



the Autonomous Management School of  
Ghent University and Katholieke Universiteit Leuven

**Vlerick Leuven Gent Working Paper Series 2006/28**

**MORE MANAGEMENT CONCEPTS IN THE ACADEMY:  
INTERNATIONALIZATION AS AN ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE PROCESS**

YASAR KONDAKCI

HERMAN VAN DEN BROECK

Herman.VanDenBroeck@vlerick.be

GEERT DEVOS

Geert.Devos@vlerick.be

**MORE MANAGEMENT CONCEPTS IN THE ACADEMY:  
INTERNATIONALIZATION AS AN ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE PROCESS**

**YASAR KONDAKCI**

Middle East Technical University

**HERMAN VAN DEN BROECK**

Vlerick Leuven Gent Management School

**GEERT DEVOS**

Vlerick Leuven Gent Management School

**Contact:**

Herman Van den Broeck

Vlerick Leuven Gent Management School

Tel: +32 09 210 97 60

Fax: +32 09 210 97 57

Email: [Herman.VanDenBroeck@vlerick.be](mailto:Herman.VanDenBroeck@vlerick.be)

## **ABSTRACT**

The purpose of this paper is to elaborate on the internationalization process in higher education as an organizational level managerial issue. This approach brings a new perspective to internationalization in higher education. This is believed to be a necessary step toward filling a gap in the internationalization of higher education discussions. Nevertheless, the purpose of the study is not to falsify the dominant discussion in the literature. Rather, adopting the organizational change process conceptualization, this paper aims to fill a gap in the ongoing discussion on internationalization in the literature. To do this, the authors adopted the commonly accepted organizational change model of Burke and Litwin (1992) and made a comprehensive discussion on both transformational (external environment, mission and strategy, leadership, and organizational culture) and transactional (structure, task requirements and individual skills, individual needs and values, motivation, management practices, systems, climate) domains of the model from the perspective of internationalization in higher education. This approach is expected to clarify process, content, and context aspects of internationalization, which is essential for successful internationalization implementation.

## INTRODUCTION

There have been ongoing change and development efforts in higher education across the world. The prime motive of these change efforts is to effectively respond to the needs of societies ranging from developing and applying knowledge to developing skilled manpower necessary to create knowledge-based competitive economies. Change and development efforts cover different domains such as organizational structure, program structure, or even the management of these organizations. One unique issue is related to the *internationalization* of these organizations, which functions as an external force of change with implications on structural and functional configurations of higher education organizations (HEOs).

Internationalization is increasingly becoming a value for HEOs and it has increasingly gained the attention of scholars (Burn & Smuckler, 1995). Historically, by their very nature of producing universally valid knowledge, universities are accepted as international organizations (Kerr, 1990). However, the developments over the last 30 years have put internationalization on the top of HEOs' agendas. Hence, the need to understand internationalization has become a primary concern of scholars in recent years.

Several authors have elaborated on internationalization in detail (*e.g.*, Knight & de Wit, 1995; Huisman *et al.*, 1998; Knight, 1999; Yelland, 2000; Deem, 2001; Huisman *et al.*, 2001; Van der Wende, 2001). In general these studies focused on three basic perspectives: (1) the supranational level issue of higher education transformation, as in the case of the Bologna process, (2) the national level issue; in most cases the impact of supranational policies on the countries' national higher education systems, and (3) very rarely in the form of curricular issues, such as internationalizing content of courses or the impact of English teaching (Paseka, 2000). These comprehensive studies have contributed to our understanding of internationalization. These studies do rarely document the actions taken at organization level for implementing the internationalization process (IP).

Our study differs from the previous studies in its conceptual approach to internationalization on both the level of analysis (not only a population level issue but also individual organization level issues) and the mode of analysis (not only as a policy issue but also as a managerial issue). Concerning the first point, we hold the individual organization and not the industry (higher education landscape) as the unit of analysis. We tackle the issue of internationalization as an external force of change which has implications not only on the population of organizations but also on individual organizations. In other words, internationalization as a policy issue has become an important dynamic in shaping the higher

education landscape across the world. Nevertheless, we have been observing the implications of internationalization on the managerial processes of individual HEOs. In higher education literature internationalization has been discussed rarely from this perspective. Concerning the second point, we perceive internationalization as a managerial issue. In particular, we use organizational change (OC) conceptualization in order to understand the development and implementation of internationalization strategies in organizations. Evidently, as one of the external dynamics of change in the higher education landscape, internationalization brings along changes in managerial practices of HEOs. Hence, our concern is not to make another literature review on internationalization as a population level policy issue but rather to conceptualize the internationalization process (IP) as a change process within an individual HEO. For this purpose we have adapted the comprehensive OC model of Burke and Litwin (1992). We have not only elaborated on different dimensions of the model but have also reviewed conceptual and empirical work on internationalization pertaining to related dimensions of the model.

Analyzing the IP as an organization level issue by using the OC framework does not contradict the previous literature but rather fills a gap in the literature. The literature covers numerous population level policy discussions on the issue. There are a rather limited number of analyses at organization level, in contrast. Hence a comprehensive organizational level analysis is needed to document the implication of internationalization on structural-managerial configurations of the HEOs.

However, before elaborating on each dimension of the model, first, we make a brief review on the definition and rationales of internationalization, and approaches to internationalize. Secondly, we state our argumentation of why we need to consider internationalization as a managerial issue in general and an OC issue in particular.

### **Definition of internationalization**

The concept of internationalization is a relatively new concept. It has generally been associated with student mobility. Nevertheless, in the last 20 years it has broadened its meaning beyond the student mobility to cover teacher mobility, joint ventures, cross-national campuses, joint curriculum development, joint courses in face-to-meetings or in systems of distant learning and field courses abroad (Fortuijn, 2002). Callan (2000: 18) defined internationalization as a *“portmanteau concept which must be understood as functioning in several distinct domains with their accompanying discourses: spheres of policy, of process, of expression of educational value, and of social and occupational organization.”* Knight and de

Wit (1999: 3) defined internationalization in higher education as “*both concept and the process of integrating an international dimension into the teaching, research, and service functions.*” However, the most comprehensive working definition come from Knight (1994: in Knight, 1999: 16): “*internationalization of higher education is the process of integrating an international/intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution.*” Knight (1999) stated that this definition emancipates from the rationales of internationalization. Another comprehensive definition of internationalization was made in the Eurydice report (Eurydice, 2000: 157) where internationalization is defined as a broad concept “*comprising any activity in higher education extending beyond the national borders of any participating country. It comprises student and staff mobility, curriculum development and all strategies initiated by public authorities and institutions to adapt to, and benefit from, cross-border relations.*” Several other scholars have clarified the meaning of internationalization by differentiating it from related concepts. For example, several authors explicate the difference between internationalization and globalization (Knight, 1999; McBurnie, 2000; Denman, 2001). Globalization is the movement of technology, economy, knowledge, people, values, and ideas across countries which may have different impacts on each country due to a nations’ individual history, traditions, culture and priorities. In contrast, the internationalization of higher education is one of the several ways a country responds to the impact of globalization (Knight, 1999). As a result, internationalization and globalization are related but not the same concepts.

