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ABSTRACT

Among the many forces confronting universities in the context of globalisation, internationalisation is a widespread response. Competitiveness, various political forces and the ever-growing importance of economic values in education are reshaping universities. Given the ever-changing global environment and corresponding policies from government, universities have responded to the challenges and opportunities by making great efforts to internationalise their institutions.

Academic mobility, which has traditionally been seen as a main component of internationalisation, has also been expedited by globalisation. Paralleling the increasing importance of human resources in the knowledge-based society, the number and actions of international students and scholars has been identified as a driving force of academic development and the internationalisation of higher education. For Korean universities, the relatively large number of Korean students studying abroad, together with a high rate of returning Korean PhDs, is one of the main influences on their development, alongside internationalisation in general.

This research examines the internationalisation of higher education in Korea, focusing particularly on the impact and experiences of returning scholars in Korean higher education. Hence, it has two main foci: the internationalisation of Korean higher education, and the impact of returning scholars in higher education within the context of the internationalisation.

The research was based on case studies employing document analysis, semi-structured in-depth interviews and questionnaire data. In order to gain a deeper understanding of the internationalisation perceptions and process, and contribution of returned scholars, four Korean universities were selected: Handong Global University (HGU), Korea National University of Education (KNUE), Yonsei University (Yonsei) and Seoul National University (SNU).
Internationalisation has been widely understood as a strategic approach to develop universities in response to globalisation, and internationalisation strategies in Korean universities tend to be embedded in the university’s long-term development plan. The specific strategies, which reflect each university’s philosophy, educational aim and demands, often have an integrative form, expressing the transformation of the university through curriculum, research, manifold education programs and administration.

The research revealed that returning scholars are seen as particularly valuable to the internationalisation process in their university because of their blend of international competence and deep understanding of Korean culture. Returnees’ international activities were found to be strong in the areas of teaching, research and administration. However, the contribution of returnees to Korean higher education is hindered by certain factors stemming from different academic cultures and working conditions, notably excessive teaching and administrative workloads, and a rigid administrative system.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BK21</td>
<td>Brain Korea 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIEE</td>
<td>Division of International Education &amp; Exchange at Yonsei University. In 2007, it was reorganised to OIA (Office of International Affairs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERASMUS</td>
<td>European Region Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>Foreign Direct Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATS</td>
<td>General Agreement on Trade in Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GATT</td>
<td>General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSIS</td>
<td>Graduate School of International Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCT</td>
<td>Human Capital Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEI</td>
<td>Higher Education Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HGU</td>
<td>Handong Global University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>International Cooperation Center at Handong Global University. In 2008, it was reorganised to OUA (Office of University Advancement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information and Communication Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMF</td>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCUE</td>
<td>Korean Council for University Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNUE</td>
<td>Korea National University of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNC</td>
<td>Multinational Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOEHRD</td>
<td>Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development. In 2008, it was changed to MEST (Ministry of Education, Science and Technology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURI</td>
<td>New University for Regional Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCI</td>
<td>Science Citation Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNU</td>
<td>Seoul National University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQM</td>
<td>Total Quality Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UIC</td>
<td>Underwood International College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCTAD</td>
<td>United Nations Conference on Trade and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTO</td>
<td>World Trade Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yonsei</td>
<td>Yonsei University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INTRODUCTION

Internationalisation has become a worldwide phenomenon as universities are challenged to transform in response to the demands of globalisation. This latter phenomenon, globalisation, has brought political, economic and cultural impacts within the education sector, and within the universities themselves. As part of this process, globalisation is also stimulating and reshaping the international dimension of higher education. National governments are initiating new internationalisation policies to meet these new demands. Given the changing global environments and the corresponding governmental policies, universities have responded to these prevailing challenges and opportunities, by making great efforts to internationalise their institutions.

Internationalisation, which refers to a strategic process approach to international dimensions (de Wit, 2002, p. 119), has been understood as a process of integrating the international dimensions to all areas of a university (Knight, 1997). However, despite this general understanding of internationalisation, perceptions and implementation of internationalisation strategies vary across different institutions, regions and cultures (Biddle, 2002; Callan, 2000; Kishun, 1998).

Academic mobility, on the other hand, which has traditionally been a main component of internationalisation, has been expedited by globalisation. Knowledge at a distance has been accumulated, adopted and reproduced through academic travel over the centuries. In the international knowledge system, students and scholars tend to congregate at academic centres and foster the circulation of knowledge, transcending national boundaries (Altbach, 1998). With regard to the mobility of academics, Korea is a major sending country to academic centres, and the United States in particular, but it has benefited by returning scholars who acquire PhDs overseas and return with substantial research experience. Considering the relatively low proportion of international students and
scholars in Korean higher education, the high proportion of returnees\(^1\) is an important factor in Korean internationalisation.

**Study overview**

The research examines the internationalisation of higher education in Korea, through focusing in particular on the experiences and impact of returning scholars in Korean higher education. Its twin foci of investigation are the internationalisation of Korean higher education, and the impact of returning academics within the context of the internationalisation.

The first purpose of the study is to investigate the internationalisation of Korean higher education. Although globalisation is generally considered to be the main force driving universities towards the new dimension of internationalisation, the meanings, perceptions and responses to internationalisation differ markedly, according to the culture, region and circumstance of specific nations. Accordingly, this research explores perceptions of internationalisation with regard to its necessity, rationales, obstacles, benefits and risks in a select number of Korean universities. This study also examines how Korean universities respond to the demands of change, by investigating Korean governmental higher education policies and the strategies of internationalisation within universities.

Secondly, the research investigates the specific impact of returning scholars on Korean higher education in their home universities on return to Korea. The research examines returning scholars' contributions to internationalisation against the background of perceptions of internationalisation in higher education through its implementation in teaching and learning and research, and related international activities. Other issues examined include the reasons returnees give for their return, and their difficulties in teaching and research, and in daily life upon return to Korea.

---

\(^1\) The researcher uses the terms returnee, returning scholar, and peripatetic scholar interchangeably to refer to academics who gain their highest degree overseas. Those who gain their highest degree in Korea are referred to as domestic or indigenous scholars.
The research answers three key research questions:
1) what are the perceptions and approaches to internationalisation in the university?
2) to what extent is the university internationalised?
3) what impact do repatriated scholars have on the university?

The research is based on a case study approach, employing document analysis, semi-structured in-depth interviews and questionnaire data. In order to gain a deep understanding of both the internationalisation perceptions and process, and specific contribution of returned scholars, four Korean universities were selected: Handong Global University (HGU), Korea National University of Education (KNUE), Yonsei University (Yonsei) and Seoul National University (SNU).

As the research gaze focuses on internationalisation in these four universities, there is a limit as to how far the study’s findings can be generalised to internationalisation and returnees’ contribution in all Korean universities. The analysis of perceptions and implementation of strategies was limited firstly to the area of internationalisation, and secondly to the returnees’ contribution and their activities, as they relate to internationalisation and some aspects of knowledge development. In addition, because of insufficient numbers of respondents in some categories, inter-group analyses by discipline, gender and age were limited. This narrow focus extends to the cross-case analysis (Chapter Nine), focusing on the cross-institutional analysis.

The significance of this study is in the institution-based analysis of how internationalisation processes are implemented in Korean universities. The research delves into internationalisation in four different types of Korean universities that range across the following polarities: private and national, large-scale comprehensive and small-scale specialised, metropolitan and regional-based. A wide range of factors were examined, from perceptions of internationalisation to implementation of strategies in various areas within the selected universities. Each university’s efforts are analysed, according to their current framework of internationalisation, approaches to internationalisation in the areas of teaching and learning, research, international activities
and programs, and management. The research also acknowledges the importance of returnees in universities especially in the internationalisation process. The investigation will allow universities to analyse their returnees' attitudes, experiences, strengths, and difficulties, and also to apply strategic approaches that will enhance their contribution to the development of universities and internationalisation. It is also hoped that the research will contribute to the broad body of research on internationalisation through providing insights into internationalisation and the contribution of returnees from this Korean context.

Overview of the chapters

The research on internationalisation of Korean universities and the contribution of returnees is organised into ten chapters that in turn present and discuss the literature underpinning the study, research methodology, the four case studies and cross case analysis, and conclusions drawn from the research.

Chapters One to Three review the global and national context with regard to globalisation and the response of universities. In Chapter One internationalisation of higher education is overviewed within the global trends of the university transformation. Globalisation is driving universities to change, and internationalisation is a key dimension of that transformation. Universities approaches to internationalisation involves the development of new values and strategies. Chapter Two discusses how, given the increasing numbers and importance of international mobility of the highly-skilled, academic mobility has enhanced university transformation through knowledge development and internationalisation. The particulars of Korean universities are discussed in Chapter Three, which provides an historical background of the Korean higher education, and current issues.

Chapter Four sets forth the research methodology, while Chapters Five to Eight discuss the individual university case studies. Chapter Four explains the research design in detail as a multi-case study employing various methodologies. It also describes data collection,
analysis and other methodology issues such as validity, reliability and ethical considerations. The following four chapters explore perceptions of internationalisation, its implementation, and the returnees’ contributions at Handong Global University (Chapter Five), Korea National University of Education (Chapter Six), Yonsei University (Chapter Seven) and Seoul National University (Chapter Eight). Chapter Nine provides a cross-case analysis of the research findings from the four universities, according to common themes. Finally, Chapter Ten summarises the conclusions that can be drawn from the data in response to the research questions and presents recommendations for Korean higher education in particular and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER ONE GLOBALISATION AND THE INTERNATIONALISATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Introduction

That universities are becoming more international in focus is not a new phenomenon. As a traditional source of knowledge in society, the university has long developed knowledge through international exchange. Now more and more students and academics participate in international activities and programs. Various intercultural and international content appears in the curriculum. Strategies for development of the university are not only regionally-focussed but are increasingly responsive to global demands. The internationalisation of higher education is a global trend.

Why and in which ways does a university become internationalised? Understanding this global phenomenon should begin with an examination of globalisation. Frequently, globalisation is perceived as a major force in the current transformation of higher education, spurring the internationalisation of the university. This chapter commences with a review of the key dimensions of globalisation which have influenced universities, to enable a better understanding of the international aspect of universities. Internationalisation of higher education then will be discussed within the context of globalisation.

Globalisation: The current context for transformation of higher education

Globalisation is a complex and multi-faceted phenomenon. Since the late twentieth century, changes to human life have accelerated rapidly via new technologies, long distance transportation and telecommunications. Some common notions of globalisation such as “time-space compression,” “shrinking world” and “global integration” encapsulate the connection between different regions of the world in which there are
intensifying inter-dependence on each other (Held & McGrew, 2003; Tomlinson, 1999; Waters, 2001). However, because of the complexity and dynamic nature of globalisation, no single discipline or school can capture the whole meaning of this phenomenon (Marginson, 1999). Although it is widely held that the phenomenon of globalisation mainly affects economic life, there are a number of researchers who view the economic, cultural and political dimensions of globalisation as forming a complicated interaction (Held & McGrew, 2003; Jones, 1999; Spybey, 1996).

The economic dimension represents the core of contemporary globalisation with such key debates as whether the increasing international trade, investment, labour migration and international economic cooperation are creating a borderless world economy (Waters, 2001). Current patterns of international economic activities across national boundaries are deepening. International trade, finance, foreign direct investment (FDI) and mobility of labour have grown to unprecedented levels in the post World War II period (Perraton, 2003). Whereas in 1998, foreign exchange trading averaged US$650 billion per day, by 2004 this had risen to US$1.8 trillion per day (Rood & Schechter, 2007). Worldwide exports, which were equal to 17% of world GDP in 1998, reached 20% of GDP in 2000, and they exceeded 25% of world GDP by 2005 (Berg & Lewer, 2007). The total number of international migrants in 2005 was about 191 million, up from 75 million in 1965 (Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2006). Multinational Corporations (MNCs) are key agents of globalisation, increasing their portion of the world economy to an estimated one tenth of world GDP and one third of world exports in 2003 (UNCTAD, 2004). To produce the most effective combinations of competitive pricing and desirable profit margins, MNCs have created global factories, intensifying foreign direct investment and international labour mobility (Letto-Gillies, 2003). The combined effects of these trends develop greater interconnectedness across nation states establishing a global economy.

Despite the integration of such internationally dispersed migrants and economic activities, the global economy is not geographically even. Global manufacturing, services and agricultural production are concentrated in just 15 countries (Dicken, 2007). In
addition, foreign investment flows are concentrated among the advanced states (Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, & Perraton, 1999) except for some rapidly developing countries. Almost 90% of outward FDI stock originates from 15 countries such as U.S. and U.K., and more than half of all the inward FDI in developing countries is concentrated in just five host countries, most notably China (Dicken, 2007). Meanwhile, uneven international mobility of the highly-skilled deepens this economic disparity across regions. The highly skilled workers who are indispensable for the economic prosperity of a nation migrate from less developed countries to highly developed countries (Niessen, 2002). Lett-Gillies (2003) too argues that the distribution of income and wealth has moved from the poorest people, groups, communities, classes, and countries, to the rich ones. The loss of the highly-skilled can lead to not only economic hardship for developing countries, but also the loss of social welfare. Due to the emigration of health professionals from sub-Saharan countries in Africa, for instance, local health systems are already severely damaged (Eastwood, Conroy, Naicker, Tutt, & Plange-Rhule, 2005). With economic globalisation on the rise, tensions between developed and developing countries are also increasing.

The changing nature of industry is another key index of globalisation. Since the late twentieth century, these changing patterns of industry and economy, which form some of the contours of economic globalisation, have been described as epoch-making (S. Cohen, 1993; Dunning, 2002). The world economy has been transformed from the Fordist system of mass production of standardised products by low-skilled labour to a post-Fordist system known for flexible production and high skilled labour (Dudley, 1998). Accompanied by growing flexibilities of organisational form and management systems in the workforce, economic activities now extend from material production to information processing (Dunning, 2002). Knowledge, regarded as intellectual property, is increasingly commodified and spreads quickly through the internet and in other ways (Sidhu, 2006). The impact of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) which treated services, including education, supplied in international trade, as products has deepened this trend (K. Larsen, Martin, & Morris, 2002). Moreover, in knowledge-based economies, the means to improve productivity is switching from tangible factors of
production to individuals, and value is derived from the education and skills of workers (King, 2004a). Consequently, along with the new types of jobs and labour demanded by the market, there is a trend towards commodification of knowledge.

Growing economic activities in global economy but deepening economic inequalities across the globe have confronted nation states with new and conflicting demands. On the one hand governments are pressured to free capital and corporations from taxes and regulations, and allow corporations to operate more freely (Slaughter, 1998). On the other hand, as Slaughter noted, the nation-state plays a significant role in stimulating high-technology innovation and building human capital. In short, in order to compete successfully in the new global market, nation states must encourage the development of sophisticated technology and nurture the growth of human capital, at a time when market-friendly policies are displacing the traditional roles of the welfare state.

The economic dimension of globalisation strongly impacts the higher education sector. Prevailing economic principles are reshaping the domain and function of universities. To improve efficiency, entrepreneurial principles have flowed into the domain of higher education, albeit differentially. Corporate practices and measures such as benchmarking, quality management and performance indicators now frequently underpin many national higher education policies (Cooper, 2005; Howie & Plomp, 2005; Welch, 2009). In a knowledge-based economy, the university is a prime site for corporations and governments to seek discoveries that will yield intellectual property (Currie, DeAngelis, de Boer, Huisman, & Lacotte, 2003). An increasingly closer relationship between industries and universities has brought research funds to the latter, and supplied the former with cutting-edge technology and human resources tailored to fit market demands. This trend has, in some cases, contributed to an increased quality of higher education but at the cost of introducing market-like demands which clash with the fundamental academic functions of the university.

Globalisation is also irreversibly transforming the nature and form of political power (Held & McGrew, 2003). As global economic changes increase FDI, and international
trade and labour mobility transform national economies, the politics of the nation-state have also been challenged (Holton, 1998). Matters which were previously contained within national political boundaries are now being affected by external factors, especially through the burgeoning information and communication technology (ICT). Growing demands for international collaboration which stem from escalating global politics and environmental concerns and the advent of various international organisations and their vigorous intervention, have consequently led the nation-state to reshape its sovereignty, identity and status (Held & McGrew, 2003).

The capability of the nation-state to resist the impact of globalisation and maintain political power is a matter for strong debate over the autonomy and sovereignty of nation-states (Strange, 2003). Potter (1992, p. 321) defines autonomy as the capacity of the nation-state to formulate and pursue its own goals. In the uneven process of globalisation while some nation states face erosion of their autonomy, others have acquired greater autonomy depending on the form of their nation-state, and other factors (McGrew, 1992). McGrew indicates that hegemonic states, and certain countries that are closely linked to specific issues, may have greater autonomy than peripheral countries. On the other hand, the concept of national sovereignty, which underpins the states' juridical authority within a territory, is now under challenge (Waters, 2001). Unlike the former industrial state, contemporary nation-states face higher levels of interdependence, and the rules of sovereignty are increasingly conditional, and complex (Weiss, 1999, 2005). Under the UN system and international law, inter-state systems of national sovereignty have been undermined. Similarly, as Held and McGrew (2003) note, MNCs are also bargaining with nations, further challenging national control over economic affairs. However, even if external forces of political change have affected the form and shape of the state system, as Mann (1997) notes, the patterns are too varied to allow one simple case to be argued that the nation-state and its political system have been either strengthened or weakened by this impact. Although the future is still unclear, the belief that the nation-state is alive and well, rather than in decline, is widely accepted (Agnew, 2009; Bissessar, 2004; Suter, 2003).
At the centre of this political transformation, multiple global actors such as international organizations, MNCs, international non-governmental organization and international conventions and agreements are reframing the politics of nation-states (Agnew, 2009; Kerr, 2004; Sklair, 1999). The profits of the gigantic MNCs are beginning to outstrip the GDP of many small countries and, as they expand, their political power to negotiate with nation states is also growing (Castells, 2003). International organisations such as the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), World Bank, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and International Monetary Fund (IMF), even if they do not have a prescriptive mandate over member countries, exert influence through coercive and mimetic pressure to reform, thus in effect having political power over nation-states (Henry, Lingard, Rizvi, & Taylor, 2001; Keohane, 2003). The international agreement, known as General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) in the World Trade Organisation (WTO) is seeking to expand its rules and sphere of influence, raising profound debates regarding governments’ role and authority (Sinclair, 2003).

