evaluation tools	48
<i>Different contextual priorities for internationalisation</i>	49
<i>Involvement of stakeholders in developing evaluation tools</i>	51
<i>Purposes for evaluating institutional internationalisation</i>	53
<i>Development approaches of evaluation tools for internationalisation</i>	54
2.6. Chapter summary.....	56
Chapter Three RESEARCH PROCEDURE AND METHODOLOGY	59
3.1. Introduction	59
3.2. Identifying appropriate aspects of evaluation approaches.....	59
3.2.1. Practical participatory evaluation approach.....	60
3.2.2. Utilization-focused evaluation approach	63
3.3. Research design	65
3.3.1. Quantitative research design.....	66

3.3.2. Qualitative research design	66
3.4. Research procedure.....	67
3.5. The research settings.....	70
3.5.1. Selecting the key university	70
3.5.2. Description of the key university	71
3.5.3. Selection of two supplementary universities.....	73
3.6. Research participants	74
3.6.1. Identifying research participants	74
<i>Participants from the key university</i>	74
<i>Participants from the two supplementary universities</i>	77
3.6.2. Research participants in Phase One	77
<i>Recruitment of representatives of the senior leaders</i>	77
<i>Recruitment of the representatives of the policy implementers</i>	79
3.6.3. Research participants in Phase Two.....	80
3.6.4. Research participants in Phase Three.....	81
<i>Research participants from the key university</i>	82
<i>Research participants from the two supplementary universities</i>	82
3.7. Data collection tools	82
3.7.1. Data collection tools in Phase One	83
<i>Document analysis</i>	83
<i>The semi-structured interviews</i>	84
<i>Questionnaire</i>	86
3.7.2. Data collection tools in Phase Two	89
<i>Document analysis</i>	89
<i>Focus groups</i>	90
3.7.3. Data collection tools in Phase Three	91
<i>Questionnaire</i>	92
<i>Focus groups</i>	93

3.8. Data analysis.....	94
3.8.1. Analysis of qualitative data	95
<i>Analysis of Phase One university documents</i>	95
<i>Analysis of Phase One interviews</i>	96
<i>Analysis of Phase Two documents</i>	96
<i>Analysis of Phase Two and Phase Three focus groups</i>	97
3.8.2. Analysis of quantitative data	98
<i>Analysis of Phase One questionnaire</i>	98
<i>Analysis of Phase Three questionnaire</i>	99
3.9. Role of researcher.....	99
3.9.1. In Phase One.....	99
3.9.2. In Phase Two	100
3.9.3. In Phase Three	100
3.10. Ethical considerations.....	101
3.10.1. Informed and voluntary consent	102
3.10.2. Confidentiality	103
3.11. Summary.....	103
Chapter Four PHASE ONE FINDINGS	105
4.1. Introduction	105
4.2. Demographic information of the policy implementers.....	105
4.3. Interpretations of internationalisation at the key university	105
4.3.1. Internationalisation means increasing domestic students’ knowledge levels	107
4.3.2. Internationalisation means improving professional competence of domestic staff ..	107
4.3.3. Internationalisation means international integration with attention to cultural identity	108
4.4. Position of internationalisation in institutional development.....	109
4.5. Organisational support for internationalisation	111
4.5.1. Coordination of internationalisation practices.....	111

4.5.2. Administrative support system.....	112
<i>Administrative support in international cooperation</i>	112
<i>Professional performance issues of the administrative staff</i>	114
4.5.3. Financial and infrastructure support.....	114
<i>Financial support</i>	114
<i>Infrastructure support</i>	116
4.6. The implementation of internationalisation in various dimensions at the key university	116
4.6.1. Education programs	116
<i>Domestic education programs</i>	117
<i>International joint programs</i>	119
4.6.2. Research.....	120
<i>Improving domestic research</i>	120
<i>International cooperation in research</i>	121
4.6.3. Academic staff	122
<i>Improving higher qualifications of academic staff</i>	122
<i>International experience for academic staff</i>	123
4.6.4. International teachers/experts	124
4.6.5. Students.....	125
<i>Domestic students</i>	126
<i>International students</i>	127
4.7. Chapter Summary	128
Chapter Five PHASE TWO FINDINGS	131
5.1. Introduction.....	131
5.2. Brief on discussion process of focus groups at the key university	131
5.3. Considerations for different evaluation dimensions at the key university	133
5.3.1. Institutional commitment to internationalisation	133
5.3.2. Management for internationalisation	134

5.3.3. Education programs	135
5.3.4. Research	136
5.3.5. Academic staff.....	138
5.3.6. Students	140
5.3.7. Administrative support system	140
5.3.8. Financial and infrastructure support	142
5.3.9. International cooperation.....	143
5.4. Chapter summary.....	144
Chapter Six PHASE THREE FINDINGS	147
6.1. Introduction	147
6.2. General context of internationalisation at two supplementary universities.....	147
6.3. Responses to internationalisation evaluation criteria from three universities	150
6.3.1. Institutional commitment to internationalisation.....	150
6.3.2. Management for internationalisation.....	152
6.3.3. Education programs	154
6.3.4. Research	159
6.3.5. Staff development.....	160
6.3.6. International teachers/experts	163
6.3.7. Students	164
6.3.8. Support systems.....	166
6.4. Relevance of evaluation criteria to study internationalisation at the key university	169
6.4.1. Education programs.....	170
6.4.2. Staff development.....	174
6.4.3. Students	177
6.5. Chapter summary.....	178
Chapter Seven DISCUSSION	183
7.1. Introduction	183