### **Rationales of internationalization**

Several authors have identified several rationales behind internationalization. Knight (1999) identified four basic interrelated categories of rationales. Political, economic, academic, and social rationales. Knight (1999) indicated that there has been an increasing integration among these categories. There are changes within each category as well. Considering the fact that there are different levels (national policy level, sectoral level, organizational levels, individual level), the rationales for internationalization may change according to these levels. *The political rationale* is more relevant to the national policy level. International education is perceived as a tool of strengthening the foreign policy with respect to international security and peace among the nations. Movement of students, teachers and researchers is believed to keep communication and diplomatic relations active. *The economic rationale* indicates that internationalization is a source of income for HEOs at organizational level (Callan, 2000; Knight & De Wit, 1995; Knight, 1999; Yelland, 2000) or contributing to

create competitive economies at national level (Denman, 2001). Internationalization is believed to enhance the competitive edge of the nations by contributing to the development of a skilled and knowledgeable workforce, and producing and applying knowledge. An important aspect is that HEOs are expected to produce a work force capable of functioning in an international work environment. The economic rationale is valid at organizational level as well. It is perceived as a source of income for HEOs. *The academic rationale* is relevant both for organization and individual levels. People in the campus develop an international understanding as a result of internationalization. It covers the movement of scholars and the international dimension of research. Internationalization is believed to help the organization to catch up with international standards in teaching and research. For individual academics internationalization may help to collate and disseminate good practices, to provide a forum for interaction between the practitioners, to develop joint curricula, to increase intercultural awareness, to set or promote teaching and assessment, and to create viable programs (Healey, 1998; Hay *et al.*, 2000; Shepherd *et al.*, 2000; Fortuijn, 2002). *The cultural and social rationales* are relevant at all levels. Internationalization facilitates respect and tolerance for other cultures and ethnicities and promotes international understanding (Knight & De Wit, 1995; Callan, 2000; Yelland, 2000). It refers to the preservation and promotion of national cultures, to respecting cultural diversity and to counterbalancing the perceived homogenizing affects of globalization. The same rationale is true for the students as well. Haigh (2002) wrote that foreign students provide local students with a window on the outside world, which enables them to act in other cultures.

### **Approaches to internationalization**

Several authors have advanced several approaches to internationalize (*e.g.*, Howe & Martin, 1998; Knight, 1999; McBurnie, 2000; Denman, 2001). These approaches reflect an open system understanding. In other words, these approaches reflect the idea that organizations exist in a dynamic environment and they need to respond effectively to the developments in their environment for their survival.

It is beyond the purpose of this study to present approaches to internationalization in detail. However, it is possible to draw two basic conclusions from these approaches. First, these approaches indicate that universities are pursuing multiple strategies to internationalize. This statement is compatible with arguments of other scholars on internationalization. Callan (2000: 18) defined internationalization “*as a portmanteau concept*” and argued that it is too “*fluid and inclusive in scope*” to be confined to a specific set of actions, programmes, or a

single model of strategic change. In other words, it provides an umbrella under which each organization may craft a unique approach to internationalize according to their own internal and external reality. Supranational frameworks, national education systems, social and occupational characteristics, and the dominant culture of education are some of the determinants of each HEO's situated understanding of internationalization. Considering the uniqueness of each organization and fluid character of internationalization, it is quite normal to be confronted with different approaches to internationalization. Howe and Martin's (1998) Abertay's Dundee Business School Case is a good example of situatedness on internationalization. They described the School's IP as an emergent process, as a product of reaction to individual circumstances rather than a carefully conceived and planned strategy. Another point in relation to the first conclusions is that each of these strategies is not mutually exclusive but interconnected, which indicates a major versus minor distinction among the strategies as such a school may devote a majority of its resources to attract foreign students but not to develop a joint venture with another HEO in another country.

Second, whatever strategy the school may pursue it is unavoidable to experience changes in management practices which fall in the domain of OC. Hence, regardless the particular strategy the HEO follows, it is unavoidable for that HEO to conduct changes in almost every domain of the organization. This makes the internationalization a process spreading across time and sub-domains rather than being a snapshot and confined to single-domain (Kondakçı, 2005). These two basic conclusions justify our perspective, which conceptualize the IP as an OC process at individual HEO.

Although there is a growing literature on the internationalization it is not comprehensive enough to guide the internationalization practices in HEOs. As a result, the majority of HEOs which are trying to build an international dimension to their teaching, research, and service functions try to accomplish this by experimenting, trial and error, imitation, and the like. We argue that perceiving internationalization as a managerial issue in HEO is a useful first step toward successfully developing an international dimension to the basic functions of HEOs.

### **Internationalization as a managerial issue**

Internationalization is a challenge of bringing diversity to the core activities of HEOs (Fortuijn, 2002). In one way or another it touches almost all the structural-functional domains of the organization. Bearing in mind the structural-functional implications of the IP is essential for successful implementation. In other words, it is not a single domain but a



multiple domain process, which covers various domains such as structure, leadership, human resources, organizational behavior, and finance. The overwhelming load of reorientation may result in stagnation at the beginning of the process with minor or no progress. Without strong organizational commitment to the process HEOs are likely to keep repeating the word “internationalization” in their formal documentation without real progress. It is a well known fact that many countries welcome internationalization in principle but resist to change (Kerr, 1990) and/or remains indifferent towards accomplishing the strategy (Paseka, 2000). The resistance in most cases can be observed at organization level as well.

We argue that internationalization is not simply an issue of managing *student mobility* but an issue of *strategic transformation of the HEOs*. Therefore, the efforts in the field need to turn into exploring the effects of internationalization at organization level and the ways of integrating an international dimension into teaching, research, and service functions of the institution (Callan, 2000). Several authors have advanced parallel arguments. Haigh (2002) suggested that allocating the necessary resources, ensuring sustainable investment, reconsidering the workloads, developing an incentive system, defining the target student body, and considering the loss results from the process are some of the points that need to be addressed by the internationalizing HEOs. Other authors argue that internationalization may require the utilization of the “*entrepreneurial university*” and business administration techniques like financial modeling, commissioned market research, and risk identification techniques (McBurnie, 2000: 65). Yelland (2000: 303) argued that the motto of “*universities must become business-like*” need to be understood in its very meaning because it implies the introduction of business processes into university management (*i.e.*, product development and market research, keeping cost down, customer services, quality control, and the like). These arguments to perceive the IP as a complex managerial issue is parallel to the arguments of several scholars who indicated the shift in the management practices in HEO from pure collegial practices into more business-like practices (*e.g.*, Neave & Van Vught 1991; Goedegebuure *et al.*, 1994). In this work, we narrow our argument down to discuss the IP as an OC issue.