Embedded within the larger network of the global system, the nation-state nonetheless remains the key site of governance and politics (Marginson, 1999; Weiss, 2005), as is apparent in the higher education sector. However, while national governments devote themselves to educational reform, various international organisations like UNESCO, the World Bank, WTO and OECD, also affect national education policy. For example, reports and international forums in the OECD provide comparative educational indicators and stages, helping to spread key educational policies and concerns (Henry et al., 2001). Within the education arena, the OECD exerts influences on member as well as non-member countries. In the WTO system, in particular through GATS, higher education is exposed to market forces. Within this context of international influence, because of an increasing dependence on higher education for training and research in a knowledge-based society, the national government may seek to strengthen its role in the higher education sector, for reasons of economic development and national prosperity. Given international trends towards liberalisation and decentralisation, and away from direct intervention, governments have transferred more responsibility to universities, while at
the same time, increasing demands for accountability and performativity have provoked strong debates over academic freedom and autonomy (Rhoads, Torres, & Brewster, 2005; Welch, 2005a).

Culture is the third dimension of globalisation to be discussed here. In an ever more interconnected global economy with social and political implications reflecting great transformation, there is no doubt about the existence of the cultural dimension of globalisation (Berger, 2000). The cultural impact of globalisation on nation-states frequently refers to the role played by mass media and satellite telecommunication, but culture cannot be limited to such technological developments or to specific events, because of its pervasive influence as a “whole way of life” (Tomlinson, 1999). Indeed, as Smith (2000) points out, there is a suspicion that a globalised culture will supersede the national, which underpins the idea of the nation. This leads to intense conflict over the potential for integration or clash of cultures. Instruments of westernised culture such as fast-food franchises and Hollywood movies are becoming increasingly pervasive, and yet in Islamic and some third world countries, notably in Latin America, the spread of American culture in particular and western culture in general is resisted. However, not all scholars view national culture as under the dominance of U.S. or English-language cultural imports, but view national culture as being permeated by many sources, not just Western, that enrich the depth and range of local culture (Pieterse, 2004; Robertson, 1992; Waters, 2001). In this school of thought, different cultural dimensions of globalisation are viewed as existing in parallel.

There are basically three approaches to understanding the cultural dimension of globalisation: cultural convergence, cultural differentialism and cultural hybridization (Holton, 1998; Pieterse, 2004). The convergence approach sees a trend toward domination by western culture, frequently arousing the suspicion that globalisation is merely westernisation or Americanisation (Holton, 1998), as evidenced by the spread of the English language, individualism, capitalism, and democracy. The cultural differentialism approach recognizes the historical North-South and East-West polarities in economics and politics terms, and concludes that the contemporary world is far from homogenising.
Within this cultural differentialism approach, differences of religion and civilisation, and cultural segmentation, are seen as leading to a future clash of civilisations (Huntington, 1996; Waters, 2001). Although it offers plausible explanations for severe conflict in specific regions, this differentialist theory has been criticised as being exaggerated and simplistic (Hopper, 2007). The third approach, that of hybridisation, suggests that in the future culture will be fused and mixed, reflecting the way that cultures blend to create mixed cultural forms, refocusing intercultural identity (Pieterse, 2004). Arguing for the concept of several regional dominant cultural powers rather than one single dominant power, advocates of hybridisation argue that in any specific region, cultures blend and fuse.

While the three individual approaches are insufficient by themselves to explain overall global cultural trends, they provides some clues to aid our understanding. Predominant cultural powers, especially U.S. and Western cultures, indeed threaten indigenous cultures. That this threat is viewed as a serious one is apparent in the efforts of UNESCO to establish a covenant for the “Protection of the Diversity of Cultural Contents and Artistic Expression.” There are also regions where a number of dominant cultures compete and conflict. However, in spite of the perceived threat of dominant cultures and intercultural conflict, the cultural hybridisation theory that argues for the capability of local culture to mix with incoming cultures and survive, albeit altered, is widely accepted (Holton, 1998; Pieterse, 2004; Waters, 2001). Indeed, through increasing international telecommunication and human mobility, cultural interchange is expanding, including in and through education. In such circumstances, in order to adjust to global trends, nation-states face two conflicting demands that both encourage the interchange of cultures and preservation of national culture.

Under globalisation, universities are expanding both their cultural interchange and role as cultural guardians. More and more students and academics have international experience, and international exchange programs in universities are encouraged. Curricula encompassing foreign languages, culture and international relationships, are increasing. Foreign language courses, especially in English, are increasing in non-English speaking
countries. At the same time, because universities are considered as one of the instruments for the consolidation of the territorial nation state (King, 2004c), curricula to maintain national culture and identity are also being intensified. Nevertheless concerns remain that the culture of local universities is under threat from a homogenised university system and the increasing use of English as a means of academic communication (Brock-Utne, 2002).

In order to summarise global trends of university transformation, the research reviewed globalisation discourses in three ways. Globalisation is however, much more complicated than the economic, political, and cultural dimensions discussed above. In fact it transcends these dimensions because ultimately the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. Facing these multifaceted challenges, national governments exert more effort to sustain national prosperity, and higher education is at the core of this effort. Next section reviews the global trends of university transformation in the context of globalisation.

**Changing higher education**

Dynamic national responses to global trends and pressures have revolutionised universities in various respects. Among such transformations, funding, university management and the main academic function of a university (teaching, learning and research) will be discussed below.

*Higher education funding in an era of global competitiveness*

Over the past few decades, government higher educational policies have transformed academic funding arrangements. Governments have been under pressure to find other funding resources to reduce growth in public spending on education (Banya, 2005). Consequently Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) are increasingly facing resourcing challenges. This insufficient resourcing of the tertiary education sector has partially arisen from the expansion of enrolments. In most countries, higher education systems expanded noticeably in the post-World War II era, but increasing governmental
expenditure in higher education has not matched the boost in the number of tertiary students with an equivalent increase in funding (Greenaway & Haynes, 2003).

Western universities were largely funded by governments, but in the era of mass higher education, a significant trend is that universities are being pressured to seek other funding resources as government funding decreases in relative terms (Goedegebuure et al., 1994). As Hansen (1997) points out, the rising perception of the private benefit of investment in human capital has also been a major contributing factor in the decline of governmental support. Human capital theory suggests that there will be greater individual returns by individuals who invest in their own human capital (Williams, 1999). For governments this leads to cost-sharing policies, resulting in high tuition fees or loans for students who, it is anticipated, will reap the rewards from higher education in the future, in the form of higher earnings (Johnstone, 2007). The Australian government, for example, introduced the Higher Education Contribution Scheme (HECS) in 1990 for all students on the basis of a user-pays system (Sidhu, 2006).

Research support from industry and other private donations are also important non-governmental sources. Universities nowadays seek funds from industries, alumni, individual donations and auxiliary enterprises (Banya, 2005). An increase in research funds from industries, in particular, is a current trend in university funding, along with for-profit ventures linking universities more closely to industries. University-industry linkages provide funds to universities and enable information exchange and technology transfer, mainly in applied research rather than pure research (Braddock, 2002).

The nature of public funding has also changed with respect to allocation methods and strategies. In the context of growing international competition, and corporatisation of universities, research grants from public sources are increasingly allocated on a competitive basis. Where previously general funding grants were more common, currently more specialised, tied funding programmes are on the increase. The rationale for this is that academic research is a means for economic development, and research
funds should be allocated to certain targeted activities and research areas according to national priorities (Michael, 2005).

When it comes to government funding of teaching and research, these imposed links between funding and performance are even more apparent. As demands for greater accountability increase and the impact of diminished funding becomes even clearer, performance-based resource allocation can be found in most universities (Michael, 2005). Increasingly, public funds are allocated with reference to performance indicators through formula funding or evaluated project proposals (Liefner, 2003). The accompanying incentive to performance-based funding is that university accountability is reinforced. Martin and Geuna (2003) indicate drawbacks however, such as the cost of project assessment, homogenisation of research, avoidance of risky long-term research and increasing governmental influence.

In Korea, changing government financial policies contributed to the transformation of HEIs during the 1990’s. As the expansion of higher education continued over the period 1990 to 2000 the total number of students and institutions doubled. However, the scarcity of funding at the national level has intensified dependence on student tuition fees in Korean HEIs. In 1999, Korean government funding accounted for a mere 20.7% of higher education funding, compared with an average of 79.2% in OECD countries (OECD, 2002a). Though the situation differs between universities, overall, Korean HEIs gain 70.5% of their income through student tuition fees (C. Joo, 2003). In 2001, national universities gained 45.8% of their income through student tuition fees while private universities had a heavier reliance on student tuition fees (69.6%). The figure for two and three year HEIs was 89.4% (C. Joo, 2003). In spite of this low level of public funding, and faced with strong international competition, the Korean government introduced a performance-based funding system in order to improve the quality and accountability of HEIs. As a result, during the 1990’s, more governmental funds began to be allocated on a competitive basis, via specialised programmes (H. Son, 2002).
Among these changes in Korean higher education finance, some trends can be distinguished. While decentralisation is accelerating, governmental intervention into higher education is strengthening. Through specialised funding systems, research activities are now being directed in specific ways that meet government priorities (C. Song, 2002). The recent decrease in the number of newly enrolled students, mainly caused by a decrease in the number of school age students, has resulted in a deteriorating overall financial situation in higher education. This may partially account for the rise in universities becoming engaged in entrepreneurial activities and seeking increased non-government funds. The growth of market-oriented policies within the HEIs has raised concern about the ongoing viability of the pure sciences and social sciences.

Organisational change and the management of HEIs

The globalisation process is leading to deep organisational change in universities. Despite strongly homogenising global trends, nevertheless diversified and specialised transformations of universities have arisen, based on national policies and situations. Vaira (2004) considers both the diversification and homogenisation theses as explanations of organisational change of the university, but does acknowledge a general trend towards entrepreneurialism. Given such corporate values, current universities are becoming different kinds of institutions (Readings, 1996). While universities increasingly rely on market discourses to respond to economic demands, the idea of the university has changed from a social institution to an industry (Gumport, 2000). Accordingly, with the advent of new organisational models of universities such as for-profit universities and university-industry strategic alliances, traditional universities have also changed in terms of organisation and operations (Hanna & Latchem, 2002).

An entrepreneurial ethos promoting values such as high flexibility, innovation and quality of production, which prioritises the matching of products and work to clients' demands, is permeating the higher education sector (Vaira, 2004). In conjunction with governmental pressures for change like reduced budgets, and increased accountability and productivity, other forces have stemmed from within the universities themselves. The current global
massification of national higher education systems with its resultant institutional diversity and organisational complexity, also requires universities to apply effective organisational forms and management styles (Sotirakou, 2004).

As universities emphasise the manager's role in their departments, managerialism has become a frame for the changing patterns of governance in current market-oriented universities. Managerialism refers to the application of managerial techniques, values and practices derived from the private sector of the economy to publicly funded institutions (Ferlie, Ashburner, Fitzgerald, & Pettigrew, 1996). Notions of efficiency, effectiveness and excellence parallel assumptions about continuous improvement of organisations, thus managerial techniques such as team-work, staff appraisal, total quality management (TQM), staff performance evaluations and outcomes are applied to the public sector (Currie et al., 2003). In the higher education sector, this institutional governance has a variety of forms designed to measure, monitor and control performance.

Hand in hand with this measurement and control of efficiency, effectiveness and quality outcomes, managerialism is also reshaping the structure of power and role in universities. Presidents of universities are tending to term themselves as chief executive officer (CEO) enhancing TQM (Banya, 2005; Berman, 1998; Currie et al., 2003). In American universities, the trend to centralise authority in a few senior managers is part of a process whereby a more aggressive top-down managerial approach is applied to planning and organisation (Green, 2003). Although centralised and top-down governance empowers the head of the university and department faculty to effectively operate the organisation, academics are systemically excluded from university governance because of this hierarchical managerial system (Teelken, Boersma, & Groenewegen, 2009). Academics thus feel that power has shifted away from them because of this centralised decision-making (Currie et al., 2003). Departments and faculties are increasingly becoming administrative units. Heads of academic departments once concerned mainly with academic leadership have now become managers (Delany, 2001). There is also increasing accountability and surveillance (Carter, 2005; Currie et al., 2003). For example, academic
audits such as peer-review measures are being increasingly used to measure quality of teaching and research in British universities (Deem, 2001).

Organisational change in universities is closely linked to cost-effective operations. In some universities, more resources are invested in the new high technology “delivery system” because it seems distance learning is more cost-effective than the usual teacher-student classroom, (Berman, 1998; Farmer, 2004). Larger budgets are distributed to those departments which attract more students and reap more profits. At the same time, departments are also pressured to generate funding for research (Delany, 2001). Alongside these increasing fund-raising and general administrative activities, heads of academic departments are also expected to widen their range of tasks to include the drafting of annual departmental strategic plans, demonstrable quality control procedures, staff appraisal schemes and general administrative activities (Sotirakou, 2004). At the same time, there has been a steady growth in the number of casual and part-time faculty at the cost of tenured positions at universities. Simultaneously encouraging early faculty retirements and reducing staff positions has been used as a management strategy in many American and Canadian universities (Berman, 1998; Lang, 2005), even more notably during the current worldwide economic recession.

Since the 1990’s, as a part of its higher education reforms, the Korean government has led structural change of universities. Various non-traditional universities such as cyber universities, corporate universities and credit bank systems have emerged, bringing greater diversity to the higher education system, and strengthening student choice and lifelong education (B. S. Lee, Kim, Kim, & Chae, 2005). At the same time, the government has delegated authority to universities and loosened regulations. Notwithstanding this ongoing delegation of authority to universities however, the Korean government has forced universities to change by introducing features such as checklists for restructuring and distribution of the budget (H. Son, 2002).

With the global trend towards increasing both autonomy and responsibility in university governance, Korean universities are faced with organisational and management change.
University leaders have transferred more authority to departments while teamwork is replacing the traditional segmented department system in university administration (A. Kim, Oh, Lee, Bak, & Yu, 2003). They report that universities operate task force teams for specialised projects, alongside regular departments or teams. Increasingly newly employed academics have annual contracts, and short-term contracts are replacing the traditional system of seniority-based work agreements and life-time tenure. Academic contracts are renewed annually based on performance review results. One of the leading universities in Korea, Yonsei University, has a centralised management system for all public research funds and a standardised administration system, which uses enterprise resource planning (ERP), to integrate all aspects of university human resource management, from finance and personnel to teaching and research (B. Kim, 1999). Sungkyunkwan University is a case of organisational restructuring where university autonomy was decentralised to the department level; colleges and graduate schools in the similar disciplines were combined; new curriculum and teaching methods were introduced; and more non-tenure track full-time academic faculty members were employed (J. Y. Kim, 2005).

University teaching, learning and research in the global era

In the era of knowledge-based societies, national economies increasingly depend on information and technology. The teaching and research functions of the university are becoming an increasingly important means of providing skilled workers and technology to industry. In turn, universities face rising demands for innovation, efficiency and responsiveness to stakeholders with regard to teaching and content (curriculum). In addition, technological developments have changed the ways in which knowledge is communicated at university (MacFarlane, 1995). Increasing transmission of knowledge via the internet and computer-based learning systems offers powerful possibilities for access and virtual mobility among staff and students, while at the same time adding to demands on staff. Finally, with the increasing international mobility of academics and students, it has become imperative for universities to transform their teaching and research in regard to content and methodology (Ryan, 2004).
From the late twentieth century, technology has been more pervasive in the classroom and more effective and cost-cutting teaching materials have altered learning practices (Ryan, 2004). For example, audio CDs and native-speaking internet partners are used in language studies and computer-based virtual problem-based learning is used in engineering, medical and design courses. Syllabus, reading lists and reference materials are uploaded to websites and Power Point presentations are common in classrooms. New technologies are being analysed and evaluated to improve learning in order to give students individual support and flexible learning opportunities (Anthony & Hallström, 2005). In particular, the spread of distance and virtual education have changed traditional teaching and learning platforms, offering possibilities that would not otherwise be available because of costs, time or location constraints. These enhanced learning opportunities have brought greater diversity of students to universities, enabling more women, ethnic and racial minorities and well as mature-aged students to pursue courses full time or part time (Shinn, 2002). In addition, developments in online education have contributed to the change of emphasis from teaching to learning. An online learning environment encompasses university services such as course administration, access to resources, and intra-student, and student-staff interactions within courses (Nunan, George, & McCausland, 2000).

Research in universities is being increasingly linked to industry. Scientific research with commercial applications reflects closer linkages between universities and businesses/industries (Stilwell, 2003). Ryan (2004) relates this trend to funding, asserting that in the context of diminishing government funds, universities find it hard to satisfy the demand for high cost technology facilities, so they cooperate with companies, establishing new university-company relationships. Following market demand, the R&D function of universities is becoming concentrated on science and engineering while research in humanities and social sciences is diminished (Slaughter, 1998).

Increasing the international exchange of knowledge and international mobility of academics is also bringing changes in teaching and learning, and research in higher
education. In a globalising world, large numbers of scholars and students travel abroad temporarily for teaching and learning, and research. Thus, internationalised curricula and relevant teaching and learning programs are becoming more important. Existing domestic-oriented courses are now infused with international content and institutions embrace more foreign language programs, international projects and area studies (Shinn, 2002).