7.2. The domestic-focused nature of internationalisation at the key university	183
7.2.1. The evolution of internationalisation as a reform of domestic factors.....	184
<i>National context as the driver for the ‘reforming’ internationalisation</i>	<i>184</i>
<i>Lack of guiding policies for institutional internationalisation.....</i>	<i>186</i>
<i>Limited financial and organisational support for internationalisation</i>	<i>187</i>
7.2.2. Implementation of internationalisation with an emphasis on domestic factors	189
<i>Focus on domestic factors in internationalising education programs.....</i>	<i>189</i>
<i>Limiting internationalisation to domestic academic staff.....</i>	<i>191</i>
<i>Focus on domestic research competence in internationalising research</i>	<i>195</i>
7.3. Contextual factors in developing the framework for evaluating internationalisation at the key university	198
7.3.1. Institutional priorities for domestic-focused internationalisation	199
7.3.2. Institutional purposes in evaluating internationalisation.....	200
7.4. Institutional and (national) cultural relevance of criteria for evaluating internationalisation at the key university	202
7.4.1. Relevance to the institutional mono-disciplinary structure.....	203
7.4.2. Relevance to the national culture	205
7.4.3. The influence of national and institutional factors in determining trajectories of internationalisation at the key university	205
7.5. Reflecting on the development process of a contextualised set of evaluation criteria for internationalisation at Vietnamese public universities.....	207
7.6. Chapter summary.....	210
Chapter Eight CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	213
8.1. Introduction.....	213
8.2. The study revisited.....	213
8.3. Implications for theory.....	215
8.3.1. An initial stage of domestic-focused internationalisation in higher education	215
8.3.2. Extending <i>glonacal</i> theory by adding institutional factors in evaluating institutional internationalisation.....	216

8.3.3. The importance of institutional relevance in evaluating institutional internationalisation	217
8.3.4. Cultural relevance in evaluating institutional internationalisation	217
8.4. Implications for methodology	218
8.5. Implications for practice and policy	218
8.5.1. Implications and recommendations for the policy implementers	219
8.5.2. Implications and recommendations for the senior leaders.....	220
8.5.3. Implications and recommendations for universities	221
8.5.4. Implications and recommendations for policymakers	222
8.6. Limitations of the study.....	223
8.7. Suggestions for future research	224
8.8. Concluding remarks.....	226
BIBLIOGRAPHY	229
APPENDICES	251

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A: The research timeline for three phases of the study	251
Appendix B: Information sheet to the key university leader	252
Appendix C: Information sheet to the key university participants	254
Appendix D: Information sheet to the supplementary universities	256
Appendix E: Participant consent form at the key university (Interview)	258
Appendix F: Participant consent form at the key university (Focus group)	259
Appendix G: Transcript release authority (for interview at the key university)	260
Appendix H: Interview guiding questions with senior leaders at the key university (Phase One)	261
Appendix I: Questionnaire to the academics at the key university (Phase One)	264
Appendix J: Questionnaire to the administrators at the key university (Phase One)	268
Appendix K: Focus group guiding questions and agenda at the key university (Phase Two)	272
Appendix L: An initial analysis of a focus group (Phase Two)	274
Appendix M: Questionnaire at the three universities (Phase Three)	275
Appendix N: Focus group discussion guiding questions and agenda at the key university (Phase Three)	297

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3.1: Procedure of the research in terms of phases	69
Figure 3.2: Organisational chart of the key university (as in 2016 from university website)	72
Figure 3.3: Grid of power versus interest among potential stakeholders at the key university (adapted from Patton, 2008).....	75
Figure 4.1: Responses of Academics and Administrators on position of internationalisation in development strategy at institutional level.....	109
Figure 4.2: Responses of Academics and Administrators on position of internationalisation in development strategy at the unit level (Q3S2: This question is for Academics only).....	110
Figure 4.3: Views of Academics and Administrators on the organisational support to internationalisation at unit level	112
Figure 6.1: Availability of communication approaches for internationalisation at two supplementary universities (Q2- Background section)	148
Figure 6.2: Compelling reasons for implementing internationalisation at the three universities (Q2).....	151
Figure 6.3: Respondents' views regarding the availability financial sources for internationalisation (Q6)	153
Figure 6.4: Responses from three universities regarding academic levels and contexts in the internationalisation effort (Q10).....	154
Figure 6.5: Responses from the three universities on the available types of international joint programs (Q15).....	157
Figure 6.6: Responses from the three universities on the availability of practices for promoting internationalisation of research (Q20)	160
Figure 6.7: Difference in particular internationalisation practices available for academic staff at three universities (Q7.1).....	161
Figure 6.8: Difference in internationalisation practices available for administrative staff at three universities (Q7.2).....	162
Figure 6.9: Responses on the involvement of different types of international teachers/experts at three universities (Q9)	164
Figure 6.10: Responses on the availability of education programs for international students at three universities (Q22).....	165

Figure 6.11: Responses on the availability of support services for international students at three universities (Q23).....	166
Figure 6.12: Responses on the availability of financial and administrative support for domestic students' international practices (Q21.1 and Q21.2)	167
Figure 6.13: Responses on the contribution of international cooperation to the improvement of internationalisation practices at three universities (Q26)	168
Figure 7.1: The complexity of contextual factors in developing an evaluation of internationalisation at the key university	203
Figure 7.2: The model for developing a contextualised set of evaluation criteria for internationalisation at Vietnamese public universities.....	208

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Overview of selected existing tools for evaluating institutional internationalisation.....	37
Table 2.2: Framework of dimensions and key criteria in evaluating institutional internationalisation.....	38
Table 5.1: International evaluation dimensions verse internationalisation foci at the key university.....	132
Table 5.2: International evaluation dimensions vs institutional considerations in evaluating internationalisation at the key university.....	144
Table 6.1: Contextual changes in evaluation criteria for internationalisation at the key university after Phase Three.....	180