### **Internationalization as an OC process**

These arguments prove that conceptualizing internationalization as a managerial issue and placing it in an OC framework is a necessary first step to bring an international dimension to the teaching, research, and service functions of the organization. The idea that internationalization is a change process has been anecdotally indicated by some authors.

Haigh (2002) indicated that internationalization requires a major institutional change at class, course, staff, department and university levels. Levin (2003) used the change categories of Levy and Merry (1986) in his analysis of the impact of economic globalization on higher education. Levy and Merry's (1986) categories of change can be grouped into four: (1) paradigmatic change, (2) mission and purpose change, (3) cultural change, and (4) change in functional processes (including structures, management, technology, decision-making, and communication patterns). Although there are slight deviances, these categories of change are compatible with Burke and Litwin (1992) model, which we suggest for understanding of IP as a change process.

Internationalizing HEOs have a tendency to relate the process to one single domain and/or unit, commonly to internationalizing the student body and/or the international office. However, internationalization is not simply an externally oriented strategy, but a strategy which has implications on internal arrangements of the organization. Taylor (2004) in his description of effective implementation of IP indicated that effective communication, the use of negotiated, agreed-upon targets that are fair but challenging, supporting mechanisms and resources allocation, identification of key bodies and individuals with specific responsibilities for implementation are the key principles of effective IP implementation. NASULGC report (NASULGC, 2004) also stated several principles of implementation an international process such as forming a change coalition, effective communication, keeping momentum of change, developing a sound human resource policy. In fact these principles are paraphrased versions of successful OC practices, which are defined in OC process models (e.g., Judson, 1991; Kotter, 1995; Galpin, 1996; Mento *et al.*, 2002; Whealan-Berry *et al.*, 2003).

The arguments indicated above clearly provide justification for analyzing the IP in HEOs as an OC process. What is less clear is the nature of this process. Scholars provide bilateral arguments on the nature of change processes. Some of the scholars have implicitly or explicitly suggested that the process is a transformational change process (e.g., Haigh, 2002; Levin, 2003; NASULGC, 2004), whereas some other scholars have indicated that the IP is an emergent (e.g., Howe & Martin, 1998), or ongoing process (e.g., Taylor, 2004). The recent conceptual discussions such as episodic versus continuous change discussion (Weick & Quinn, 1999), or theory O versus theory E discussion (Beer & Nohria, 2000) and empirical discussions (Kondakçı, 2005) suggest the tendency toward reconciliation rather than further detachment of these two perspectives. This trend toward reconciliation of these two conceptualizations is instrumental for the scholars investigating the IP from an OC perspective in a higher education context. Holding a single perspective in the analysis and

practice of an OC process is likely to yield the partial picture of the OC process (and as a result the IP). Hence, in real change practices it is likely to observe the features of continuous and episodic change.

### **Burke-Litwin's causal model of organizational performance and change**

Burke and Litwin (1992) model is one of the most comprehensive OC models. Three basic qualities of the model make it instrumental in understanding IP. First, unlike other models, this model covers both process and content of change. Second, it is a product of change practices in real OC settings. Third, it has been tested by several scholars again in real OC settings (Burke, 2002).

Several other qualities pertaining to both structure and content of the model make it an effective tool in analyzing and implementing IP. First, it incorporates the 7S model (strategy, structure, systems, style, staff, skills, and shared values), an approach which does not ignore any organizational domain affected by the OC process. It is our argument that internationalization is a major undertaking that may affect all of these organizational domains. Hence, the model is an effective tool in theoretical analyses and practical implementations of the IP. Second, the model does not only depict these organizational domains but also recognizes the interrelations among all of these domains. In other words, it takes into account the dynamic nature of the change implementation process. Third, the model incorporates an environmental dimension and explains how these seven dimensions are affected by the external environment. Fourth, it integrates (a) change process theory (the activities that must be undertaken to affect planned change (e.g., survey feedback), and (b) implementation theory (specific changes that need to occur as a consequence of implementation of these activities).

Being inspired by the leadership theory, Burke and Litwin (1992: 529) differentiated between *transformational* (external environment, mission and strategy, leadership, organizational culture) and *transactional domains* (structure, management practices, systems, climate, task requirements and individual skills/abilities, individual needs and values, motivation). The model indicates individual and organizational performance as the final domain which is connected with both transformational and transactional domains. We argue that the model is comprehensive enough to analyze IP as an OC process. On the one hand, it helps scholars and practitioners to consider the domains of internationalization. On the other hand, it also facilitates implementing the IP. In the rest of this work, we report both the extensive literature and our interpretation on each domain from the perspective of IP.

**External environment:** It has been one of the basic concerns of OC scholars to document both the external developments and the impact of these developments on the organizations. Burke and Litwin (1992) in their model indicated the external environment as the main source of change. This is parallel to the broader OC literature in that the external environment has been defined as the main source of change. The discussion in this domain has not only contributed to the development of the field but also to the broader organization science literature.

Several external forces of change for HEOs have been documented by the scholars. Globalization (Levin, 2003; Morey, 2004; Kezar, 2005); technology and communication technology (Moore, 1998; Kwiek, 2001; Morey, 2004); developments related to demography, such as demographics changes (Kitamura, 1997), diverse and changing population (Kezar, 2005), growth in demand for higher education (Kitamura, 1997; OECD/IMHE-HEFCE, 2004); new types of students (Moore, 1998; Kezar, 2005); developments related to governments of the countries such as governmental change (Curri, 2002), government policy (Taylor *et al.*, 1998; Kwiek, 2001; Levin, 2003), government funding (Levin, 2003); complex demands of the society and the broadening range of the stakeholders and their interests (Kwiek, 2001; OECD/IMHE-HEFCE, 2004); economic and financial developments such as developments in the global economy (Levin, 2003), world economic recession (Curri, 2002), and financial stress (OECD/IMHE-HEFCE, 2004; Kezar, 2005); developments in the higher education as a field of profession and practice such as new ideas on the intellectual or academic part of education (Moore, 1998), the developments within the profession (Levin, 2003); competition (OECD/IMHE-HEFCE, 2004; Kezar, 2005), or new provider of higher education (Kwiek, 2001). In our broad review of the external forces of change only Kwiek (2001) indicated internationalization as a force of change, which proves the need for further investigation of the topic.