Changes to teaching, learning, and research in Korean universities have been achieved, led by both strong governmental policies and the universities' own efforts. While some policies such as cyber universities and credit bank systems fundamentally expanded teaching and learning horizons, two government initiatives, namely Brain Korea 21 (BK21) and the New University for Regional Innovation (NURI) have changed research environments. The Brain Korea 21 (BK21) project was started in 1999 for the purpose of creating human resources through world-class graduate schools and improving the quality of research at universities (Jang, 2002). NURI, on the other hand, was established to provide support to universities at the local level, linking local universities, research institutions and industries (B. S. Lee et al., 2005). Reviewing the performance of the first seven-year period of BK21, Yu et al. (2002) claim that BK21 has contributed to the improvement of quality of research in the selected universities through increased international research collaboration with research students who work at advanced foreign institutions, and increased publication of articles in international journals. The report also suggested that the learning environment was improved.

At the same time, Korean universities have reformed also themselves in order to survive in the new and austere environment. Universities have strengthened research co-operation activities with industries and foreign institutions. University-industry collaboration benefits both sides; while universities receive financial support and more job opportunities for their students, industries develop their technology through university research. Co-operation with regional industries is a notable example. Hanyang University and Pusan University have both strengthened collaboration with high technology and finance industries (MOEHRD, 2005). However, the close link between industries and
universities is also a cause for concern. It has led to a strategic focus by universities on high profit areas and the cultivation of immediately effective technology and personnel. In addition, certain government priorities have encouraged a research focus on key research areas. On the other hand, the strengthening of research universities also strengthens co-operation with foreign institutions. More universities operate collaborative programs such as joint research and student exchange. For example, 14 Korean universities operated joint or duel degree programs, and 115 universities operated students exchange programs with their foreign counter parts in 2005 (MOEHRD, 2006d).

To sum up, under the challenge of various forces worldwide, universities are undergoing transformation. As discussed above, university funding and governance are influenced by market-driven principles. Given the importance of universities for national prosperity, the government strives to control the universities, mainly through funding policies. University governance aimed at enhancing institutional effectiveness, despite its questionable effect on academic functions, has led to academics becoming more cost-effective both in management and research. In addition, more sophisticated information communication technology (ICT) has enhanced student learning and extends the teaching and the learning environment from the traditional campus-based programmes to virtual programmes. In the next section, the impact of globalisation on the internationalisation of higher education will be discussed.

Internationalisation of higher education

Over the past decades, the process of internationalisation has become a much more prominent research theme, especially relating to higher education. Universities are internationally connected by increasing research collaboration and mobility of personnel. The international dimension has been diffused into various areas such as the content of the curriculum, policies and academic programmes. Accordingly, international trends have not just been limited to specific international activities and programs; there is a trend that internationalisation is conceived as a process to change institutions (Ellingboe, 1998). Knight (2003b, p. 2) defines internationalisation of higher education at the
national/sector/institutional levels as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education.”

Although internationalisation of higher education is believed to be one of the essential characteristics of universities (Altbach, 2004a), it has been strongly influenced by and even changed direction, in the context of globalisation. Therefore, in this part, to explicate internationalisation of higher education, internationalisation will be discussed in relation to globalisation. Rationales and strategies will then be developed to portray the discussion of internationalisation of higher education and an understanding of Korean universities’ internationalisation.

**Framing internationalisation of higher education in globalisation**

The internationalisation of higher education is a complex and ongoing process. While the international dimension of higher education is the central issue, the term, internationalisation, is being used in more and more diverse ways (Altbach, 2004a; Knight, 2004; Sporn, 2003; Teichler, 2004; van der Wende, 2001; Welch, 2005b).

Perceptions of internationalisation differ from people to people and country to country. For some, international academic co-operation promotes mutual understanding and conserves national identities but for others it threatens academic values. While elite universities may perceive internationalisation as an opportunity for international expansion, redbrick universities may feel transformation to be an imperative for the sake of survival. Different perceptions also result from the different cultural, historical, economic and political backgrounds which underpin different nation-states (Knight, 2006; R. Yang, 2002). As globalisation influences the international dimension of higher education, internationalisation has become a more complicated phenomenon within the higher education sector, reshaping its directions and patterns. Through intensified global connections, international activities such as international research collaboration and academic mobility have also grown. In this context, globalisation and internationalisation are commonly used to describe international dimensions in higher education.
Although the terms globalisation and internationalisation have been used interchangeably in higher education, the two phenomena have quite distinct and separate meanings (Knight, 2006; Teichler, 2004). The pivotal distinction stems from the position of the nation state. Globalisation transcends the borders of nation-states, but internationalisation embodies relationships between nations (S. Taylor, Rizvi, Lingard, & Henry, 1997). “Global” signifies intensive contact between people through the compression of time and space so as to eventually bring about the emergence of a global society, not founded on the nation state. The term “inter-national,” describes the growth of relationships between nations and national cultures in which the nation state is at the core (Marginson, 2000).

In the debate on the relationship between culture, globalisation and the nation state, cultural divergence adherents claim that globalisation leads to homogeneity, whilst internationalisation emphasises diversity (Gacel-Avila, 2005; Kishun, 1998). Basically internationalisation refers to the processes of co-operation between states based on the recognition of their own cultures and traditions, whereas globalisation refers to the processes of increasing interdependence and the potential ultimate convergence of culture (Knight, 2006). Amid concerns at this convergence through the spread of English and neo-liberal economic practices, cultural forms and social relations of dominant regions, globalisation also has the potential to bring about a multilingual and multicultural society (Marginson, 1999). Nonetheless this combination is different from that produced by internationalisation which presupposes exchange of culture and traditions, and cooperation with other countries is on somewhat equal terms. In contrast globalisation connotes that dominant global or regional cultures have strong influence on indigenous cultures and threatens their continued existence or at least their independence uncontaminated by dominant cultures.

These two terms, globalisation and internationalisation, are interpreted differently in the higher education sector. While globalisation is perceived as an important environmental factor of education, internationalisation is perceived as a response to globalisation (van der Wende, 2001). Distinguishing globalisation from internationalisation, Knight (2004,
2006) also argues that globalisation is positioned as part of the environment in which
the international dimension of higher education is becoming more important and is
significantly changing. In this respect, Altbach (2002) clarifies that globalisation refers to
trends in higher education which have cross-national implications, and
internationalisation refers to the specific policies and initiatives of countries and
individual academic institutions or systems to deal with global trends. As universities
internationalise, they do so within the context of globalisation.

Globalisation processes are not just the context for internationalisation, but a force that
impacts upon the international dimension of higher education, expanding it, and more
fundamentally, changing its values. Although fundamentally based on the idea of nation,
contemporary universities reveal an international dimension to their essential academic
values, promoting co-operation and collaborating with their foreign counterparts. Scott
(1998) categorises this trend as traditional internationalisation. However, while
globalisation, which has a conflicting value system based on competition and a nil-sum
game ideology that leads to one-sided benefits, stimulates the international dimension of
higher education, it also infuses its value into the international dimension (Kwick, 2001;
Welch, 2002). The current internationalisation of higher education incorporates both the
cooperative and collaborative, and the competitive value systems.

Yang (2002) describes the primary values of globalisation as competition, combat, and
one-sided economic benefits contrasting with the key internationalisation values of co-
operation, collaboration and mutual advantage. Internationalisation is based on the vision
of “international community, international cooperation, international community of
interests and international dimensions for the common good” (Jones, 1999, p. 147).
Therefore international norms and order may be achieved based upon mutual respect,
acknowledgement of difference and understanding among nations (Welch, 2002). Hence,
the value system of internationalisation translates into the advancement of human
knowledge, based on the realisation of the bonds of humanity, training intercultural
competence, and improvement in the quality of education (Currie et al., 2003; Knight,
1994; Stier, 2004; R. Yang, 2002). Internationalisation of higher education should be
based on academic values and a not-for-profit character of cross-border exchanges of people and knowledge (King, 2004b).

However, globalisation has brought different values to higher education. It has introduced a business culture and corporate ethos into higher education (Kwick, 2001; Teichler, 2004). Education has become commercialised, with words such as capitalism, managerialism and entrepreneurialism, which previously seemed ill-fitted to the education sector, now in common use in the university. In this education market, education consumers select an education service provider or commodities, according to brand-name or taste, and the provider (the university) struggles to improve its efficiency and productivity. These commercial values have also given an impetus to the international dimension of higher education. Universities internationally sell skills and training, awarding degrees or certificates under the rules of the WTO (Altbach, 2001). This trend is fuelled by a shortage of finance mainly due to the massification of higher education and reduction in student governmental funding. For example, universities have been pushed into the international market place to overcome their financial difficulties by attracting more full-paying international students and establishing offshore branch campuses. Sidhu (2006) insists that internationalisation of Australian universities was stimulated by government grants that enabled universities to develop promotional and marketing plans for overseas recruitment. This established the foundations for the export industry while allowing institutions to retain a large proportion of the international students fee income. Some contemporary international practices and programs in universities are far from the values of internationalisation. Therefore, Welch (2002) has distinguished between internationalisation and globalisation of higher education by pointing to the signs of globalisation in the commercialisation apparent in some international programs and activities. From this viewpoint, the commercial aspects of globalisation can be seen as a severe challenge to internationalisation and the two trends may lead in opposing directions, raising conflict (Scott, 1998).
Internationalisation values that have been reflected in academic values include cooperation and mutual benefit; however, under the influence of globalisation, new values have been added and are even replacing those of internationalisation. For example, the current commercialisation of international higher education is drastically transforming the key values of HEIs. Figure 1.1 illustrates this by listing two opposing sets of values, those of internationalisation and globalisation, where, under the impact of globalisation, the value of globalisation permeates the HE. Thus the current internationalisation of higher education exists within a mixed value system, where competition and commercialisation from globalisation contend with, and may at times come to dominate, the existing values of co-operation, collaboration and mutual benefit.
Rationales of internationalisation

The reasons why universities are internationalising are complicated and vary among nations and among universities, because they are based on the local situation. For universities in developing countries, it may be important to import advanced knowledge from universities in developed countries. If a nation-state views globalisation as a threat rather than an opportunity, universities in that country may concentrate more on national identity and development. Though there are many different reasons for internationalisation, academic, cultural, economic and political rationales are generally regarded as prominent (Knight, 1997, 2004).

With regard to internationalisation of higher education, it is perceived that the university's fundamental function is as an institution for the storage, generation and transmission of knowledge. The transfer of knowledge transcends political and geographical boundaries. Throughout history, scholars and students have travelled internationally in pursuit of academic knowledge (Welch, 1997; Welch & Zhang, 2007) and academic mobility was natural between universities in the medieval period (Stichweh, 2001). Pure academic curiosity for new knowledge cannot be limited by national boundaries. Therefore, it is desirable in higher education to gather information and exchange knowledge from all over the world (Teichler, 2004).

Knowledge transition and exchange is often tied to the improvement of educational quality (van der Wende, 1999). Among contemporary universities, particularly newly-established or less-developed ones, sending academics for academic research in advanced universities is a conduit for improvement of their quality (Altbach, 2004a). International cooperation can bring academic benefits to both less-developed and top-tier universities. This international approach often yields valuable knowledge advancements, while also bringing unexpected results when compared to research projects in a single country (Teichler, 2004), stimulating critical thinking and avoiding parochialism in scholarship and research (R. Yang, 2002).
The introduction of various international topics unrelated to any specific nation also strengthens international collaboration. For example, environmental and scientific research, which are matters of global concern, have been strengthened through international cooperation. Various international seminars are held, networking researchers internationally. This network of researchers has been used to exchange knowledge, and undoubtedly brings knowledge advancements that can satisfy mutual interests between nations.

The internationalisation of higher education is closely connected with cultural matters. As a "cultural centre" conserving tradition, culture and knowledge, the university can both preserve national cultures and improve intercultural understanding. Amid threats of cultural convergence in globalisation, most contemporary universities, which have been established by nation-states, stand for conservation of national culture and identity (Knight, 2006). Research on national culture in domestic institutions is promoted and the research of other countries and cultures is also supported (Bassett, 2006).

In addition, because mutual understanding and respect for different cultures are important in a inter-connected world, intercultural competencies are set requirements for students and staff (Stier, 2003). Intercultural and international content in the curriculum can assist students to increase their intercultural understating and skills (Shinn, 2002). As international mobility of personnel and international cooperation increase, intercultural competence assumes greater importance.

In the global knowledge economy, economic rationales are becoming more prominent (Currie et al., 2003). In the context of fierce economic, scientific and technological competition, human capital is essential for national prosperity. Industries demand suitable human resources in a global society which demands international and intercultural knowledge and skills. Students hope a university education will provide knowledge of other cultures and languages, and they willingly go abroad to develop international competence in order to gain better job opportunities in the international market. At the same time, to enhance the human capital of a country, governments make political efforts
to attract and retain domestic and international students and academics (Knight, 2004). While markets and students demand high international education standards, governments endeavour to retain national, and to attract international human resources for national prosperity. Accordingly, universities make efforts to be both internationalised and respond to national human capital demands.

Internationalisation of higher education is related to university financing and funding. Education services are a source of national income and can provide an alternative funding source for universities faced with reducing governmental financial support (K. Larsen & Vincent-Lancrin, 2002). In the WTO system, educational programs belong to the service sector. As international programs and the number of students increase, so does the provision of education services. The international market for student mobility alone amounted to US$ 40 billion in 2004 (OECD, 2009). Although exports of educational services are largely concentrated in a few advanced countries and their universities, more and more universities have entered this market, notably in the Asia-Pacific region, Singapore, Malaysia and China. In an effort to increase income in universities, various education programs such as distance learning, branch campuses and twinning programs are fuelling the growth of international programs of higher education. Ever-increasing competition in the education service market, and the reputation and quality of the university, are the factors that tend to attract international students and programs. To acquire a better international reputation, universities foster more international activities for academics and students.

From a political viewpoint, internationalisation of higher education can be seen as helping to preserve national identity and development through international collaboration which strengthen mutual benefits while reducing conflict between nations (Knight, 2006). Under threat from the converging global culture and influence of powerful international organisations, governmental independence in the face of international trends may help to sustain the national identity (de Wit, 1997). On the other hand, international exchange of knowledge via international research projects and mobility of researchers contributes to national development. In the Asian region, for example, newly developed South Korea
and Taiwan have successfully attained advanced knowledge and enhanced national
development (J. Johnson, 2002).

**Internationalisation strategies**

In the context of globalisation, institutions that have economic, cultural, political and
educational rationales for their international dimensions have expanded their various
international activities and programs. A university may often approach strategic planning
by building upon the varied activities and programs to develop institutional strategies for
internationalisation.

De Wit (2002) identifies internationalisation strategies as initiatives that are taken by an
institute of higher education to integrate an international dimension into research,
teaching and service functions as well as management policies and systems. Ellingboe
(1998) grouped varied international strategies into six areas: college leadership, faculty
involvement in international activities, an internationalised curriculum, international
study opportunities for students, integration of international students and scholars and
international co-curricular units and activities. Knight (1994) has categorised strategies at
the institutional level as program and organisational strategies (see Table 1.1). The lists in
each category cover various possible components of a university internationalisation
strategy, straddling both academic and administrative areas. In administrative areas,
while Ellingboe has categorised several components under the dimension of college
leadership, Knight presents more components in the sub-divisions i.e. governance and
human resource development.

In Knight's internationalisation strategies, program strategies refer to those academic
activities and services of an institution that integrate an international dimension into its
main functions whilst organisational strategies refer to those initiatives that help to ensure
that an international dimension is institutionalised through developing the appropriate
policies and administrative systems (Knight, 1997). Table 1.1 provides information and
examples of program and organisational strategies at the institutional level.
### Table 1.1 Institutional level program and organisational strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic programs</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student exchange programs, • Foreign language study, • Internationalised curricula, • Area or thematic studies, • Work/study abroad, • International students, • Teaching/learning process, • Joint/double degree programs, • Cross-cultural training, • Faculty/staff mobility programs, • Visiting lectures and scholars, • Link between academic programs and other strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research and scholarly collaboration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Area and theme centres, • Joint research projects, • International conferences and seminars, • Published articles and partners, • International research agreements, • Research exchange programs, • International research partners in academic and other sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External relations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community-based partnerships with NGO groups or public/private sector groups, • Community service and intercultural project work, • Customised education and training programs for international partners and clients, • International development assistance projects, • Cross-border delivery of education programs, • International linkages, partnerships and networks, • Contracts based training and research programs and services, • Alumni abroad programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extracurricular</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students clubs and associations, • International and intercultural campus events, • Liaison with community based cultural and ethnic groups, • Peer support groups and programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational strategies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expressed commitment by senior leaders, • Active involvement of faculty and staff, • Articulated rationale and goals for internationalisation, • Recognition of international dimension in institutional mission/mandate statements, and in planning, management and evaluation policy documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Integrated into institution-wide and department/college level planning, budgeting and quality review systems, • Appropriate organisational structures, • Systems for communication, liaison and coordination, • Balance between centralised and decentralised promotion and management of internationalisation, • Adequate financial support and resource allocation systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support from institution-wide service units, • Involvement of academic supports units, • Students support services for incoming and outgoing students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human resources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recruitment and selection procedures which recognise international expertise, • Reward and promotion to reinforce faculty and staff contributions, • Faculty and staff professional development activities, • Support for international assignments and sabbaticals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Adapted from Internationalisation of higher education: A conceptual framework (pp. 15-17), by J. Knight, in J. Knight & H. de Wit (Eds.), *Internationalisation of higher education in Asia Pacific countries* (pp. 5-19), 1997, Amsterdam: EAIE.
As a process, internationalisation strategies are undertaken within a university organisation. Knight (1994) identified six stages within a cycle for internationalisation: awareness, commitment, planning, operationalising, review, and reinforcement. According to Knight, university staff acknowledge the need, purpose and benefits of internationalisation and participate in the internationalisation. In the process of planning, steps, needs, purposes, objectives and strategies are identified, then, internationalisation strategies are implemented. All strategies are reviewed and finally reinforced via incentives and rewards.