Being a battleground between adaptation and ecology perspectives, the discussion of external forces of change enables the field of higher education to contribute to a major OC theory development. The population ecology perspective indicates that educational organizations are inert in that they fail to accomplish radical changes in strategy and structure in the face of the environmental pressures (Hannan & Freeman, 1977). Reliability and accountability have been advanced as two basic reasons for inertia (Hannan & Freeman, 1984). The institutionalization perspective, another perspective which implies the inertial nature of organizations (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983), complements this perspective in the sense that it suggests a tendency for legitimacy that pushes the organizations toward sameness

rather than differentiation, which, in the final analysis, means a narrow response variety of the organizations toward external developments. Both population ecology and institutional perspectives imply that educational organizations stick to traditional features rather than exhibiting varied responses in the face of external environmental pressures (Zajac & Kraatz, 1993). Contrary to this view, the adaptation view indicates that organizations are complex adaptive systems. In other words, according to this perspective organizations are flexible enough to reconfigure structural-functional designs, so that organizational performance will not suffer (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967).

Several scholars have considered this debate in their analysis of OC higher education setting (*e.g.*, Zajac & Kraatz, 1993; Gumpert, 2000; Stensaker & Norgård, 2001; Vaira, 2004). In these studies the authors, holding the distinction between ecology and adaptation, consider the forces simultaneously pushing for change, on the one hand, and curbing change, on the other. Zajac and Kraatz's (1993) "*diametric forces model*", Gumpert's (2000) "*economic exigencies*", Stensaker and Norgård's (2001) "*isomorphism versus adaptation*", and Vaira's (2004) "*organizational allomorphism*" discussions indicated the mutual existence of inertial and adaptive forces in the higher education industry. The common idea in all of these studies can be summarized as follow: HEOs are confronted with external forces pushing them to adaptive responses, which is believed to be necessary for survival purposes. Nevertheless, the concern of loosing legitimacy because of moving away from the traditional historical roles may curb these organizations to undertake major change. According to this idea the dilemma of protecting the heritage of higher education versus the need to respond to environmental forces is clear for HEOs. It is believed that this dilemma puts higher education in a unique period of time. HEOs may adapt some structural-functional aspects, on the one hand, and they may show common institutional patterns to avoid changes in their structural-functional domains, on the other (Vaira, 2004). Zajac and Kraatz (1993) in their empirical investigation of OC in higher education setting stated that HEOs are responsive rather than inertial. However, we still need more investigation on the inertia versus adaptation dilemma.

***Mission and strategy:*** Any major OC process is likely to have an impact on the mission and strategy of the organization. ***Mission*** refers to the explicit core purpose of the organization. As an external pressure, internationalization is likely to have an impact on the mission of the internationalizing HEO. More importantly internationalization may result in identity and mission confusion (Levin, 2003). Since their activity domain is expanding the HEOs need to reconsider their mission. Hence, linking the IP to the mission of the

organization is one of the essential steps in the successful implementation of IP (Taylor, 2004).

A comprehensive recent review on the mission change in higher education in relation to internationalization was made by Scott (2006). The author stated that the internationalization mission, which refers to servicing multiple nation states, is one of the outcomes of globalization and the postmodern society. The author indicated that the [postmodern] university is faced with the obligation of internationalizing its teaching, research, and public service missions. An international mission may conflict with the national one because of economic, political, or cultural differences. The internationalization mission, which brings along movement of information, faculty members, students, and curricular content ultimately trigger a change process in the structures and policies of the HEOs. The discussion on the internationalization mission by Scott (2006) refers to the abstract meaning of the concept which implies the aspirations attributed to the HEOs rather than concrete organizational goals articulated by individual organizations. However, the discussion of Scott (2006) is still valuable in the sense that it shows the basic lines of how to translate internationalization into a concrete *unity of purpose* for the individual HEO.

*Strategy* refers to the way the organization intends to accomplish the central purpose of the organization. Internationalization brings changes in the mission of the school. Subsequently the school's strategy is likely to change in order to accomplish the new mission. Taylor (2004) highlighted the need to develop more comprehensive strategies including research and teaching and many other domains of activity for a successful move toward internationalization. As we indicated above different scholars have indicated several different approaches (e.g., Howe & Martin, 1998; Knight, 1999; McBurnie, 2000; Denman, 2001), each of which describes different but concrete strategies to internationalize. In terms of major elements some of the HEOs pursue a strategy of internationalizing the student body while others pursue the strategy of internationalizing the faculty. In terms of core activities some of the HEOs pursue the strategy of internationalizing teaching while others pursue the strategy of internationalizing the service function. Since research is an international activity by its very nature for most of the HEOs it can be accepted as an implicit strategy contributing to internationalization.

*Leadership*: This is another transformational domain that needs to be considered in major change initiatives (Burke & Litwin, 1992). It is instrumental to bear in mind the distinction between episodic and continuous change (Weick & Quinn, 1999) in understanding the role of leadership in the IP. As a large scale, intentional and infrequent process the IP

refers to an episodic change process. The success of episodic change primarily depends on the capacity of the change agent to recognize the need of change, to craft a plan, and to implement this plan. Hence, leadership is a critical factor in successfully implementing the IP.

In OC initiatives, the leader may not always undertake the role of change agent. However, in most cases the leader plays an important role in the change coalition.

The NASULGC report (2004) is one of the most comprehensive texts on the role of leadership in IP. Although the report does not present them explicitly, we articulated nine concrete roles of leadership in the context of internationalization. First, typical to any episodic change effort, recognizing the need for internationalization (change) is assigned to leadership. This role suggests that the leader has a good command of the environment-organization interface. Second, once the need of change has been recognized it is important to articulate a concrete vision of internationalization (Taylor, 2004). The NASULGC report (2004: 17) indicated that HEOs are expected to “*articulate a clear and compelling vision for a global university within the context and heritage of each individual institution.*” Third, once the vision is developed, it is necessary to communicate the vision and get organizational members around the internationalization vision. In this stage, the leader plays the champion of change. She/he speaks out internationalization frequently on the campus and off the campus. Fourth, leaders are expected to contribute to building a change coalition or teambuilding efforts. Incorporating effective individuals, making the coalition visible, supporting the coalition’s campus-wide implementation efforts are some of the essential roles of leaders in relation to coalition building. Hence, the power dynamics of HEO can be translated into facilitative forces rather than resistant forces for the IP. Fifth, HEO will need a strategy of IP. Whether adapting a common strategy of IP or crafting a unique strategy, the leader needs to support the change coalition. Here once again leadership has a critical role in assessing and adopting or crafting a strategy. The assessment includes not only the academic aspect of the process but also the managerial aspect. Sixth, creating conditions of change in the organization is also among the roles of leadership. Leadership realigns the priorities around the IP. In addition, he/she encourage IP related activities such as traveling abroad, developing foreign language skills, and providing both financial and psychological support. Seventh, leadership has the role of connecting the IP and the culture of the internationalizing HEO. The internal culture can be facilitative or inhibiting in IP. Hence, creating congruency between organizational culture and internationalization is also an essential success factor as well. Eighth, using personal networks and identifying and building partnerships with national or international organizations are also initiatives assigned to leadership in the IP. In addition, connecting the

change coalition to business leaders, civic persons, and other figures in the society with global experiences are some of the actions that can be taken toward accomplishing partnerships and networking. Finally, accountability toward accomplishing the vision of internationalization is also a task of the leaders. Accountability covers setting concrete measures toward accomplishing the vision. Setting measurable goals in the form of deadlines, specifying indicators of success, and communicating the result are some of the measures that the leader may assign to the change coalition. On the other hand, assessing the impact of the internationalization on different groups such as academic and administrative staff, students, and stakeholders is also a part of leadership accountability.

***Organizational culture:*** The final transformational dimension of OC is the culture of the organization (Burke & Litwin, 1992). Culture is the collection of overt and covert shared values and beliefs that affect organizational members' behavior patterns (Schein, 1985). There are two basic aspects of culture in relation to OC: diagnosing organizational culture and changing organizational culture (Woodman, 1989). Several authors have documented the culture in higher education settings. Bolman and Deal (1991) documented the impact of culture on organizational behavior in an academic context. Bergquist (1992) in their comprehensive work differentiated between the collegial, managerial, developmental, and negotiating cultures.

Perceiving the IP as a change process conveys the idea that it has an impact on organizational culture. IP is likely to bring changes to faculty and students profiles but more importantly to values and basic assumptions of the internationalizing HEOs (Levin, 2003). The NASULGC report (NASULGC, 2004) highlighted the cultural aspect of IP in that internationalizing HEOs value diversity of faculty, students, and cultures. It is an environment supportive of foreign constituents (students and faculty) and facilitates the exchange between foreign and domestic constituents. These changes are likely to have impact on the culture of the HEO, which deserves special attention (Taylor, 2004). Switching from operating in a single and unified cultural perspective into a multiple and diverse one makes reviewing the impact of the internationalization on the culture of the internationalizing HEO is essential. There are two challenges that IP practitioners are likely to confront in this regard. First, culture change is very difficult if not impossible. It is very difficult to bring deep change because structural and behavioral configurations are aligned to the old culture. Hence, any change effort is likely to be faced with resistance or to trigger conflict among different groups when it interferes with basic values of these groups (Levin, 2003). Second, it is very difficult



to document the impact of IP on a particular culture. Although in the definition of culture we advance overt aspects, culture is more about covert aspects in organizations.

**Structure:** Burke and Litwin (1992) indicated the structure of the organization as the first transactional dimension in OC. Structure refers to “*the arrangement of the functions and people into specific areas and levels of responsibility, decision-making, communication, and relationship to assure effective implementation of the organization's mission and strategy*” (Burke & Litwin, 1992: 532). Kitamura (1997) documented the impact of internationalization on the structural characteristics of the Japanese higher education system. Levin (2003) documented particular consequences of a major OC process on functional processes (structures, management, technology, decision-making, and communication) in HEOs. For an internationalizing HEO restructuring may sound unnecessary. However, the IP brings along some structural changes. The most common structural change is the creation of an international office and the appointment of an internationalization manager, commonly a senior faculty member. There may be variations in structuring the international mission. Some of the HEOs prefer the centralization approach. The centralized approach is instrumental in that it ensures the consistent implementation of the internationalization within the campus. This is essential in HEOs which are loosely-coupled organizations. In addition, considering the fact that HEOs both have academic and managerial functions, the agents must ensure that the IP includes both academic and managerial domains. In addition to the international office, several sub-units functioning as the back-office nurturing the front-office can be established.

In addition to these points, Taylor (2004) made an interesting argument about the structural characteristics of internationalizing HEOs. Taylor (2004: 164) indicated that IP has a centralized character because of the following reasons: [1] The need for overall planning, prioritization of activities, and target setting, [2] the diversified and ambiguous nature of the provision which require administrative rigor and discipline to channel the process of internationalization, [3] the need to organize the student services from a central perspective, [4] avoiding duplication and ensuring efficiency of all units in providing the services, [5] the need for regular scrutiny and monitoring international activities.

**Management practices:** These practices cover a broad range of activities. Practice refers to “*a particular cluster of specific behaviors*” and management practices refer to “*what managers do in the normal course of events to use the human and material resources at their disposal to carry out the organization's strategy*” (Burke & Litwin, 1992: 532).

Levin (2003) and Taylor (2004) provided comments on the ways the IP influence the management practices of HEOs. Levin (2003: 457) articulated changes in the governance of the HEOs from "*administrative or governing board authority*" into "*bicameral governance*". That is the faculty has gained entrance to board governance and HEOs has brought a "*senate-type board*" for HEOs in legislation. In other words, faculty members have gained a role in the decision-making process, and it becomes not only the role of the board members but it is also shared with the faculty (Levin, 2003).

Taylor (2004) listed his observations of changes made in managerial practices of four internationalizing HEOs. (1) the appointment of a senior faculty member (international), who has the skills to drive and to oversee the overall internationalization policies, who reports directly to the Vice-Chancellor, and who is the interface between the Vice-Chancellor, the International Office and the faculties, (2) the establishment of a high level Internationalization Committee chaired by the Vice-Chancellor, (3) the redevelopment of the international unit with corresponding developments in the faculty offices. In these efforts international offices function as the key units. They are interface units between higher level units responsible from management practices of the university as well as lower level units responsible from academic practices such as curriculum development, research, quality assurance, and human resources. It is a common challenge for the internationalizing HEOs to accomplish a harmony between the functions of the internationalization unit and other units, which reflects the difficulty of integrating the internationalization strategy to the broader strategy of the HEOs. This difficulty pertains to any changing organization and not only to the internationalizing HEOs.

**Systems:** Systems refer to the "*standardized policies and mechanisms*" organizations implement for accomplishing tasks (Burke & Litwin, 1992: 532). Patterns of these policies and mechanism can be observed in reward systems, management information systems (MIS), performance appraisal, budgeting, and human resource allocation of organizations (Burke & Litwin, 1992).

IP has forced governments and institutions to undertake various initiatives in order to manage internationalization. The initiatives undertaken by governments toward the internationalization serve as a regulating mechanism guiding the actions at organization level. Kitamura (1997) highlighted the need for changes in the patterns of teaching and learning, evaluation and accreditation system, course contents, and the crediting system at institution level. The Eurydice report (Eurydice, 2000) indicated that in the majority of European countries the policy of internationalization is determined at the institutional level. The institutions and their staff establish networks and links for conducting various types of

activities ranging from student exchanges to initiating joint programs. Throughout time some of these individual initiatives have developed further and have become more structured as a result of coordination and centralization. Although governments provide various type of support, individual HEOs have been autonomous in managing these initiatives.