**The context of internationalisation in Korean higher education**

While internationalisation is variously expected to foster mutual understanding, economic growth and enrichment of learning, there are also other concerns. Along with the importation of advanced knowledge and encouragement of mutual understanding that it brings, internationalisation is also affected by the Korean context of the mobility of the highly-skilled, and Korean culture and society.

The international mobility of academics and students is a key component of internationalisation in higher education. It is a goal and indicator of internationalisation in many universities. Although mobility of academics leads to internationalisation, it is also a major concern, because the common destination tends to be the English-speaking Western countries (de Wit, 1997; B. Lee, Park, & Lee, 2003). Wealthy nations attract academics and fee-paying students from the “poor” world, risking brain drain in their home countries (Stier, 2004). While receiving countries enjoy the advantage of financial and human resources gains, sending countries on the contrary experience intensified brain drain.

With regard to the mobility of Korean academics, there are two forces operating: brain drain and brain regain. There is an imbalance of international student mobility in Korea. Amongst OECD countries (including a non-OECD country, China), Korea was the third largest source country but fourth smallest recipient country in 2002 (OECD, 2004a).
Korea and its universities lack international students, while losing their own human resources and suffering brain drain. In the long term however, Korea has also benefited from returning academics. International activities have contributed to the development of Korean universities and their quality. During the 1970's to 80's, Korea incorporated advanced science and knowledge from developed countries via international activities. Choi (1999) insists that one of the main reasons for the rapid development of Korean science and technology was, indeed, just this international exchange of academics. The number and quality of returning scholars working in both universities and industrial sectors has significantly contributed to the development of Korea.

As Altbach (2004a) argues however, because of the disparity of advanced level resources, there are “centres and peripheries” in academia. The powerful universities and national systems have always dominated the production and distribution of knowledge, while weaker institutions follow. If a nation-state is overwhelmed by foreign advanced knowledge, where is its own academic base? Korean universities boast a comparatively high percentage of scholars who have obtained their highest degree in foreign countries. This dimension of academic mobility with its trends and issues for Korean higher education will be discussed in Chapter Two.

Internationalisation of higher education must be viewed within the context of culture. Yang (2002, p. 83) states that, for a university, cultures in internationalisation refer to the “the awareness and operation of interactions within and between cultures....” From a historical perspective, internationalisation for non-western countries was linked with colonial policies, ongoing western influence and greater inter-dependence (de Wit, 1997). Hence, in practice, internationalisation involves not only mutual co-operation, but conflict and adoption of foreign cultures.

Internationalisation of Korean higher education needs to be understood within the Korean cultural context. With regard to national culture, a national prosperity strategy based on advanced Western countries yields mixed emotions: rejection of and yearning for foreign culture. Although Korea has a long history of higher education, modern universities have
been modelled on western institutions and thus it is fair to say that western influence has been hegemonic. Furthermore the traditional set of values based on nationalism, ethnic homogeneity, Confucian hierarchy, communal values and patriarchy seem to conflict with the new internationalised Korean value system. These cultural dimensions and the context of Korean society will be discussed in Chapter Three.

Conclusion

Under globalisation, life in different regions of the globe is becoming more entwined and interwoven and this global network seems to ultimately orientate towards a “global village.” Hitherto, however, the openness and connection between regions was set within the context of the nation-state. As Weiss (1999) points out, global and national aspects are interdependent principles of organisation. Here lies the key to the transformation of higher education. While strong global economic values, political power and culture influence universities within a nation, national government policies and regional culture, are each an important impetus for change. Through funding policies, a government steers universities from a distance (Sidhu, 2006). More governmental funding is allocated through performance indicators which require academics to produce visible results in the relatively short-term. An entrepreneurial ethos and managerial techniques have come to influence governance within universities. With the development of technology and mobility of academics, those changes of funding and governance have also brought changes to teaching, studying and research.

The current globalised world is accentuating the internationalisation of higher education. Contemporary universities (based on the nation-state but also with intrinsically international aspects) are now entering a new phase. Increased international mobility of academics, various international programs and a permeating ethos of globalisation, have reshaped international dimensions. While an economic rationale is becoming important, educational, cultural and political rationales still lead the direction in international dimensions. In particular, the national situation, culture and the environment of individual
universities are factors that shape the purpose and strategies of internationalisation (J. G. Choi, 2003).

In the context of changing global environments, the internationalisation of Korean universities has at least two important components: academic mobility and the Korean cultural background. Academic mobility is certainly one aspect of internationalisation, but the uniqueness of the Korean academic mobility is brain drain in the short-term but brain regain in the long-term. Returnees and their influence are significant in the internationalisation of Korean higher education. The second factor is the Korean environment, including Korean higher education system, Korean culture and society. This is the background to any research seeking to understand the internationalisation of Korean higher education and will be taken up in Chapter Three.
CHAPTER TWO   THE INTERNATIONAL MOBILITY OF ACADEMICS

Introduction

International mobility has now increased to become of vital importance in the globalised world. Currently, diverse parts of the world are becoming much more closely interconnected through international mobility. Although current forms of ICT allow people to access to new information around the world without the need for physical mobility, nonetheless, this mobility is still increasing. With increased mobility, especially of the highly skilled, nation states have a vested interest in managing the impact of this mobility on national development. Since human capital theory emphasises the value of the highly skilled, the outflow of human recourses overseas is considered a national loss, and most sending countries struggle to minimise this loss, and retain or regain their overseas high-skilled nationals. More recently, however, mobility has been perceived to be of mutual benefit within the global context.

The huge scale of mobility has also emerged as an issue in the education sector. When international academics learn, teach and carry out research outside their home counties, they bring a mix of knowledge and academic culture to those foreign countries. When they return to their home countries, they bring home knowledge and academic culture as well. Consequently, the mobility of academics can yield knowledge advancements that benefit both the host and home countries. With the mobility of academics, the ethos of academic exchange and cooperation of universities reveals itself in internationalisation. Internationalisation of higher education, which was triggered by academic mobility, is now shaped by that mobility.

This chapter begins with an exploration of varied approaches to the mobility of the highly skilled. After scrutinising the approaches it focuses on reverse brain drain. Next is a discussion of the impact of academic mobility on higher education. It especially focuses on their impact in terms of knowledge development and change, and internationalisation.
The mobility context: Changing perceptions of mobility of the highly skilled

The mobility of the highly skilled between countries with different levels of development has been a critical issue and remains an intractable problem. Once imbalanced flows, the so called “brain drain,” was a source of severe concern to sending countries, but the positive effect of repatriates on the country of origin and the networks of the highly skilled has reshaped perceptions of the international mobility of the highly skilled. The following section examines various critical approaches to the mobility of highly skilled, and concepts such brain drain, brain circulation and diaspora, from a human capital theory basis. The section concludes with research into reverse brain drain which is a key concept to this research.

From brain drain to diaspora

In recent decades, much discussion of mobility has been based on the concept of human capital. Human capital refers to the fact that human beings invest in themselves to produce future benefits in the form of higher income for both individuals and for society as a whole (Becker, 1975). According to human capital theory workers shape and develop those attributes that influence the improvement of productivity, through education, training and other activities (Woodhall, 1986). The highly skilled with university degrees or extensive equivalent experience in a given field are seen as key instruments for growth (Auriol & Sexton, 2002). Therefore, the mobility of the highly skilled has become a matter of national concern, raising welfare and economic development issues (Bhagwati & Rodriguez, 1976; Grubel, 1987; Lucas, 2001; Olesen, 2002).

International mobility of the highly skilled which is termed “brain exchange” implies “a two-way flow expertise between a sending country and a receiving country” but the net flow is biased in one direction mainly from developing countries to developed countries so the term “brain drain” is used (Salt, 1997, p. 5). The concept “brain drain” is used to refer to the migration of highly skilled individuals, who are initially trained in one country and then take up residence and work in another (Grubel, 1987).
The mobility flow patterns have been distinguished from those flowing from between the less developed to developed countries and vice versa, and critical approaches to the "brain drain" tend to be divided into the "internationalist" and "nationalist" models. In the "internationalist" model, the mobility of the highly skilled is perceived to raise the total world output (H. Johnson, 1968). Since human capital theory sees knowledge as a form of capital, it is unconcerned about where that human capital is located as long as it can flow freely. Johnson (1968) insists that when human capital flows from regions of low productivity to regions of high productivity, resources will be allocated rationally worldwide, maximising world output and benefiting the world as a whole economically. However, from the "nationalist" perspective, because human capital is an indispensable resource for national economic development, international mobility creates a loss for sending countries (Partinkin, 1968). Sending countries lose out on the return of the capital they invested in individuals, and taxes cannot be collected from them (Mullan et al., 1995). As permanent emigration of the highly skilled may result in a loss of technological development and economic growth, sending countries are vitally concerned about the "brain drain" (Dzvimbo, 2003).

However, in a globalising world where more people transfer across national boundaries, the mobility of the highly skilled is understood differently. Recent literature on the "brain drain" has drawn attention to some of the potential benefits of technology transfers, trade and capital flows induced by "brain circulation" (Gaillard & Gaillard, 1998; Saxenian, 2002, 2006; Solimano & Pollack, 2004). The concept of "brain circulation" refers to the flow of expertise between sending and receiving countries in a way that is mutually benefit sides (Mahroum, 1999).

Receiving countries enjoy several net positive effects academic mobility such as the stimulation of an innovation capacity, an increase in the stock of available human capital and the international dissemination of knowledge (Solimano & Pollack, 2004). For sending countries in the short term, the loss of human capital has a negative effect, but the return of migrants and the development of networks is beneficial in the long term.
OECD, 2002b). For example, the returning highly skilled bring development and technology transfer to their home countries (Kapur, 2001; Lucas, 2001). The return of migrants which is often called reverse brain drain refers to the phenomenon of those who study toward advanced degrees and work in their professions in a more developed country for a time, but ultimately return to their home countries permanently (H. Choi, 1995). The contribution of repatriates was particularly crucial for the development of the Korean semiconductor industry and equally, in Taiwan, economic growth of the late 1980s was fuelled by returned scientists and engineers (J. Johnson, 2002). Immigrant countries such as the United States, also regard reverse brain drain as providing opportunities through science and technology partnerships (J. Johnson, 2002). Usually, repatriated scholars do not completely isolate themselves from their former colleagues abroad. Rather, they are likely to strengthen scientific ties with U.S.-based scholars in order to keep up with the newest developments in the field (H. Choi, 1995).

The significance of the world wide human network in terms of knowledge transfer and development of countries continues in the discourse of the diaspora. The term, diaspora, once referred to the dispersion of ancient Jews and Greeks, but has now widened to include political refugees, guest workers, alien residents, expellees and overseas communities (Shuval, 2000). In comparison with other types of migration, a diaspora is a "system of personal networks, shared culture and language, and an imaginary relationship to the homeland" (Kapur, 2001, p. 5). Because the diaspora is a network, which maintains an identity and connection to the home country, its role is varied but can be crucial. The network is a means of channelling the economic resources of the overseas diaspora to encourage investment and entrepreneurial activity in the homeland (Reis, 2004). For example, in 2002, remittances accounted for 9.6% of the GDP in the Philippines (Chalamwong, 2004). In China, from 1987 to 1995, 67.5% of the accumulated foreign direct investment came from the Chinese residents of Hong Kong, Macao and Taiwan (Lucas, 2001). The role of the diaspora is also significant from a political viewpoint. Shain and Barth (2003) identifying diaspora as an active force, pointing out its influence on foreign policies in their hostlands and homelands. Diasporas often organise interest groups in order to influence the foreign policies of their hostland vis-à-vis their
homelands. In addition, the diaspora directly affect the foreign policies of residents' homelands since they may achieve economic and political power, while also forming a source of recruits and funding.

While coping with brain drain, sending countries now increasingly recognize diaspora as a channel for technology transfer. So-called knowledge diaspora maintain an attachment to their homelands, and can create knowledge networks in order to connect professionals and scientists around the world to help promote the scientific and economic development of their home countries (Solimano, 2002). For instance, grassroots initiatives in South Africa and Latin America developed to link researchers abroad to networks in their home countries. Indian professionals in the U.S. have been the primary driving force in the transfer of knowledge to India (Cervantes, 2002; Saxenian, 2006). The Korean diaspora networks reinforce the unity of overseas Koreans and their attachment to their homeland. For example, the global network of Korean scientists and engineers (Kosen) strengthens bridges between the homeland and host country for highly skilled Korean scientists and scholars. Without permanent repatriation, diaspora transfer expertise and skills to the countries of origin, strengthening the connection between host and home countries.

Reverse brain drain

Recently, there has been a trend for the mobility of the highly skilled to be understood as a potentially mutually beneficial phenomenon for both the host and home countries. While the home country of the expatriates gains through the additional skills, knowledge and networks they may bring, the host country does not suffer a disadvantage, whether immigrants work within its borders or return to their country of origin. Instead, within the context of a global network, increasing mobility of the highly skilled strengthen links between countries and opens more opportunities for countries (Lucas, 2001). Nevertheless, despite this mutual benefit viewpoint, countries are still eager to gain the highly skilled internationally and retain their own in order to maintain their competitive edge and replenish their national labour pool. Indeed, countries such as the U.S., Australia, Canada, Germany, have all established targeted migration schemes, to compete
for mobile talent. Brain circulation feeds new forms of global competition (Favell, Feldblum, & Smith, 2006). While advanced countries which are experiencing a net brain gain refine their brain gain strategies, sending countries endeavour strongly to regain the highly skilled, and strengthen international knowledge networks via diaspora strategies.

The pattern of the academic mobility cycle is often one of moving abroad to study, then taking a job abroad, and later returning home to take advantage of a good job opportunity. In America, for example, foreign recipients formed about 29% of PhD recipients in all disciplines in the year 2000 (Burrelli, 2004). In order to investigate the stay rate of foreign recipients, Finn (2005) probed their Income and Social Security tax records. His research revealed that an estimated 68% of foreign doctoral recipients in the science engineering disciplines in 2000 were still resident in 2005. According to the research, it was assumed that some of the foreign students who developed knowledge in those areas returned to their home countries as scientists and researchers. Overseas mobile academics often settle abroad and build their professional and personal life there but they may be still concerned with the development of their country of origin and often return to their home countries (Meyer & Brown, 1999).

The migration literature often classifies international mobility of academics as being driven by “push” and “pull” factors. In general, as Guellec & Cervantes (2002) point out, the economic, political, academic situation of countries and the strategies of individuals seeking international experience should be included as the main drivers of international mobility. Among frequently cited push factors in the home countries are an oppressive political system, lack of job opportunities, and social problems. These are counterbalanced by a number of pull factors that motivate the academic to return, such as commitment to home, economic growth and increased demand for skills (Marks, 2004). On the other hand, for host countries while some factors such as political stability, higher salaries, and professional career development seem to pull to retain migrants, difficulties of adjustment caused by cultural differences, dissatisfaction with foreign life and inadequate job opportunities tend to push migrants to return to their home countries (Slawon, 1998; H. J. Song, 1991). Academics may decide to return home only if the
influence of push factors from abroad and pull factors from home country far exceeds
the influence of pull factors from abroad and push factors from home (Altbach, 1998). In
spite of some flaws in the push and pull factor description, it provides a reasonable
general picture of individuals’ decisions for migration (Dzvimbo, 2003; Thorn & Holm-
Nielsen, 2008).

The specific strategies of home countries has drawn greater attention as a strong
influence on return migration (Guellec & Cervantes, 2002; Lucas, 2001). An increase in
the demand for skilled labour has prompted countries to develop targeted policies of
return migration. Policies by source countries to regain human capital have been
implemented to intensify pull factors and minimise push factors (Dzvimbo, 2003; Kapur
& McHale, 2005). Thorn and Holm-Nielsen (2008) have categorised varied policies into
“individual-based approaches” and “systemic approaches.” The former policies shape the
individual decisions of researchers and scientists and the latter aims to stimulate return by
improving framework conditions and opportunities. Individual-based approaches are
policies designed to oblige individual researchers and scientists to return home or to
provide economic incentives to induce them to do so. Systemic approaches are policies to
strengthen national innovation systems, provide more funding for science and research,
create job opportunities for young researchers and strengthen tertiary and graduate
education. In practice the two approaches have often been combined to create an
integrated and effective policy response. For example, both the Taiwanese and Korean
governments in the 1980’s encouraged return of their overseas scientists by both offering
high salary and job opportunities, and creating improved working conditions such as
research facilities, equipment, and organisational autonomy (Kapur, 2001). These policy
approaches then acted as the catalyst to draw overseas researchers home.

Once expatriate highly skilled return home, they often play a significant role in for the
growth and development of their home countries. Referring to economic studies such as
Ammassari (2004), and McCormick and Wahba (2003), Kapur and McHale (2005) insist
that returnees’ overseas work experience plays a useful role in the development process
of the home country, introducing new work practices and technologies and stimulating
investment. Saxenian (2006) in her research on the contribution of emigrants returning from Silicon Valley during the 1980s and 1990s, argues that they brought technical and operating experience, knowledge of new business models, and networks of contacts in the U.S. Returnee contributions are not limited to economic areas. Returning elite academics play an important role in reforming their societies. Rejecting irrational business practices such as familial patronage, opacity and corruption which dominate many developing economies, they have engaged policymakers to develop policies that improve the local environment for entrepreneurship (Saxenian, 2006). Over the longer term, Kapur and Mchale (2005) argue that Soviet citizens returning from America during the final decades of communism helped raise the Iron Curtain, by fostering cultural exchange.

The explicit contribution of returnees to home countries stems from the advantages they acquired from their experience in host countries. Returnees may increase their stock of human capital during their period overseas, learning advanced technology, management and trade, accumulating advanced work experience, building knowledge networks and broadening their horizons of international, intercultural competence (Guochu & Wenjun, 2002). Some empirical research indicates that returnees have advantages over those who stay at home. The research on Hungarian return migrants shows there is a premium accorded to work experience abroad, while there are large differences amongst returnees across gender and compared to the host countries in which the experience occurred (Co, Gang, & Yun, 2000). Barrett and O Connell (2001) also maintain that returning Irish emigrants have been found to be more skilled than the permanent labour force.

However, despite some advantages experienced on return to the home country, returnees still face difficulties. During their period of readjustment to their home country, returnees confront an environment which is different to the one with which they were familiar before leaving (Meyer, 2001). If they work as an entrepreneur, returnees often experience regulatory constraints on private sector enterprise and conflicting perspectives on returnees from those who remained home (Kapur & McHale, 2005). If they return to work at a home institution, returnees may seek to use their experience from the host country to reshape the institution but they may face difficulties as technical and
entrepreneurial development remain rooted in the limitations of local financial, regulatory, and management models (Saxenian, 2006). The unreliability of colleagues, weakness of infrastructure and a job which is quite different from their professional situation abroad have often presented huge problems (Meyer, 2001). Confronting these difficulties at their home country may cause returnees to become frustrated, and increase their likelihood of remigration at a later stage (Thorn & Holm-Nielsen, 2008).

The impact of academic mobility on higher education

Over the few past decades, academic mobility in the higher education sector has brought about substantial change in the universities. Alongside the increasing importance of human resources in the knowledge-based society, the significant numbers of international students and scholars is perceived as a driving force of academic development and internationalisation of higher education (Mahroum, 2000; Welch & Zhang, 2007). Not surprisingly, large numbers of international academics change the shape of the university, especially its international dimensions. In spite of the asymmetry of mobility between developed and less developed countries, international students and scholars are the main factor in the internationalisation of universities in both the receiving and sending countries.

Knowledge development and change

The impact of academic mobility is enormous in the advancement of knowledge and change. For over a thousand years, as Welch (1997) has pointed out, geographically and politically bounded knowledge has been expanded via peripatetic scholars. High calibre scholars have travelled seeking knowledge and students. Also students have congregated where advanced knowledge and well-known scholars were situated. Knowledge at a distance has accumulated through expedition and academics’ travels, which have played a crucial role in the acquisition of knowledge in a number of historically important scientific fields (Harris, 1998). Recently, with increased academic mobility, the impact on knowledge advancement and change has become a main issue in universities.
Knowledge production and dissemination is based on a network in which information is constantly exchanged between the centre and the periphery via peripatetic researchers (Altbach, 1998; Connell & Wood, 2002; Latour, 1987). In the international knowledge system, the global mobilisation of scholars and students fosters a circulation of knowledge and ideas that transcends national boundaries (Altbach, 1998). Latour (1987) perceives a centre in a cycle of knowledge in which knowledge is accumulated from less known places, so-called “peripheries.” As researchers travel more, knowledge is aggregated in home institutions and even though the place may be a small town or an obscure laboratory, it can become a centre, which dominates many other places at a distance (Latour, 1987). On the other hand, in the context of inequality of economic and political power in a globalised world, the centre and the periphery of knowledge production and dissemination has been explained as a more fixed “dominant-subordinate” relationship (Altbach, 1998). While core nations play a leading role in the production and distribution of advanced knowledge, peripheral nations mainly receive knowledge from other places (H. Choi, 1999).

Knowledge dissemination in the form of academic mobility exists in the context of the convergence and divergence of academic traditions in different geographical sites (Mahroum, 2000). Centres in the “dominant-subordinate” relationship in the international knowledge system exhibit a degree of convergence of academic traditions. While the centre gives directions and models producing research, peripheries copy developments, imitating their models (Altbach, 1998). Latour’s (1987) concept of “cycle of accumulation,” however, presupposes that anywhere the academics go to gather information can be a centre if varied knowledge is accumulated from remote areas and developed to a new knowledge, interacting with the pre-existing knowledge base at home.

Advanced universities lead in research and teaching, creating worldwide centres of academic excellence in which more scholars and students gather. Internationally, academics are concentrated in selected advanced countries where industries are developed and new knowledge is generated. In 2005, about 64% of international students
were attracted to six countries, the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Australia and Japan, and 22% went to the U.S. alone (OECD, 2007). Knowledge and research methods are disseminated by such international academics to their home countries, which may bring a degree of homogenisation of higher education. When knowledge transfers from centre to periphery, the impact of centres and their initiative in research is maintained (Altbach, 1998).

In this homogenised environment, the role of the returning academic can significantly assist local universities to catch up with world-class universities. Academics who carried out research in the advanced universities are often particularly welcome at home universities and frequently have strong academic influence (Altbach, 1998). When Guo (1998), for example, reviewed the influence of foreign ideas and modes on Chinese higher education, he described returnees academic leadership as follows: a majority of returned scholars were appointed as group leaders at institutions and some have taken leadership positions as provincial governor or even cabinet minister. Academics in peripheral universities tend to go to centres where they can join in advanced research and acquire new knowledge along with the norms and values of the academic system (Connell & Wood, 2002). When they return and work as academic staff, much that they learned at the host universities is potentially infused into the curriculum and research at home universities. For example, foreign-trained professors frequently use foreign textbooks and research materials when they teach and carry out research, and the connection to host countries is a knowledge conduit for them (Altbach, 1998).

Another point of discourse about the impact of academic mobility on the higher education sector is the divergence of academic traditions. When academics bring in knowledge and ideas, they are applied locally and transformed in the region so that they evolve differently in the adopted areas from their place of origin (Mahroum, 2000). Because the academic atmosphere, scientific positions and research methods differ between countries and institutions, knowledge transfer can lead to the academic traditions of host institutions blending with those of home institutions. In addition, researchers who have varied academic and cultural backgrounds, enrich academic diversity. As
international exchange programs based fundamentally on the idea of diversity preserve national academic traditions while harmonising with foreign academia (Baumgratz-Gangl, 1996), and more academics acquire foreign experience, a more diverse academic atmosphere is formed in both home and host institutions. University students of diverse backgrounds can foster intercultural development in society and amongst individuals (Volet, 2003) and most teachers who experienced teaching abroad via the European Region Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students (ERASMUS) programme in Europe responded that their international and intercultural understanding improved (Enders & Teichler, 2005).

Divergence of academic traditions within a region, however, does not seem to occur automatically when advanced knowledge is exported. There are at least two prerequisites: the establishment of a certain degree of academic identity, and the regional centre developing a tradition of regional strength with their own standards and knowledge accumulation and dissemination system. In the globalised knowledge system, all regions operate within the one knowledge system. In this system, accordingly, there is no place for an isolated island; hence regional universities are both connected to the centre and peripheries of knowledge. As Latour (1987) states, even small laboratories in remote areas can produce new knowledge when they continuously communicate in international knowledge networks. However, the centre not only produces advanced knowledge but also standardises it. Peripheries are pressed to follow this standard. Therefore, regional institutions need to establish their own academic identities. They have to standardise regional knowledge at the very least and diffuse it, and not just import knowledge from the centre but plant it creatively in the regional soil.

Within this worldwide trend of convergence of academic traditions, regional responses vary. Even peripheral universities, which follow advanced universities, are often regional centres (Altbach, 1998). Universities are rooted in their region, responding to the demands of local society to a greater or lesser degree, and conserving local traditions. Though academic development and changes at the periphery may start from imitating
knowledge and ideas from the centre, blending with local tradition eventually leads to
diversity.

Internationalisation

Academic mobility has been a major focus in the internationalisation discourse. The term has often been used to depict the international aspect of the university. International mobility is a key factor in perceiving universities as international institutions from the medieval era onwards (Altbach, 1998; Enders, 2004; Teichler, 1999) and for the same reason some go further in extending the history of internationalisation to ancient Greece and China where peripatetic scholars travelled across national boundaries (Welch, 2005b; R. Yang, 2002). At modern universities, the explosion in the international flow of academics has been a major factor enabling the university to become more international (Scott, 1998). As international aspects become an essential part of higher education, recent internationalisation discourse has tended to extend the domain to the whole process of internationalisation at universities rather than focus only on international students (Knight, 1994). However, Knight (2003a) affirms that academic mobility remains the most important aspect of internationalisation.

International academic mobility includes both students’ and scholars’ mobility. They visit foreign countries for the purpose of study, research or teaching, participating in conferences and exchange programs in the short term, or pursuing degree or non-degree research in the long term. During recent decades, the number of foreign tertiary level students has noticeably increased globally. Since 2000, the number has increased by 8.4% annually and in 2005, 2.7 million international students enrolled outside their country worldwide (OECD, 2007). Notwithstanding the lack of statistics of the mobility of scholars worldwide, some evidence in the U.S. and European countries indicates that there has also been an increase in the number of international scholars. Between 1999-2000, and 2005-2006, the number of foreign scholars at U.S. academic institutions increased by 21.8% from 79,651 to 96,981 (Institute of International Education, 2002,
2007). In European countries, since the establishment of ERASMUS there has been considerable increase in staff mobility (Baumgratz-Gangl, 1996).

As culturally mixed groups on international campuses provide opportunities for multicultural learning, international experiences enhance intercultural competence for students and scholars. Stier (2003) states that studying abroad, or studying in ethnically diverse home universities, facilitates intercultural competence and personal growth. Shinn (2002) also claims that student diversity on a campus, can result in educationally significant outcomes for students, including increased cognitive and affective development and greater cultural awareness. Considering that one of the primary reasons for internationalisation of higher education is the improvement of international and intercultural knowledge and skills of students (Knight, 1994), academic mobility is a key means to enhance internationalisation.

A different academic and cultural environment is an opportunity to gain added academic experience and cross-cultural experience, but it can also cause discomfort and difficulties in adjustment. Mahroum (2000) maintains that greater differences in scientific traditions between home and host countries, have lead to greater impacts on peripatetic academics. However, at the same time, living and working in different cultures interferes with the quality of the experience (McNamee & Faulkner, 2001). In the case study of a top research university in U.S., Trice (2003) notes that the most common challenges faced by international students are functioning in English, achieving distinct academic goals, adjusting culturally and integrating with domestic students. Like other types of return migration, difficulties also occur when they return to their home countries. In the case of returning Asian students from New Zealand, Butcher (2002) found that in contrast to returnees' high expectations, there are shortages of well-paid high status jobs, and difficulties in transferring skills they acquired at host universities into the work environments in their countries of origin. They also face difficulties in re-establishing relationships with family and friends, consolidating a changed worldview and confronting the gap between expectations and reality.
In terms of the internationalisation of higher education, the mobility of academics is often beneficial to universities both in receiving and sending countries. At host universities, international students may fill research-assistant vacancies, help faculty members establish international ties and provide domestic students with a more accurate perception of diverse life circumstances (Trice, 2003). In researching the impact of international students in New Zealand, Ward (2005) declares that cultural awareness at institutions may, but not necessarily however, result from the presence of international students. For home universities, returnees who have acquired advanced knowledge, international and intercultural competence may be the main driving sources for internationalisation if they work at universities as academic staff. Welch (1997) argues that there are significant differences between international and home-grown scholars. So called, “peripatetic” scholars who obtained their highest degree overseas frequently sustain a more international profile than locally oriented peers, maintain more frequent attendances at international conferences and value foreign connections more highly. While teaching, carrying out research, and governing institutions, the scholars’ attitudes and values have an impact on their students and on the ethos of the universities (Clark, 1987). Therefore, considering the tendency of preference for foreign PhDs, and their symbolic power at universities in developing and newly industrialised countries (Altbach, 1998), the role of the returnees in internationalisation is significant.

**Trends and issues of academic mobility in Korean universities**

The number of overseas Korean students has rapidly increased in the past decade. The number tripled from 53,875 in 1991 to 159,903 in 2003 and the trend continued in 2006 to 190,364 (MOEHRD, 2004, 2006b). Compared to other countries Korea was the third biggest sending country in 2005 (OECD, 2007). In terms of receiving international students, Korea remains in the smallest group, but recently it has attracted more foreign students. The number of international students enrolled at degree and non-degree courses in Korean higher education institutions tripled from 11,646 in 2001 to 32,557 in 2006 (MOEHRD, 2006b).
The mobility of students, both inbound and outbound, is concentrated in particular countries. Statistics of Korean students' mobility reveal that 79% of overseas Korean students are concentrated in the following six countries: U.S. (30%), China (15%), U.K. (10%), Australia (9%), Japan (8%), and Canada (7%) (MOEHRD, 2006a). 87% of incoming students come from the following six countries: China (62%), Japan (11%), U.S. (5%), Vietnam (4%), Taiwan (3%), and Mongolia (3%) (MOEHRD, 2006b). Notwithstanding the preference of outbound Korean students for study in the U.S., their actual destination can vary significantly but the influx of inbound foreign students is slanted towards Asia and heavily reliant on China.

Academic staff mobility in Korea is increasing in both directions; increased numbers of Korean staff visit foreign countries and more foreigners work in the Korean higher education sector. In spite of the lack of statistics on the mobility of university academic staff, national statistics indicate that there are increasing international visits. The ratio of
overseas visiting academic staff to full-time academic staff at all Korean higher education institutions has increased from 11.9% in 2003 to 15.8% in 2004 (Korean Council for University Education, 2006). The number of Korean visiting scholars in the U.S., for example, has increased from 5,830 in year 2000/01 to 9,291 in year 2006/7, an average 10% annual increase (Institute of International Education, 2007). The number of foreign academic staff working at Korean higher education institutions is also increasing. In 2006 there were 2,540 foreign academic staff which represented an annual increase of about 17% from 1,387 in 2002 (MOEHRD, 2006c). The top sending country was the U.S., followed by Canada, Japan, and China.

This increasing academic mobility draws attention to one explicit feature of the Korean higher education sector, namely the number of scholars employed in foreign countries after gaining their PhDs: the so-called, knowledge diaspora. In fact, despite the large numbers of Korean students studying overseas, the relatively high return rates of Korean academics on completion of research is a distinctive feature of the mobility of Korean academics. Of all foreign doctorate recipients from U.S. universities from 1987 to 1998 who stayed 4 to 5 years after graduation, Korean rates of stay remain low. In 2003, for example, Koreans' stay rate was 34% compared with China (90%), India (86%), Taiwan (47%), and Japan (37%) (Finn, 2005, p. 8). Notwithstanding the high rate of brain drain in general, Korea has benefited by brain regain strategies focused on the “core high skilled” including PhDs and experienced researchers.

Analyses of the impact of returning scholars in Korea have been mainly focused on national development and knowledge transfer. Yoon (1992) emphasised the returning researchers’ contribution to national development during the 1970’s when Korea was still a less developed country. The important role played by returning scholars in science and technology is well documented by Hyaeweol Choi (1999). Choi (1999) asserts that the Korean government should take advantage of returning researchers to help development of high technology institutions and also stresses the importance of giving more autonomy to returned scholars. Song’s (1997) research into the changing phenomenon from brain drain to brain regain in Korea, shows the returning scholars’ contribution to the transfer
of technology and national development in past decades. When Korea was at a basic stage of development, returning scholars who studied in advanced countries were the driving force for national development in their transference of new science and technology. In the international knowledge network, the returning scholar's role is even more important. Through communication with foreign institutions and scholars, they continuously receive and distribute new knowledge.

However, the positive impact of returning scholars in Korean universities may be modified by their experiences of resettlement and assimilation of their knowledge. As Trier (1996) analysed in the case of the return of the highly educated Russian Jews, returnees often experienced identity ambiguity and feel the culture of home country to be unfamiliar. Moreover, homeland residents often feel that a returnee may threaten their status or their property (Shuval, 2000). Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that, for Korean returnees, the longer they live in host countries, the harder they may find it to resettle in Korean society. In academia, returnees will compete with domestic educated researchers and may struggle to adapt to Korean university culture, at times influencing and at other times compromising with domestic academic culture. In addition, some doubts have been expressed as to the returnees' academic impact on higher education. As Altbach and Teichler (2001) indicate, knowledge in advanced countries tends to be focused on the concerns and interests of those advanced countries rather than those of the peripheries, however Korean returnees may tend to indiscriminately apply foreign curriculum and knowledge to the home universities (J. K. Lee, 2001). Moreover, the preference for overseas PhD holders and the high proportion of American-based PhDs raises concerns of academic dependency (Sin, 2005). In spite of the visible positive academic impact of returned academics on Korean universities, possible conflicts the domestic academic culture and foreign-based academic influences may have a negative impact on Korean universities.

With regard to internationalisation of Korean universities, the high rate of international experience of Korean academics is a positive factor. There are large numbers of overseas Korean students, and equally impressive numbers of academic staff with overseas PhD in
Korean universities. Commenting on the increasing ratio of foreign-educated academic staff at Korean universities, H. G. Kim (2000) has responded that following global trend in academia, Korean universities seem to prefer foreign PhDs. The overall influence of foreign educated academic staff on internationalisation of Korean universities is not yet clear, but as Enders and Teichler (2005) state, their international experience may contribute to the improvement of the international and intercultural awareness for them and for their universities.

Previous research predicts a positive role for returnees in Korean universities. Lee (1996) stated that in the generally low level of international connection among Korean scholars, foreign-educated scholars have better opportunities to develop academic relationships with colleagues in other countries because of their language skills and previous connections with foreign academics. In research on ten Korean universities, Choi (2003) found that academics with overseas experience were more actively involved in international programs. However, Kim (2005) noted the exclusive nature of aspects of university academic culture in Korea as a barrier to internationalisation and transformation of cultural identity, asserting that regardless of the international experiences of Korean university academics studying abroad, not many returnees preserved the intercultural identities they had gained. Moreover, returnees often faced difficulties in Korean academic atmosphere that hindered them from contributing to the development and internationalisation of the university (Namgung, 2006). In spite of the returnee’s significant contribution to internationalisation in general, it seems that their impetus was eroded during their readjustment to Korea.