First, the most concrete form of initiatives resulting from internationalization is the establishment of an international relations office and the appointment of a manager for managing these units, as we indicated in our structure section. The second institutional level activity is related to foreign languages. HEOs either offer intensive courses to the newcomers (students, faculty) or offer opportunities for teaching and conducting research (e.g. PhDs) in another language, commonly in English. A third requirement that internationalizing HEOs have to deal with is related to developing student support services ranging from orientation to accommodation. Fourth, internationalization has impact not only on the structural managerial configuration of the HEOs but also on the academic aspect of these organizations. HEOs tend, first, to review the mainstream curriculum and to internationalize the existing courses by adding an international dimension to these courses, and second, to develop totally new courses and integrate them in the existing curriculum. Although it pertains specifically to Europe, the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) is a specific example of changes in the systems as a result of internationalization. These changes indicate that HEOs either readapt their existing systems or develop new system in their IP.

**Climate:** It refers to “*the collective current impressions, expectations, and feeling that members of local work units have that, in turn, affect their relations with their boss, with one another, and with other units*” (Burke and Litwin, 1992: 532). Climate is closely related to the concept of culture. Burke and Litwin (1992: 534) explained the interrelations between culture and climate in the context of change as “*...the new organization culture, as it becomes accepted, would create a modified if not an entirely new set of dimensions around which climate would be perceived, described, and responded to.*”

The changes in the organizational climate of internationalizing HEOs has not been documented widely. The changes in the organizational climate in the face of other external pressures is relatively more investigated. One of the most comprehensive and recent investigations of an organizational climate in the face of the changing higher education era came from Allen (2003). The author investigated the relationships between organizational climate and strategic initiatives. The author used a grounded theory approach to highlight the influence of different styles of management on organizational climate. However, the author focused the discussion on the antecedents and influence of insecurity/security dimension of

organizational climate. Security/insecurity climate can be present at organizational level or it can find its roots in sub-cultures. Perceptions of change management and its frequency, predictability, openness, degree of participation, discontinuous or incremental nature of change, and whether or not decision are implemented by the use of persuasive power or coercive power are the six issues affect the climate of security/insecurity. Allen (2003: 61) indicated that managerial approach is associated with climate of insecurity in which the staff is “*de-motivated, cautious, less willing to take risks or exercise discretion and more likely to resist change.*” In contrast, collegial approach reflects a more secure climate in which staff is open, willing and share information and positive relationships. Based on these arguments the author suggest that there is a need for more sophisticated approaches of strategic planning and change which essentially reflects the uniqueness of HEOs.

***Task requirements and individual skills/abilities:*** These refer to aggregate knowledge, skills, and behaviors required from people for effectively fulfilling their tasks. These aspects of work setting refer to a job requirements-personal abilities match (Burke & Litwin, 1992), which has concrete implications for the behavior patterns of organizational members toward OC.

IP brings diversity into the practices, products, and services. Hence, it may demand new skills, knowledge and behavior patterns from organizational members. Bringing students and faculty from different nations into the campus, developing international products (*e.g.*, international programs), and bringing an international dimension into research practice may not be accomplished with current skills, knowledge, and behavior patterns. Hence, internationalization has an impact on human resource management of HEOs (Taylor, 2004). Concerning requirements and skills, it can be argued that two dimension need to be highlighted in relation to IP. First, having knowledge of other cultures, being open and aware of other cultures and nationalities, having interests in world affairs, and valuing differences are extra but desirable qualities. All of these qualities suggest the need for a mindset change of organizational members of the internationalizing HEOs (Haigh, 2002; NASULGC, 2004). Second, IP highlights the competencies of organizational members. Teaching international students and bringing an international dimension into teaching and research demand new competencies from the organizational members. Faculty members of the internationalizing HEOs are expected to “*draw upon, integrate, and compare information from a diverse set of disciplines, cultures, and international experiences, and perspectives that are derived from multiple sources and experiences*” (NASULGC, 2004: 24). Developing language skills is the most commonly highlighted skill of organizational members of the internationalizing HEOs

(Paseka, 2000; Haigh, 2002; NASULGC, 2004; Taylor, 2004). In addition to these common-to-all set of skills, Taylor (2004) advanced several skills special to the top managers of HEOs such as international marketing and entrepreneurship, different management skills for administrators and staff, and financial management skills.

In general, there are two ways of developing necessary competencies and qualities necessary in the internationalization context. First, HEOs may initiate formal training programs such as language training or training administrative staff. Second, the HEOs may encourage their staff to expose themselves to international experiences such as traveling abroad for short or long period of studies, participating in international meetings, being member of international associations and networks (Haigh, 2002; NASULGC, 2004). Concerning the academic staff, the HEOs may have the option of attracting international faculty members. However, this option should not replace the need of training the local labor force and the improvements in employment conditions of the current staff. Otherwise, deterioration in the employment conditions will eventually affect the quality of both inflowing and local labor (Mahroum, 1999).

***Individual needs and values:*** They are the specific “*psychological factors*” that drive individuals toward certain actions and pattern of thoughts (Burke & Litwin, 1992: 533). In culture and task requirements and individual skills/abilities sections we have already indicated the impact of the IP on values and needs of organizational members. In these sections the discussions suggest that switching from a homogenous national environment into a heterogeneous international environment inevitably brings along changes in the values of both the HEOs and members of these HEOs. However, as OC scholars indicated it is a challenging task to accomplish changes in individual and organizational values. Wong and Tierney (2001) indicated the problems in changing values in a higher education setting. They stated that a change from traditional individual based values into communal values such as collaboration and participation leads to problems. Concerning individual needs, as we stated above, internationalization may challenge the ability-job requirement task. Hence, effective IP implementation demands both support services and training of organizational members.

***Motivation:*** It is a force trigger behavior, direct this behavior toward certain purpose, and make behavior persistent. According to Burke and Litwin (1992) motivational principles need to be considered in change efforts. Internationalizing HEOs need to consider these principles for successful implementation. IP has implications on workload, reward systems, and work incentives, which are closely related to the motivation of the organizational members (Levin, 2003). Internationalizing HEOs both value and reward international

involvement (NASULGC, 2004). This attitude of the HEOs is made clear in the redefinition of job descriptions by incorporating internationalization into job descriptions of organizational members. Failure to do so may lead to severe behavioral problems in the change process of internationalization. In addition, the IP demands the organization to invest in time, energy, resources and goodwill. Haigh (2002) indicated that resource constraints may have negative implications over the motivation of employees. Besides, disagreement over the allocation of resources can be an inhibiting factor in IP. Providing the resources for international activities such as providing financial resources for faculty travels, development of international activities or events is essential for motivating organizational members to involve in international activities.

Taylor (2004) indicated that at the University of British Columbia providing financial incentives to the members and developing a reward mechanism for the staff have been stated as basic elements in the IP implementation. Kondakçı (2005) in an investigation of an IP in a HEO found that reconsidering the reward mechanism in the face of the IP is one of the most common demands of the staff.