Conclusion

In the era of knowledge-based societies where national economies increasingly depend on information and technology, the highly skilled are considered indispensable for national development. Given the importance of the highly skilled, especially to sending countries, retaining their talent, and regaining overseas expatriate highly skilled has become a matter of concern. Along with changing perceptions of international mobility
of the highly skilled from brain drain to brain circulation, recently, there increasing consideration has been given to the role and contribution of diaspora. Nevertheless, returnees who temporarily or permanently return to their home county are still regarded as important human resources for home countries. Therefore, sending countries have implemented policies to bring the highly skilled back home from their overseas diaspora (Kapur & McHale, 2005).

The significance of international academic mobility in the higher education sector is linked to the potential of the HEI for knowledge advancement and change. While academic mobility brings knowledge advancement, it also fosters change in university academic traditions, norms and culture. In the international knowledge system, peripatetic scholars play a key role in transferring knowledge and ideas between the centre and the periphery. In general, their impact on home universities is felt most strongly within the context of the convergence and divergence of academic traditions. Despite trends towards convergence, the impact of international mobility of academics on universities rests within the context of the unique national, social and institutional cultures leading to different responses in different universities.

Internationalisation of higher education is also closely linked to the mobility of academics. Peripatetic scholars have crossed national boundaries since ancient times, and the university has preserved this international aspect from the beginning. In this context, increased academic mobility impels universities to be more international. For students and scholars, a different academic environment is an opportunity to gain added academic and cross-cultural experience. From gathering academics worldwide, the host university experiences an accumulation and sharing of various knowledge, customs and tradition. From returning academics, the home university also experience dissemination of knowledge enriching its academic diversity.

The international academic mobility in the Korean higher education sector has certain key features, notably increasing numbers evident in both inbound and outbound mobility. Relatively large numbers of Korean students studying abroad and the high rate of
returning Korean PhD holders is one of the distinctive influences for the development and internationalisation of Korean universities, as is the preference for study in the U.S. Returnees have been key sources for advanced knowledge and international networks. The high rate of returned scholars in the Korean higher education sector arouses both expectations and concerns. Returnees may contribute to improvement of the international and intercultural awareness, knowledge development, and academic diversity for the university. On the contrary, there are concerns about potential academic dependency for Korean university, and that difficulties experienced by returnees may impede their contribution.
CHAPTER THREE CONTEMPORARY KOREAN UNIVERSITIES: INTERNATIONALISED AND INFLUENCED BY TRADITION

Introduction

Internationalisation is considered to be one of the major trends in the development of higher education. It is no longer unusual for countries and universities to be aggressively internationalising but their perceptions and implementation of internationalisation differ according to their social, cultural, political and economic contexts. Internationalisation is currently emphasised in Korean higher education. The uniqueness of the Korean universities' approach principally stems from the distinctiveness of the Korean higher education system, governmental policies and Korean society itself. This chapter provides a background to internationalisation in Korea from the history of Korean higher education with focus on some specific salient features. Firstly, a discussion on the longstanding interaction between specific domestic roots and imported exotic cultures on the establishment and development of Korean higher education will shed light on the present internationalisation of Korean universities. Secondly, features of Korean higher education, notably the structure of the higher education sector, academic dependency, gender issues and governmental strategies will provide clues for analysis of both internationalisation and returnees' contribution in each of the selected case universities.

Establishment and development of Korean higher education: roots and grafted branches

Since the first Korean higher education institution, the TaeHak was founded in the fourth century, traditional institutions based on Confucian principles followed but by the late 19th century these traditional institutions of higher learning were replaced by a modernised Western-style higher education system (S. H. Lee, 2004). Based on European academic models and traditions, contemporary Korean universities are not truly Korean
in origin, but they are fundamentally influenced by local historical traditions. This section examines the history of the development of Korean higher education: through the following periods: Indigenous (first century AD through to the middle of 19th century), Modern (the late 19th century-1945), Contemporary (1945-present) period.

**Indigenous higher education**

The roots of Korean higher education lie in the first century, when ancient kingdoms first instituted formal education. The first formal higher education institution in Korean history, *TaeHak* [Great School], was established in 372 A.D. in *Goguyeo* during the so-called Three Kingdoms period (57 B.C.-A.D. 668). Two other countries, *Baekje* and *Silla*, subsequently established their own education institutions. The first higher education system in these Three Kingdoms was adopted from neighbouring ancient dynasties in China where the advancement of knowledge was well respected at that time (J. Kim, 2000b, p. 7; J. K. Lee, 2000, p. 25). During the Three Kingdoms period, academics from these three countries travelled to ancient neighbouring dynasties where Confucianism and Buddhism were integrated into the society and education system, and were being spread to other countries (J. C. Kim et al., 1989).

After the Three Kingdoms period, the southern United *Silla* (668-935) and northern *Balhae* (698-926) established their own higher education institutions, the *Gukhak* [National Academy] and *Jujagam* [National Academy] respectively, modelled upon the pattern of the Chinese Tang dynasty’s education system. Vigorous efforts to acquire advanced knowledge, resulted in a large number of academics being sent to Tang centres of learning to study, resulting in a strong cultural influence flowing back into United *Silla* and *Balhae* (Yi, 1984, p. 90).

The succeeding era saw two kingdoms, *Goryeo* (918-1392) and *Joseon* (1392-1910), confirmed the established prototype of Korean higher education. Modelling itself on institutions in United *Silla* and *Tang* Dynasty, the *Gukjagam* [National Academy] was established in 992 in the *Goryeo* Dynasty. At the same time during this period private
higher education institutions, *Sibido* [Twelve Academic Assemblies], were established. Founded by famous scholars, *Sibido* provided Confucian education for the offspring of aristocrats. National higher education in the *Goyeo* Dynasty was succeeded by the higher education institution in the *Joseon* Dynasty, the *Seonggyun-gwan* [National Academy]. This institution continued without any major changes until the late *Joseon* Dynasty when the education system was finally replaced by western style institutions (J. C. Kim et al., 1989).

It is asserted that the establishment of Korea’s traditional higher education system was modelled on Chinese patterns of educational programs, objectives, functions, administration, faculties and student composition (J. Kim, 2000b; J. K. Lee, 2000). This early instance of international influence highlights the development of traditional Korean higher education via selective adaptation of foreign culture in response to pre-existing indigenous education structures and local ideologies (Ma, 1991). In the *Goryeo* Dynasty, for instance, although the *Gukjagam* changed its title and education system several times, it firmly established a unique local system of organisational structure and curricula that reflected Neo-Confucianism (J. C. Kim et al., 1989).

The purpose of higher education institutions in ancient Korea was to educate young male aristocrats to be higher civil servants, in the interests of strengthening national sovereignty. It was a system that combined politics and education via an elite education of selected talented individuals for political governance (Ma, 1991, p. 444). For this reason, higher education institutions in ancient Korea were national institutions oriented towards elite education (Y. Han, 1999). While the main content of the curriculum were the Confucian classics, the atmosphere of such institutions was also Confucian and masculine.

**Modern higher education**

From the late 19th century, a modern education system was gradually adopted as the *Joseon* Dynasty encountered Western culture. Official efforts to modernise education in
this period mainly consisted of sending students abroad, inviting foreign teachers and establishing modern institutions. Another factor in the development of modern education was the influence of Christian missionaries.

Before modern institutions had been established, sending diplomatic envoys and students abroad was the principal way to receive foreign advanced knowledge (G. L. Lee, 1986). From 1876 the Joseon Dynasty started to send diplomatic envoys to Japan and to the Qing Dynasty China for observation purposes to gradually adopt Western culture (Y. Han, 1994). These observation missions were followed by the sending of students abroad, among them whom were many attendants of the diplomatic envoys. Already in these early instances of internationalisation, the significance of returnees was evident, as they proved to contribute substantially to the modernisation and establishment of Korean education on their return. The importation of both Western knowledge and values by the visitors encourage development of a new principle of Dongdo Seogi [Eastern Ways, Western Technology], which means preserving one's own culture and values, while mastering Western technology. This ideology gradually spread among Confucians, displacing their adherence to the principle of Wijeong Cheoksa [The Defence of Orthodoxy and Rejection of Heterodoxy], and their severe rejection of Western culture and the enlightenment policy (Yi, 1984).

In the late Joseon period, the government reformed Seonggyun-gwan into a modern institution of higher education and established a number of other modern institutions. Since 1869 reform of higher education had commenced at the Seonggyun-gwan by order of King Gojong (Y. Han, 1999). After taking several educational reform measures, in 1895 a modern management system was applied to Seonggyun-gwan. Curricula, which had remained mainly steeped in the Confucian classics, gradually came also to be infused with more modern subjects: National History, World History, Geography and Mathematics (W. H. Lee, 1982). Along with this effort, the government founded modern institutions such as Dongmunhak (1883) and Yugyeong Gongwon (1886) for English education, and recruited foreign teachers (Y. Han, 1999).
Christian missionaries, also played their part, by contributing to the establishment of modern institutions for the purpose of missionary work (Y. Han, 1994; I. S. Son, 1998). After the 1882 signing of the Korean-American Treaty, missionaries, mainly from America, advanced on "the hermit kingdom." They founded institutions such as Gwanghyewon (1885) for medical service and education; Baejae Hakdang (1886), Ewha Hakdang (1886), which was the first institution for women; Sungsil Hakdang (1897), and Severance Professional School of Medicine (1905).

Despite government efforts, the traditional Confucian higher education institution, Seonggyun-gwan, failed to transform into a modern university (Umakoshi, 2001). In addition, only a few of the newly established governmental institutions and others founded by missionaries or Koreans developed to become higher education institutions. This was largely due to the political changes and the ensuing national crisis under Japanese influence (J. Kim, 2000b). The implementation of reforms was impeded by several factors: the severe resistance from vested interests, the lack of capability of government itself, and the influence of foreign powers, especially the strong influence of imperial Japan. Under such pressures, the Joseon government gradually lost the energy for reform. After 1905, the Protectorate Treaty imposed by Japan effectively deprived Joseon of diplomatic rights, resulting in the weakening of both public higher education and private higher education institutions (W. H. Lee, 1982).

Korean higher education during the Japanese Colonial Period (1910-1945) was forcibly re-established in a Westernised Japanese style that was disconnected both from tradition and Korean nationality. The traditional Confucian model was brought to a close with the termination of an educative function at Seonggyun-gwan (Umakoshi, 2001). College level institutions, established in the late Joseon Period, did not develop into universities (J. C. Kim et al., 1989). The Japanese concentrated principally upon expansion of primary education for the purpose of integration and assimilation but discouraged higher education on the pretext of not being prepared (Chung, 1989; Y. Han, 1996; Tsurumi, 1984). Later the Governor-General of Joseon permitted the establishment of college-level institutions and in 1924, Gyeongseong [Seoul] Imperial University was established,
which was the only public university authorised during the Japanese colonial period (Umakoshi, 2001). By 1945, one university, the Gyeongseong Imperial University, and 22 college level institutions existed (J. C. Kim et al., 1989).

In general, modern higher education had taken concrete form during this Japanese Colonial Period. While the college-level professional school was the predominant type of higher education (J. Kim, 2000b), the Japanese university model which was largely adopted from Germany was implanted to Korean soil (K. S. Kim, 2007). This development, however, was very limited and distorted on account of colonial policies. Programs in the various institutions of higher learning were strictly controlled by the Japanese colonial government and opportunities for higher education for Korean students were severely limited (J. Kim, 2000b).

**Contemporary higher education**

The contemporary higher education system in Korea was formed after the liberation of Korea from the Japanese Empire in 1945. The U.S. military government (1945-1948), then assumed significant influence over Korean higher education. The imported American style education ideal, policy and operating system, laid the cornerstone of the contemporary higher education system replacing the Japanese one which was then taken over by the Korean government in 1948 (J. C. Kim et al., 1989). National education aims and laws underpinned by democratism and nationalism were legislated this period.

Given the difficult circumstances, educational opportunities in higher education had widened significantly. Under the American military government, a total of 23 universities were upgraded or newly established. In 1946 Seoul National University was founded and several institutions that had remained at junior college level were raised to the status of university. By 1950, the number of universities had increased to 42 (J. K. Lee, 2000). In order to meet the demand for higher education, the government, faced with insufficient finances, started to rely on private universities. It allowed a high proportion of private institution to develop in the higher education sector, without sufficient governmental
financial support (H. H. Lee & Sin, 1995). However, while universities were established adopting the American form, the Japanese imperial model of higher education that had previously deeply infiltrated the Korean higher education system, was not replaced. Formally the higher education system was re-established modelled upon the American style but in actual practice, universities continued to follow the Japanese style, which led to something of a hybrid of American and Japanese styles (J. C. Kim et al., 1989).

During the 1950’s, the Korean War inflicted massive damage on the budding Korean universities, which were only gradually restored to order with the assistance of international aid. National universities in the regions had been established stemming from the so-called Wartime Union Colleges (J. Kim, 2000b). These provided higher education opportunities to students in the regions and, at the same time, contributed to the development of regional culture (H. H. Lee & Sin, 1995).

Post-war restoration aid for higher education was mainly led by U.S. assistance to universities and teacher education. This material and technical assistance contributed to the rebuilding of university facilities and academic development, as well as the abolishment of the remnants of Japanese culture in the Korean HEIs (Umakoshi, 2001). American education models were systematically adopted and implemented, via the work of visiting American education teams, inter-university cooperation projects, and visiting programs to the U.S., for Korean government administrators and faculty members (I. S. Son, 1991). However, because the aid was concentrated mainly on Seoul National University and a few leading private universities such as Yonsei and Korea Universities, it widened the development gap between national and private universities, and between universities in the metropolitan area and regional areas (B. S. Lee et al., 2005).

The period from the 1960’s to 1970’s was characterised by the reinforcement of higher education governance by the central government. Higher education was reformed in direct connection with national development. The government established a long-term education development plan for academic excellence and quality control in the context of
the expansion of higher education (J. C. Kim et al., 1989). Two key reform efforts were the development of pilot institutes and the promotion of university specialisation. The former was to reform universities designating certain universities as for the implementation of reform. The latter was to develop universities in the regions in response to demands from local industries (Umakoshi, 2001).

In this period the Seoul National University was reformed via a ten-year development plan to raise the university to the level of a world-class university, part of the plan being the development of a unified campus at a new site (J. Kim, 2000b). At the same time, the government also increased its efforts to educate elites in the Natural Sciences and Engineering, leading to a gradual increase in graduates from those disciplines (Umakoshi, 2001).

During 1980's to 1990's, the Korean higher education system pursued variety, excellence and quality in education. Education restricted to schooling started to change to lifelong education from the early 80's. Accompanying the trend towards continuing education, came efforts to diversify the higher education system (Umakoshi, 2001). As a result, various types of institutions were founded or upgraded to university status, including the Korea Air & Correspondence University (1981), Open University (1982), Korea National University of Education (1984), Credit Bank System (1990), Independent-Learning Degree System (1990), and the Cyber University (1998). While the higher education system moved, in Trow's term (2006), from a mass to universal university system, it pursued excellence and quality in education too. In order to preserve the function of elite education in higher education, graduate schools were expanded and for the quality of education, university assessment was implemented from 1994 (H. H. Lee & Sin, 1995). Varied university assessment systems contributed to the quality of education but were insufficient for international competitiveness (N. Park, Kim, Song, Lee, & Yu, 2001).

From the middle of the 1990's internationalisation of higher education was a key priority, particularly from 1995 when the Korean government encountered pressure to open up the education market under the newly established WTO system. International exchange
programs and cooperation in research were promoted for the quality of education (MOEHRD, 1998). The Korea Research Foundation, established in 1981, supports international research cooperation and exchange. Ongoing governmental emphasis on policies such as 5.31 Educational Reform (1995), Brain Korea 21 (1999), Study Korea Project (2004), has led universities to enlarge their international dimensions through increasing international agreements, exchange programs, and the establishment of International Schools (B. S. Lee et al., 2005).

The brief review above of the history of Korean higher education illustrates some major characteristics regarding internationalisation that merit further consideration. The traditional Korean higher education system was founded to fulfil national purposes through providing national elite institutions, strongly Confucian and masculine in their outlook. The establishment and development of higher education was not limited to traditional domestic values but in fact imported and adapted advanced systems and philosophy from foreign countries. In the contemporary higher education system therefore traditional values, Japanese influence and Western values are all comiled within a Western style university (J. K. Lee, 2000). However, as the development of Westernised higher education system was disconnected from Korean traditional values and knowledge during the Japanese colonial period, and has undergone strong American influence ever since, there have been ongoing concerns regarding academic dependency (H. Choi, 1995; J. Kim, 2000b; J. G. Lee, 1992). Furthermore, although the contemporary higher education system was established based on American models, it has maintained centralised structures and a traditional Confucius atmosphere. It also retains its national mission as a mean of creating national capabilities for applying advanced science and technology to the process of national development (Seth, 2002).

Hence from the earliest period of Korean higher learning, academic exchanges have existed in the form of students and scholars studying abroad, and the importation of advanced knowledge and foreign academics. These international aspects in higher education have been currently reinforced through sustained governmental effort. The next section will provide further information on various aspects of the Korean higher
education context: its key general features, academic dependency, women in higher education and national internationalisation policies to promote and embed the process within Korean higher education.

Higher education in Korean society

The university as an organisation has evolved in interaction with its environment. Since Korean higher education was re-established in the form of western-style modern universities underpinned by democracy and pragmatism, the values and organisational culture of the institution have also been formed within the context of Korean society. In the era of globalisation, with an unprecedented degree of interaction between the national and international environments, the Korean university faces another transformation, internationalisation. In this section, some characteristics are examined: key features of higher education, academic dependency, women in higher education, and specific internationalisation policies.

Features of higher education in Korea

The Korean higher education system has three sectors and various types of institutions. Higher education institutions can be classified in terms of their foundation, as national, public, or private. Various HEIs consist of universities, which offer a full 4 to 6 year bachelor degree, and junior colleges providing a 2 to 3 year education resulting in a Diploma.
Table 3.1 Types of higher education institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>No. of Institution</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>No. of Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>National &amp; public</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ.*</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior College</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Universities include universities, universities of education which are for teacher training, and industrial universities which involve industry more, but exclude other types of universities such as the Korean air & correspondence university. Adapted from “Education statistics & information,” by MOEHRD, 2006c, from http://cesi.kedi.re.kr/index.jsp.

Table 3.1 provides statistics of Korean HEIs. In 2006, there were 352 HEIs consisting of 200 universities and 152 junior colleges. Among universities offering four to six year undergraduate programs, 158 (79%) institutions were private universities founded and administered by individuals or organisations. This high dependence on the private sector has existed since the establishment of the Korean government in 1948, against a backdrop of a high demand for human resources and inadequate governmental financial support (H. H. Lee & Sin, 1995).

As can be seen above, the total number of students enrolled in universities was 2,094,752, while full-time academic staff totalled 54,833. In addition, 817,994 students were enrolled in junior colleges, an indication of how Korean higher education has changed from a traditional elite education system to a universal education system in which 82.1% of high school graduates were admitted to the higher education sector in 2006 (MOEHRD, 2006c).

Higher education administration is under the supervision of the Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development (MOEHRD). The Higher Education Support Bureau within the MOEHRD supervises all higher education institutions in accordance with the Education Law and the relevant presidential and ministerial decrees (J. K. Lee, 2000). Although the scope and extent of the governmental control differs between national and private institutions of higher education, it is pervasive in nearly all aspects of higher
education policies (J. Kim, 2000a). Therefore, the centralised patterns of governance from the MOEHRD have been criticised at times for being too directing and controlling in its supervision of universities (MOEHRD, 1998).

Since the 1990’s there has been a noticeable change toward increasing autonomy of higher education institutions and reducing government direct control (B. S. Lee et al., 2005). This global trend for governments to reduce their direct control, and lead the transformation of university via quality assurance, discretionary funding and such measures (Currie & Newson, 1998) has been accomplished in Korea by delegating some administrative functions and powers to the Korean Council for University Education (KCUE) and to individual universities (J. Kim, 2000a). While deregulation increases autonomy, however, the parallel enhancing of government indirect control mainly by financial support adds to the pressure felt by universities in terms of increased accountability measures (Liefner, 2003; Martin & Geuna, 2003). Both governmental funding and assessment criteria in Korea have become a strong indirect means of exerting control over universities (H. Son, 2002).

Universities are ranked in the Korean higher education system according to a Seoyeol [ranking system]. The ranking system of Korean universities operates according to students’ university entrance exam score (J. S. Jeong, 2004). According to Jeong, under this socially fixed order universities are ranked as follows: Seoul National University (SNU) is at the top, Yonsei University (Yonsei) and Korea University (KU) occupy the second tier, universities in the metropolitan area are in the third tier, national universities in regional areas are in the fourth tier, private universities in regional areas inhabit the fifth tier, and junior colleges occupy the last tier. Top disciplines, according to the status of graduate careers, are Medicine, Korean Medicine, Pharmacy, Law, Business and Education. Differentiation in mass higher education has been required as institutions serve diverse purposes and students attend universities for various reasons (Altbach, 2006). However, the Seoyeol ranking of Korean universities has created a unique university atmosphere combining with very Korean characteristic of Hakbeol.
Hakbeol is a “kinship group consisting of graduates from the same school” (J. K. Lee, 2003, p. 21) and has often been used to explain the phenomenon of the high ratio of graduates from certain universities obtaining high status job positions (J. K. Lee, 2003; G. Y. Park, 2005). Graduates from the top three universities listed above dominate in the area of political, economic, cultural, and academic life. For example, 68.8% of Ministry positions in the central government in 2006 were occupied by graduates from SNU (56.3%), KU (9.4%), and Yonsei (3.1%) (J. D. Yang, 2006). The term Hakbeoljuui (Hakbeolism) has been created to describe this social phenomenon of discrimination against graduates from less-distinguished universities compared to those from more-distinguished universities, regardless of individual ability (T. H. Jeong, Jang, Yu, Jang, & Oh, 2003). Critics of Hakbeoljuui [Hakbeolism] have asserted that this abnormal domination of Korean society by graduates of the top tier universities is based on factionalism (J. S. Jeong, 2004; T. H. Jeong et al., 2003; J. K. Lee, 2003). With such status graduates from leading universities occupy the major part of the professoriate in Korean universities (G. Y. Park, 2005). To secure selective positions graduates from the leading universities study abroad and to enable access to any of opportunities, graduates from less-distinguished universities likewise study abroad. While the Seoyeol [ranking system] in universities intensifies Hakbeol within Korean society, the Hakbeol itself also deepens the Seoyeol to prevent conditions from changing within Korean universities (J. S. Jeong, 2004).

The chief executive officer in Korean universities is the president. Presidents in national universities are appointed for a four-year term by the Korean government, based on voting from the university faculty whilst those in private universities are appointed by the Board of Trustees based on recommendations from faculty or without recommendation (J. Kim, 2000a). A university president is expected to be a representative of the institution, an integrator of the university community, a core decision maker, the senior administrator for academic governance, and the senior manager of supporting services and functions (J. Kim, 2000a).
The typical university organisation consists of several offices and colleges such as the Office of Academic Affairs, the Office of Student Affairs, the Office of Financial Affairs, and Colleges and Graduate Schools (MOEHRD, 1998). Full-time university faculty members include Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors and Instructors. Generally, a full-time academic faculty member has a minimum teaching load of nine to ten hours of instruction per week, but actual loads often exceed this minimum standard (J. Kim, 2000a).

In terms of organisational culture, while Korean universities have developed an open, rational and democratic atmosphere, they have retained the base of a traditional value system. Regarding the latter, J. K. Lee (2000) asserted that traditional values and norms, hierarchical order and authority were intrinsic and pervasive to the education sector. University administrators use authoritarian leadership (S. H. Lee, 1996). A hierarchy persists between supervisors and subordinates and between the old and the young. Junior faculty generally defer to senior faculty and senior faculty usually deal with junior faculty leniently (J. K. Lee, 2000). However, this can cause conflict should younger faculty challenge the authority of more senior authority figures, or administrators. Increasing the number of younger faculty members who come equipped with contemporary knowledge and values brings changes, but this seldom radically affects the traditional systems of authority and hierarchy (J. K. Lee, 2000). In addition, personal relationships via school ties, kinship, and regionalism based on traditional Confucian values influence the organisational culture in universities. It is expressed in the form of favouritism towards those who are on one’s side, and through collectivism, maintaining collectivistic culture that encourages task performance in groups for group recognition (J. K. Lee, 1997). The relationships between faculty members and students shows strong hierarchical elements but in practice involves reciprocal obligatory relationships (J. K. Lee, 2000). University teaching staff exercise legitimate authority over their students, maintaining relationships that are reciprocal, within an overall paternalistic authority structure.
Academic dependency, independency and diversity

In the current globalised world, whether the increasing scientific knowledge exchange contributes to making Korean higher education more independent and diverse or more dependent is a critical issue. As contemporary Korean higher education developed from the ruins of traditional knowledge during the colonial period and a flood of Western knowledge and a Westernised academic system, maintaining academic independence has been a challenge in the contemporary era (G. S. Lee, 2000). Increasing transnational knowledge transfer has raised concerns of academic dependency (Gerke & Evers, 2006). If international exchange in internationalisation should be based on the rationale of conservation of national culture and identity (Knight, 1997), academic independence arguably becomes indispensable.

Academic dependency has been defined in a similar way to political and economic theories that have, adopted “dependency theory.” Alatas (2003) defines academic dependency as a relationship whereby the social sciences of certain countries on the periphery are conditioned by the development and growth of the social sciences of other “core” countries to which the former are subjected. According to Altbach (1998), the international knowledge system is one where knowledge mainly produced at the centre is disseminated to the periphery, creating a “dominant-subordinate” relationship. In this relationship, sciences in intellectually dependent societies are dependent on institutions and ideas in sciences from the centre and the dependent scholar is more a passive recipient of research agenda, methods and ideas from the science powers (Alatas, 2003).

In order to describe the knowledge naturalisation of Korean academia via the degree of independency J. G. Lee (1992) used three levels: structural, content and theoretical naturalisation. At the first level, structural naturalisation is related to the capacity for knowledge production and distribution in a country: the extent to which a country possesses education and research institutions, academic communities, and academic journals. Content naturalisation means that knowledge in a country needs to deal with its own societies, persons, cultures and histories, thus this level does not refer the creation of
new theories and concepts. Collected empirical data is merely analysed by a foreign concept structure and theory. At the last level, theoretical naturalisation, scholars in a country establish conceptual analysis systems and meta-theory which reflected their own global outlook, socio-cultural experiences and intended values. He pointed out that Korean academia has established the structural naturalisation but the lack of content and theoretical naturalisation has brought about an identity crisis in Korean academia.

Knowledge dependency which deepened in the process of contemporary knowledge development in Korean academy is often linked to concerns about this identity crisis. In the period of education reconstruction after the liberation in 1945, efforts to reinstate Korean academic tradition were aimed at the elimination of remnants of Japanese colonialism. This restoration, however, led to new form of dependency with an overflow of American influences (J. Kim, 2000b). After the Korean War of the early 1950s, Korean universities once again rebuilt, adopting the American education system via international aid and assistance programs. While, as in post-war Japan, American assistance teams directly transplanted American models, later visiting Korean administrators, scholars and students, as a part of exchange programs, had a significant role in transplanting American educational ideals and methods into Korean soil (Umakoshi, 2001). Since the earlier era, when academic development was largely based on assistance from America, Korean academia has largely developed through adopting advanced methodologies and theories. From the standpoint of dependency theory, J. S. Han (2005) points to a characteristic of academic dependency, whereby Korean higher education has been continuously modified on the basis of successive transplants from foreign systems, principally American. This process of continuous adoption and adaptation, of academic development without knowledge naturalisation has finally aroused concerns regarding an identity crisis in Korean knowledge (J. G. Lee, 1992).

The high ratio of foreign-educated scholars and preference for them adds to apprehensions of academic dependency. In 2006, academic staff with foreign doctorates totalled 18,433, comprising 33.6% of the total faculty across all higher education institutions. The three major host countries were America, Japan and Germany, with
American PhD holders comprising 64.6% of all foreign doctorates (MOEHRD, 2007c). This tendency commenced decades ago, with the shortage of Korean scholars in the decade after WWII. Since academic staff from SNU started visiting America funded by American aid after the Korean War in 1953, about 50% of all academics had study abroad experience in the U.S. by 1969. As a result, returnees from America had led the overall American influence in Korean higher education at that time (Umakoshi, 2001). The role of foreign-educated returnees was indispensible to the restoration of academic life, at a time when the Korean higher education had neither well-equipped facilities nor a developed academic system. However, the continuing preference for foreign PhD’s and the high ratio of American doctorate holders raises concerns of academic dependency in general and the disproportionate influence of the U.S. in particular (J. M. Choi, 2000; H. G. Kim, 2000).

In this sense, the priority attached to internationalisation within Korean higher education can be seen as adding to the anxiety over academic dependency (H. C. Lee, 2004). Transnational flows of people and knowledge would appear to bring academic diversity (Teichler, 2004). Accumulated knowledge within home institutions is expected to enrich academic diversity, while researchers from different academic backgrounds contribute towards blended academic traditions (Mahroum, 2000). Internationalisation is also expected to bring about the improvement of educational quality (van der Wende, 1999). It is assumed that internationalisation is a positive change agent for institution building, serving as a catalyst for major institutional planning and review exercises (Knight, 1997). In spite of these positive assumptions, however, internationalisation arouses concerns about increasing homogeneity, deriving from an excessive emphasis on internationally recognised standards (Knight, 1997; Room, 2000). In the context of widening education markets, H. C. Lee (2004) has argued that Korean higher education with its relatively low competitiveness regarding the quality of education and system may be encroached upon, causing academic dependency. From this perspective, therefore, vigorous efforts for internationalisation are something of a double edged sword, being expected to bring diversity and improvement of educational quality in Korean academia, but at the same time risking a deepening of dependency.
Altbach (2007) has pointed to the similarity between international knowledge system and globalisation in general. Globalisation permits institutions to participate in the international scientific network through information technology and worldwide circulation of scholars whilst all participants are under the pressure of imposing norms and values by dominant institutions at the centres. Structurally, it is possible that peripheral universities remain in dependent status. Under pressure from dominant homogenising powers, however, according to the hybridization approach, the response from the regions would reveal localisation strengths preserving cultural identity and producing hybridised cultural forms (Holton, 1998; Pieterse, 2004). The response from internationalisation policy in Korean higher education at the national level is that through adopting advanced foreign higher education systems, it would develop an Asian education centre (MOEHRD, 2006d). This response presupposes academic independence. Adopted advanced knowledge should be localised and the theory and methodology developed in Korean universities, and also Korean Studies, should meet international standards. In addition, international collaboration with varied regions, may contribute academic diversity.

**Women in South Korean higher education**

In the late 19th century the traditional male-centred Korean higher education was opened to women and after the liberation of Korea (1945), education opportunities for women in restructured higher education institutions has gradually increased. The increase in female participation in higher education can be explained in terms of a transition from a broadly Confucian and masculine culture to one of values of democratic involvement and gender equality. Within the context of widespread access to Korean higher education, the role of female students and faculty, and the impact of organisational culture have often been investigated to determine to what extent women’s opportunities in higher education have improved (Min & Heo, 1998; Oh & Pang, 2000). In a more globalised context, the role and contribution of women in Korean higher education is an important dimension of internationalisation.
In 2006, the number of woman students in four-year universities, was 758,524 (36.2%) out of the total 2,094,752 students (MOEHRD, 2006c). Considering that the proportion of female students was a mere 28.5% in 1965, female participation in university education has certainly increased, although clearly much remains to be done to attain gender equality. The increase is more distinctive at the graduate school level, where the proportion of women graduates in both masters and doctoral courses has increased from 10.7% in 1970 to 42.8% in 2006 (MOEHRD, 2006c). The ratio of full-time woman faculty was 18.8% in 2006, which is more than double the figure of 9.2% in 1965 (MOEHRD, 2006c), but it is still low by international standards. These figures indicate that in Korean higher education, women’s opportunities both in education and teaching has gradually increased. However, in spite of this gradual improvement, the figure also clearly reveals that women’s participation in universities has not yet reached equality and growth in the proportion of female faculty members is even less marked.

As Luke (2001) mentions for women’s difficulties in universities, high ratio of part-time positions and low ratio of senior management positions for women are clear in Korean universities. Female faculty members face particular problems in Korean society, in which teaching is highly regarded, and the legacy of traditional Confucian values persist, and the professoriate still holds an honoured and leading social position. Unlike the broader education opportunities for women in higher education, attaining and fulfilling their role within the professoriate is still challenging for women. According to Min and Heo (1998) having a full-time job in a university for a woman is harder than a man: becoming a member of faculty is like passing through the eye of a needle, while gaining a senior academic title and a major administrative position involves confronting more difficulties than a man. The ratio of female part-time lecturers without tenure was 43.2% in 2006. Considering that female academic staff represent only 18.8% of faculty, this 43.2% ratio of part-time female lecturers is relatively high. In addition, the ratio of female full professors was 30.6% of all female full-time academic staff, compared to 45.5% for males (MOEHRD, 2006c). In general, female researchers seem to have more difficulties in gaining a full-time position at higher education institutions and, even after
securing tenure, they still seem to have more difficulties in gaining promotion to the rank of Full Professor.

There are cultural backdrops to these difficulties. J. K. Lee (1997, p. 539) points to the hierarchical, paternalistic and authoritative Confucian morality that still persists in the organisational culture of university.

Traditionally, the Korean people have kept Confucian values that: (1) encourage learning, (2) emphasise self cultivation and social morality, (3) stress family regulations, and blood ties, (4) insist on class notions and male authority (5) retain reverence for rulers, parents teachers, the old, and ancestors and (6) emphasise political rules and rituals.

In a male-dominated Korean university, faculty culture which is like “a Confucian family culture in a rural village,” female academics are not merely in a small a minority, but are also positioned as subordinate in institutional status and decision-making power (T. Kim, 2005).

These disadvantages for woman faculty have important implications for internationalisation and returned women scholars. Firstly, it relates to the reason for return of foreign educated women scholars. Female foreign educated scholars have better advantages to obtain a position at universities, relative to domestically educated woman scholars (Min & Heo, 1998) but given women’s disadvantageous position in general, they may also face difficulties in their academic life in the university. H. Kim (2004) has stressed the presence of male-centeredness in performance and assessment for professoriate, and hierarchical gender discrimination in teaching, research and service, that is likely to hinder women’s readjustment. Returnees often experience difficulties after their repatriation but for women scholars it would be stronger and qualitatively different. These different conditions between men and women also may cause impact on women’s contribution to university development and internationalisation.
The international dimension of higher education has developed through varied phases. Before the mid 1990's, when the Korean government set up comprehensive approaches for internationalisation of higher education, it mainly existed in the form of implementation of policies for studying abroad, and international activities (MOEHRD, 1998). From 1948, to the 1980's a small number of selected elite students were sent overseas to cultivate science and technology human resources. Special programmes to send students abroad at governmental expense began from 1977 and from the 1980's, as restrictions on self-paid study abroad were lifted, the number of outgoing students increased markedly (MOEHRD, 1998). For international programs, there has been government support for Korean scholars for cooperation with foreign institutions and for Korean Studies in foreign countries since the 1970's (MOEHRD, 2000). Although these approaches have enabled the acquisition of the talented for national development and international exchange in universities, within the context of globalisation, the Korean government encountered demands for new forms of approaches.