It is evident that the limited literature on motivation in the context of internationalization focuses on reward mechanisms. However, the broader literature on OC provides richer arguments on motivational principles. However, there it is necessary to look at IP from an outcome factors' view of the OC perspective (Armenakis & Bedeian, 1999). According to this perspective communicating the vision, involving organizational members in the development and implementation of the process, providing material and psychological support are some of the strategies of fostering positive attitudes, commitment to change, readiness for change, and eliminating resistance to change.

***Individual and organizational performance:*** This refers to the outcome or result of the OC efforts. In other words, performance indicates the success of the organization in accomplishing change objectives in terms of “*productivity, customer satisfaction, profit, and quality*” (Burke & Litwin, 1992: 533). Concerning the IP the outcome of change is problematic. The fluid nature of criteria of success makes measuring the outcome of IP a challenging and controversial issue. In addition to these difficulties we argue that some other issues arise because of conceiving the IP as an OC process. We argue that it is necessary to assess the human side of change as well. In other words, the cost or benefit of the process on organizational members also needs to be assessed for a true performance measure.

Given these special difficulties of measuring the performance of the HEOs in the IP, there are still some guiding works of scholars for assessing the performance of HEOs on the process. The number of foreign students, the number of staff with overseas qualifications, the number of publications with international collaboration, the number of staff taking up leave abroad, the number of exchange agreement, and partnerships with foreign HEOs are some of these assessment criteria (NASULGC, 2004; Taylor, 2004).

In addition to these concrete criteria, the NASULGC report (2004: 42) highlighted "*audacious goals*" which may require non-conventional ways of measuring. These goals are related to the "*soft*" criteria which are largely related to the culture of the organization and the internationalization related overtones such as international environment and international climate. Although, it is very difficult to concretely measure these dimensions, they are part of the performance of HEOs in the IP (NASULGC, 2004).

Although measuring performance is a controversial issue and the literature suggests limited ways of measuring it we argue that the rationales for internationalization (*e.g.*, Howe & Martin, 1998; Callan, 2000; Denman, 2001) and approaches to internationalization (*e.g.*, Knight & De Wit, 1995; Knight, 1999) are still instrumental in determining the performance of a HEO in the IP. As we indicated above there are different rationales of pursuing an IP and different approaches of accomplishing it. Hence, we suggest translating these two aspects into concrete performance measurement criteria.

## CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate the IP from an OC perspective. This study deviates from the previous studies in its level and mode of analysis. First, unlike the common discussions in the literature, in this study we developed our argumentation at the organizational level. This approach is not common in the literature. In the literature scholars tend to conceptualize internationalization either as a supranational issue or an industry level issue. Second, the mode of analysis also differs in this study. Previous analyses of internationalization tend to perceive internationalization as a policy issue. In contrast, in this study internationalization is analyzed as a managerial issue. Considering the fact that internationalization is an external force of change, this study documents the impact of the process on every possible domain in the organization.

It is important to note that holding a managerial and organizational level perspective does not aim to falsify the policy and population level analyses. Rather, the purpose here is to depict the impact of IP on structural-functional domains of HEOs. In that sense, this approach

is complementary to the dominant one. Nevertheless, managerial and organizational level analyses are relatively less frequent than policy and population level analyses. Hence, such conceptual and empirical analyses are essential to respond to the growing need of guiding successful IP in higher education.

Another contribution of the study is bringing several management concepts into higher education in order to explain the impact of internationalization on different domains of HEOs. For this purpose, we adopted the comprehensive model of Burke and Litwin (1992). The concepts we adopted from the Burke-Litwin model (Burke & Litwin, 1992) may sound new but not alien concepts to the academy. Since several decades scholars have been indicating the need to use such concepts in discussions on higher education.

However, this study does not suggest to turn the discourse in higher education discussions from a collegial one into a managerial one. Rather, perceiving the IP as an OC process we try to develop guidelines for internationalizing HEOs. This is parallel to what Allen (2003) suggested: *"a more sophisticated view of governance and management in the [HEOs] should be taken, one that recognizes both social nature of the context, and process, of strategic change. The [HEOs] should be treated as a symbiotic community based on mutual interdependence of different groups."* The IP approach that we advanced in our discussion does not discard the uniqueness of these organizations. On the contrary, on each dimension of the model we applied the literature peculiar to HEOs and we made our interpretations considering the uniqueness of these organizations. It is believed that HEOs have entered a new era in which management values have increasingly been used, and which is believed to be unavoidable (Allen, 2003). The introduction of management that touches power structures within the HEOs is still problematic (Allen, 2003). Developing management practices, which consider the uniqueness of HEOs is a first step toward turning these organizations into effective organizations. As long as management and administration techniques reflect the complex nature of HEOs they are still potentially valuable in helping HEOs respond to the need of the society in the internationalization era.



## REFERENCES

- Allen, D. K. (2003). Organizational climate and strategic change in higher education: Organizational insecurity. *Higher Education, 46*(61-92).
- Armenakis, A. A., & Bedeian, A. G. (1999). Organizational change: A review of theory and research in the 1990s. *Journal of Management, 25*(3), 293-315.
- Beer, M., & Nohria, N. (2000). Resolving the tension between theories E and O of change. In M. Beer, & N. Nohria (Eds.), *Breaking the Code of Change* (pp. 1-35). Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Bergquist, W. H. (1992). *The four cultures of the academy: Insights and strategies for improving leadership in collegiate organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1991). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and relationship*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Burke, W. W. (2002). *Organization change: Theory and practice*. London: Sage.
- Burke, W. W., & Litwin, G. H. (1992). A causal model of organizational performance and change. *Journal of Management, 18*(3), 523-545.
- Burn, B. B., & Smuckler, R. H. (1995). *A research agenda for the internationalization of higher education in the United States*. Carbondale, IL: Association of International Education Administration.
- Callan, H. (2000). The international vision in practice: A decade of evolution. *Higher Education in European, 25*(1), 16-23.
- Curri, G. (2002). Reality versus perception: Restructuring tertiary education and institutional organizational change-a case study. *Higher Education, 44*, 133-151.
- Deem, R. (2001). Globalization, new managerialism, academic capitalism and entrepreneurialism in universities: is the local dimension still important. *Comparative Education, 37*(1), 7-20.

Denman, B. D. (2001). The emergence of trans-regional educational exchange schemes (TREES)

in Europe, North America, and the Asia-Pacific Region. *Higher Education in Europe*, 26(1), 95-106.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147-160.

Eurydice. (2000). *Two decades of reform in higher education in Europe: 1980 onwards*. Brussels: European Commission.

Fortuijn, J. D. (2002). Internationalizing learning and teaching: A European experience. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 26(3), 263-273.

Galpin, T. (1996). *The human side of change: A practical guide to organization redesign*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Goedegebuure, L. C. J., Kaiser, F., Maassen, P. A. M., Meek, V. L., Van Vught, F. A., & De Weert, E. (1994). *Higher education policy: An international comparative perspective*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Gumport, P. J. (2000). Academic restructuring: Organizational change and institutional imperatives. *Higher Education*, 39, 67-91.

Haigh, M. J. (2002). Internationalization of the curriculum: Designing inclusive education for small world. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 26(1), 49-66.

Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. (1977). The population ecology of organizations. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 82(5), 929-964.

Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. (1984). Structural inertia and organizational change. *American Sociological Review*, 49(2), 149-164.

Hay, I., Foote, K., & Healey, M. (2000). From Cheltenham to Honolulu: The purposes and projects of the international network for learning and teaching (INLT) in geography in higher education. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 24(2), 221-227.

- Healey, M. (1998). Developing and internationalizing higher education networks in geography. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 22(3), 277-282.
- Howe, W. S., & Martin, G. (1998). Internationalization strategies for management education. *Journal of Management Development*, 17(6), 447-462.
- Huisman, J., Maassen, P., & Neave, G. (2001). *Higher education and the nation state. The international dimension of higher education*. Oxford: IAU/Pergamon Press.
- Huisman, J., Schrier, E., and Vossensteyn, H. (1998). Breaking fresh ground: Regional co-operation in higher education. *Higher Education in Europe*, 23(2), 253-261.
- Judson, A. (1991). *Changing behavior in organizations: Minimizing resistance to change*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.
- Kemelgor, B. H., Johnson, S. D., & Srinivasan, S. (2000). Forces driving organizational change: A business school perspective. *Journal of Education for Business*, 75(3), 133-138.
- Kerr, C. (1990). The internationalization of learning and the nationalization of the purposes of higher education: Two 'laws of motion' in conflict? *European Journal of Education*, 25(1), 5-22.
- Kezar, A. (2005). Consequences of radical change in governance: A grounded theory approach. *Journal of Higher Education*, 76(6), 634-668.
- Kitamura, K. (1997). Policy issues in Japanese higher education. *Higher Education*, 34(141-150).
- Knight, J. (1999). Internationalization of higher education. In J. Knight, & H. de Wit (Eds.), *Quality and internationalization in higher education* (pp. 13-23). Paris: OECD.
- Knight, J., & de Wit, H. (1995). Strategies for internationalization of higher education: Historical and conceptual perspectives. In H. des Wit (Ed.), *Strategies for internationalization of higher education - A comparative study of Australia, Canada, Europe and the United States of America*. Amsterdam: European Association for International Education.
- Knight, J., & de Wit, H. (Eds.). (1999). *Quality and internationalization in higher education*. Paris: OECD.

- Kondakçı, Y. (2005). *Practice-based continuous change process: A longitudinal investigation of an organizational change process in a higher education organization*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Ghent University, Ghent-Belgium.
- Kotter, J. P. (1995). Leading change: Why transformational efforts fail. *Harvard Business Review*, 73(2), 59-67.
- Kwiek, M. (2001). Social and cultural dimensions of the transformation of higher education in Central and Eastern Europe. *Higher Education in Europe*, 26(3), 399-410.
- Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. (1967). *Organization and environment: Managing differentiation and integration*. Boston, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration.
- Levin, J. S. (2003). Organizational paradigm shift and the university colleges of British Columbia. *Higher Education*, 46, 447-467.
- Levy, A., & Merry, U. (1986). *Organizational transformation: Approaches, strategies, theories*. New York: Praeger.
- Mahroum, S. (1999). Patterns of academic inflow into the higher education system of the United Kingdom. *Higher Education in Europe*, 24(1), 119-129.
- McBurnie, G. (2000). Pursuing internationalization as a means to advance the academic mission of the university: An Australian case study. *Higher Education in Europe*, 25(1), 63-73.
- Mento, A. J., Jones, R. M., & Dirndorfer, W. (2002). A change management process: Grounded in both theory and practice. *Journal of Change Management*, 3(1), 45-59.
- Moore, K. (1998). The impact of the information age: Higher education and the new technologies. *Higher Education in Europe*, 23(2), 163-168.
- Morey, A. I. (2004). Globalization and the emergence of for-profit higher education. *Higher Education*, 48(131-150).
- NASULGC. (2004). *A call to leadership: The presidential role in internationalizing the university*. Washington D. C.: NASULGC.

Neave, G., & Van Vught, F. (1991). *Prometheus bound: The changing relations between governments and higher education in Western Europe*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

OECD/IMHE-HEFCE. (2004). *On the edge: Securing a sustainable future for higher education*. Paris: OECD/IMHE-HEFCE.

Paseka, A. (2000). Towards internationalization in teacher education: an attempt to use English as the working language in a sociology course. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 5(3), 359-371.

Schein, E. H. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Scott, J. C. (2006). The mission of the university Medieval to postmodern transformation. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(1), 1-39.

Shepherd, I., Monk, J. J., & Droogleever Fortuijn, J. (2000). Internationalizing geography in higher education: Towards a conceptual framework. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 24(2), 285-298.

Stensaker, B., & Norgård, J. D. (2001). Innovation and isomorphism: A case study of university identity struggle 1969-1999. *Higher Education*, 42, 473-492.

Taylor, J. (2004). Toward a strategy for internationalization: Lessons and practices from four universities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8(2), 149-171.

Taylor, T., Gough, J., Bundrock, V., & Winter, R. (1998). A bleak outlook: Academic staff perceptions of changes in core activities in Australian higher education, 1991-96. *Studies in Higher Education*, 23(3), 255-268.

Vaira, M. (2004). Globalization and higher education organizational: A framework for analysis. *Higher Education*, 48(483-510).

Van Der Wende, M. (2001). The international dimension in national higher education policies: what was changed in Europe in the last five years? *European Journal of Education*, 36(4), 431-441.

Weick, K. E., & Quinn, R. E. (1999). Organizational change and development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50(1), 361-386.

Whelan-Berry, K. S., Gordon, J. R., & Hinings, C. R. (Bob). (2003). Strengthening organizational change processes: Recommendations and implications from a multilevel analysis. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science.*, 39(2), 186-207.

Wong, M. P. A., & Tierney, W. G. (2001). Reforming faculty work: Culture, structure, and the dilemma of organizational change. *Teachers College Record*, 103(6), 1081-1101.

Woodman, R. W. (1989). Organizational change and development: New areas for inquiry and action. *Journal of Management*, 15(2), 205-228.

Yelland, R. (2000). Supranational and transnational education. *Higher Education in Europe*, 25(3), 297-303.

Zajac, E. J., & Kraatz, M. S. (1993). A diametric forces model of strategic change: Assessing the antecedents and consequences of restructuring in the higher education industry. *Strategic Management Journal*, 14, 83-102.