The agreements of the Uruguay Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) in 1993 and the subsequent establishment of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) in 1995 aroused deep concerns at the potential of an open education market developing in Korea (H. C. Lee, 2004). Education services had been included in the negotiations under the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) in the WTO (OECD, 2004b). Accordingly, the Korean government prepared to open up its education sector. In 1995, Hagwon [a private tutoring institution] was opened and from 1997 related education laws have been amended to open up the higher education sector (S.-H. Joo, 2002). The amendment of related education laws have included the establishment of an international free economic zone, recruitment of foreign scholars at HEIs, invitations to establish branch campuses of foreign HEIs in Korea, accreditation of foreign degrees and courses, and activation of joint programs with foreign HEIs (K. S. Lee, 2007).
The government responses to this international change was revealed through political strategies from the mid 1990s. In 1996, in order to cope with the growing global free trade environment, the government promulgated the “Higher Education Opening Strategies” (MOEHRD, 1995). It contained plans such as permission for joint programs and foreign institutions in Korea. The reinforcement of global competitiveness of Korean higher education became a top priority in higher education policies and internationalisation of higher education was integrated into important education reform projects (Committee of Education Reform, 1997). To deepen the internationalisation of higher education, the government intensified support to related areas such as researching measures to attain a world class level, cultivating globally competent human resources, policy improvements regarding receiving foreign students, the establishment of Korean higher education overseas, and maintenance of Korean cultural identity.

The current government formulated its internationalisation strategies based on the direction of its two preceding governments from 1993. Internationalisation strategies at the governmental level have been based on two pillars: reinforcement of the global competitiveness of Korean higher education and opening the education market (MOEHRD, 2006d). A highly ranked official in MOEHRD clarified the direction:

> It is to improve the quality of the universities. To improve their quality, it is necessary to open up higher education sector. ...the government is considering widening the exchange between advanced foreign institutions and Korean institutions. First, we should invite branch campus of foreign advanced universities or domestic universities to operate joint programs with them. Second, with regard to the exchange of personnel, we are considering how to widen the opportunities for top-rate foreign scholars to work in Korean universities. ... (MOEHRD 1)

The strategies were established and implemented by eleven ministries of central government, centred on MOEHRD. Varied tasks in six areas can be categorised as two areas for exporting and importing education system, two areas for exchange and cooperation programs, and two areas for infrastructure.
Table 3.2 National strategies and tasks for internationalisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of high-quality foreign higher education system</td>
<td>- Invitation of branch campuses of foreign institutions</td>
<td>Importing Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Activation of joint programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation of international exchange for academic staff and research cooperation</td>
<td>- Activation of academic staff exchange</td>
<td>Exchange Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Enlargement of academic exchange and research cooperation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation of student and credit exchange</td>
<td>- Extension of the range of credit recognition for international exchange and stimulation of dual degree programs</td>
<td>Exchange Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Support for international internship programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Extension of support for study abroad at government expense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for higher education service exports</td>
<td>- Extension of education aid</td>
<td>Exporting Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Administrative and financial support for offshore programs and campuses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Deregulation of the establishment of offshore branch campuses and joint programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Extension of government invitation programs for international students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Activation of invitation of international students via supporting employment working with companies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of education infrastructure for internationalisation of higher education</td>
<td>- Improvement of education infrastructure for invitation of international students</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improvement of teaching and learning ability for academic staff and students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Extension of dormitory and accommodation for foreign students and academic staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Internationalisation of curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Extension of medical service for international students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Simplification of immigration management and permission process for activities outside of the sojourn purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of support infrastructure for international exchange</td>
<td>- Construction of cooperation network among national and international institutions</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Construction of portal system of international exchange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Application of the level of internationalisation on the evaluation of financially supported projects to the HEIs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Quality assurance system for branch campuses of foreign institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 It strategically combines education service industries and international education aid.
Major tasks in each area are described in Table 3.2. In the area of import and export of higher education system, the import of elements of the foreign system were aimed at stimulating competition among Korean universities to become an educational hub in Asia (somewhat like similar intentions in Singapore and Malaysia), and to reduce the demand for study abroad, while export of the education system was related to the view of Korean education as a service industry, and as an element in its international aid programme (MOEHRD, 2006d). By 2006, foreign university campuses had not yet been established but 19 Korean universities had collaborative programs such as joint or dual degree programs. In terms of export, two Korean universities exported curriculum (K. S. Lee, 2007).

In the area of international exchange and research cooperation, the purpose was to develop education and research in Korean universities to a world class level, and to extend students’ international competence (MOEHRD, 2006d). Regarding students’ exchange programs, 11,326 Korean students took part in overseas programs, 162 of them acquiring a dual degree. 420 international students in Korea attended exchange programs and 59 acquired a dual degree in 2005 (MOEHRD, 2007a). Via academic staff exchange and research cooperation programs, 620 academic staff and researchers participated in visiting programs of a year’s duration, while the number of research projects in foreign researcher invitation programs was about 500 in 2006 (MOEHRD, 2007a).

The area of infrastructure is oriented at improving the educational environment for internationalisation and networking among institutions. In 2006, the ratio of courses in foreign languages was 2.2% and the ratio of foreign academic staff was 3.7%. The number of international students reached 32,557 in 2006 from 16,832 in 2004; with the majority residing in dormitories, which have the capacity to house 60.6% of international students (MOEHRD, 2007a). To ensure universities’ involvement in internationalisation, the government used assessment criteria for internationalisation including data such as the number of international students and staff, lectures in foreign languages, joint
programs, exchange programs, internationalisation strategies, and agreements with foreign institutions (K. S. Lee, 2007).

Internationalisation policies in Korea have changed rapidly from the 1990's (Mok, Yoon, & Welch, 2003). Confronting by a more open education market, the government has started to implement broader approaches to higher education. In order to respond to this changing environment, ministries especially the MOEHRD have implemented specific internationalisation strategies. The government's internationalisation strategies established in 2006 reflect how policies have developed from the 1990s. Invitation programmes for international students, for example, were started in 2001 and the Graduate School of International Studies established in 1999.

The government's vigorous efforts to promote internationalisation, however, raised concerns in the higher education sector. For a long time the government had implemented internationalisation tasks without a master plan to explicitly explain the meaning of internationalisation, purposes and directions. In addition, in order to obtain immediate results, the government linked assessment criteria to the funding of various projects, effectively driving universities to adapt to the criteria. Such measures caused universities to implement international activities without long-term strategies, focusing on programs that could bear immediate results (K. S. Lee, 2007).

Conclusion

Considering the fact that academic institutions are part of the international knowledge system (Altbach, 2004a), contemporary universities must be international. At the same time, universities must also respond to more nationally-oriented purposes (Scott, 1998, p. 113), hence the university has developed from this interaction of national and international factors. Korean traditional higher education which was established from foreign models and values, has nonetheless responded to national purposes. Its later development was affected by more Westernised models, largely imported from the U.S.;
the current system has continued its international dimensions but also maintained some traditional values. It is, therefore, intrinsically national and international.

Although largely influenced by the American model, and thus presenting an American style externally, traditional values are nevertheless more apparent in the internal operation. Government supervision of universities has been strong, and universities have been considered as a means of national development. With regard to organisational culture, traditional Confucius values and norms have generally been preserved. Hierarchical order, personal relationships, and masculine-centeredness are strong in academia. In research and knowledge, while advanced knowledge from abroad is continuously absorbed, there is a countervailing eagerness to develop indigenous academic knowledge, thereby ending academic dependency.

Early international aspects of Korean higher education which mainly relied on personal exchange and international activities changed to a comprehensive approach from the middle of the 1990's. The Korean government emphasized international dimensions in order to cope with the globally changing atmosphere. Various government policies were implemented for international dimensions in higher education integrated in the form of “international strategies of higher education” in 2006. It reflected government efforts in the areas of importing and exporting education, exchange and cooperation programs and the development of infrastructure.
CHAPTER FOUR: DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this multi-site case study was to examine the internationalisation and contribution of returnees at four Korean universities. The study sought to investigate and answer the following key research questions. What are the perceptions of internationalisation in the university? How has the university implemented internationalisation? What impact do returned scholars have on the university? Research was conducted through case study methodology, employing both qualitative and quantitative approaches. This chapter describes the research protocol followed by this study including a brief discussion of the research design, case study considerations, data collection and analysis.

Research design

The research was designed as a multi-case study employing varied methodologies. While a case study provides rich information for understanding a phenomenon, it also requires careful consideration of such issues as validity, reliability and ethics. This section describes the case study considerations of selection, triangulations, validity, reliability and ethical issues.

Case study

The case study is used in many situations to gain a holistic and meaningful image of real-life events such as individual life cycles, organisational and managerial processes, and international relations (Yin, 2003). Case study research in education is often conducted to identify and explain specific issues and problems of practice (Merriam, 1998). As the focus of study is the complex and comprehensive process of university implementation of internationalisation and the perceptions and contributions of academic staff of that process, case study methodology was selected as the most appropriate choice. The study
Aims to investigate various aspects of the institutions to gain a deep understanding of the process of internationalisation and contribution made by returned scholars to this process at four selected Korean universities: Seoul National University (SNU), Yonsei University (Yonsei), Korea National University of Education (KNUE) and Handong Global University (HGU).

A case study is an in-depth, multi-faceted investigation of a single social phenomenon (Feagin, Sjoberg, & Orum, 1991). Merriam (1998) states that a case study adopting any and all methods of data gathering and interpreting in context, allows a researcher to gain an in-depth understanding of the situation and meaning for those involved. For Yin (2003), the advantages of case study research, consist of the ability to investigate a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, relying on multiple sources of evidence.

The methodology employed in this case study is the descriptive case study. Merriam (1998) has identified three main types of case study described as descriptive, interpretive and evaluative according to the overall intent of the study, the descriptive case study being defined as one that presents a detailed account of the phenomenon under study.

Through the case study the thesis seeks to build up a rich description of:

- the perceptions and approaches to internationalisation in the university;
- the extent to which the university is internationalised; and,
- the impact of repatriated scholars on the university.

In keeping with the different phases of the research process in a case study, the descriptive phase evolves to the phase of theory development and testing (Edwards, 1998). Rich descriptions of perceptions and implementation of internationalisation, and the contributions of returned scholars to the Korean higher education sector and the
conclusions drawn from this information should enrich the existing theories of internationalisation and international mobility of academics.

The current study applies a multiple-case design based on the selection of four cases. Multiple-case design is employed where there are two or more case settings, in contrast to single-case design. There are various considerations in selecting the appropriate type of case design. Single-case design are often chosen when the case is considered unique, prototypical, or especially salient to the understanding of a phenomenon or problem (Scholz & Tietje, 2002). According to Yin (2003), single-case designs, however, have a potential vulnerability because they rely only on one case. As he states, a multiple-case design has the possibility of direct replication as analytic conclusions independently arising from cases will be more powerful than those coming from a single case. By looking at a range of similar and contrasting cases via multiple-case study, a researcher can strengthen the precision, validity, and stability of the findings (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

The choice of case study in this research was based on considerations of the complexity and multidimensional aspects of internationalisation. Whilst perceptions of internationalisation differ across people and regions, the implementation of its programs and activities is also diverse. Moreover, the ongoing effects of globalisation on the higher education sector is continuously changing the face of internationalisation which is regarded as a key response to globalisation (van der Wende, 2001). As Merriam (1998) states, a case study offers a means of investigating complex social units consisting of multiple variables of potential importance in understanding the phenomenon. The case study with its various methods of data gathering and interpretation in the Korean context enabled the researcher to gain a holistic and in-depth understanding of internationalisation and in particular the contribution of returning scholars.
In case studies, purposeful sampling, which allows a researcher to access information-rich cases for study in depth, is often chosen (Schumacher & McMillan, 1993). This type of sampling applies to case studies at two levels. Sample selection occurs first at the case level, followed by sample selection within the case (Merriam, 1998). For both levels of sampling, criteria need to be established to guide the process. As Stake (2006) has suggested, criteria such as balance and variety, relevance to the target, and opportunity to learn provide general guidelines. More specifically, a typology such as type, size, educational philosophy at the macro level, and age, sex, disciplines at the micro level would to be prepared before the selection (Kayrooz, 2005).

In order to select cases, the researcher set up a typology with regard to the characteristics of Korean higher education system. Korean higher education institutions are mainly categorised as either national or private universities, although there are also some universities established by provincial governments. However, the policy of a university and its internationalisation are not only distinguishable in terms of whether the university is national or private, but also by whether it is located in a metropolitan or regional area. Size is also an important factor with universities being categorised as large-scale comprehensive universities or small-scale specialised universities. Therefore, the typology used to select the case study universities was type (national or private), location (metropolitan or regional) and size (large or small scale).

On the basis of this typology four universities were chosen: SNU, Yonsei, KNUE, and HGU. SNU is a comprehensive national university located in a metropolitan area; Yonsei is a comprehensive private university in a metropolitan area; KNUE is a small-scale national university located in the regions; and HGU is a small-scale private university located in the regions.

The second phase - participant selection - involved selection of individual respondents at each of the selected universities. As the research targeted Korean scholar returnees who...
were overseas educated and work-experienced, most of them were doctorate holders but academic staff members at the university are not limited only to doctorate holders, so other higher degree returnees were considered. However, scholars who had acquired their highest degree in Korea and only had post doctoral programs or working experience overseas were not regarded as returnees, for the purposes of this study. The university where they gained their highest degree, their gender (male or female) and age (twenties, thirties, forties, fifties, sixties and above), were also considered.

Different disciplines as reflected in different departments/organisational systems also played a part in participant selection. The four universities selected have different organisational systems. Normally, a university consists of several colleges equivalent to a faculty and a college consist of several departments but a small size university consist of departments. The two comprehensive universities, SNU and Yonsei, have a number of colleges each consisting of several departments. KNUE has four colleges, despite it having just the one discipline - education - as a teacher training university. HGU, as a small, regional university, does not have an over-arching college, but it does have a number of departments. Participants were selected in varied colleges and departments as shown in Table 4.1.

As the organisational structure and disciplines of each of the selected universities varied, the researcher categorised the disciplines from each university according to Biglan’s discipline dimensions (Biglan, 1973). According to Biglan categorising academic disciplines along a continuum of hard-soft (based on the paradigm within the discipline) and pure-applied (based on the emphasis given to the discipline’s application) served as the strongest predictor of the structure and output of university departments. This two-dimensional framework comprises four domains: hard-pure, hard-applied, soft-pure, and soft-applied, which are identified, respectively with the Natural Sciences, the Science-based professions, the Social Sciences and Humanities, and the Social professions (Kolb, 1981). Following Biglan’s classification of academic disciplines and subsequent studies which identified the characteristics of disciplines (Becher, 1989), the researcher has
classified all the disciplines taught in the four selected universities according to the four above domains.

Table 4.1 Disciplinary domains in the four universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplinary</th>
<th>SNU</th>
<th>Yonsei</th>
<th>KNUE</th>
<th>HGU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hard-Pure</td>
<td>†Natural Sciences</td>
<td>†Science</td>
<td>†Life Science &amp; Biotechnology</td>
<td>†Spatial Environment System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Engineering</td>
<td>†Engineering</td>
<td>†Mechanical &amp; Control System</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Agriculture and Life Sciences</td>
<td>†Medicine</td>
<td>†Computer Science &amp; Electronic Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Medicine</td>
<td></td>
<td>†Industrial &amp; Media Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Dentistry</td>
<td></td>
<td>†Life &amp; Food Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Pharmacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard-Applied</td>
<td>†Factory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Agriculture and Life Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Medicine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Dentistry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Pharmacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft-Pure</td>
<td>†Humanities</td>
<td>†Liberal Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td>†International Studies,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Languages &amp; Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Graduate School of International</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Human Ecology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Fine Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Business Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Human Ecology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Sciences in Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Business &amp; Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†The 1st College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†The 2nd College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†The 3rd College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†The 4th College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†International Law School*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Management &amp; Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Social Science &amp; Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Communication Arts &amp; Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>†Counselling &amp; Social Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Items in bold indicate the departments/faculties/schools surveyed. The following interdisciplinary departments/faculties/schools were excluded: Interdisciplinary Program at SNU; University College at Yonsei; General Studies at HGU.

*International departments at graduate school were included: GSIS (SNU), GSIS (Yonsei) and ILS (HGU)

Table 4.1 tabulates the disciplines of the four case universities according to the Biglan typology. SNU and Yonsei have faculties or schools in all four of the domains: hard-pure, hard-applied, soft-pure, soft-applied, although not all of the departments/faculties were surveyed. Veterinary Medicine at SNU and Dentistry and Theology at Yonsei, for example, were not surveyed. Nor were interdisciplinary programs covered at any of the four universities. KNUE as a teacher training university only has the one faculty of
education. HGU being a smaller private university in the regions does not offer hard pure. i.e. natural science.

In addition, in each university, a senior administrative staff member in charge of internationalisation, several heads of schools, and several academic staff were selected for in-depth interview. Quota sampling was used for questionnaire surveys of administrative and academic staff. A predetermined number of people were selected from each category. The number of people in each category was determined according to their proportion of the total university population.

**Triangulation**

In social science, triangulation is often used to develop more effective methods for the capturing of social phenomena. The logic of triangulation involves the use of multiple methods and measures of an empirical phenomenon in order to overcome the weaknesses or bias of a single method (Royce A. Singleton & Straits, 2005). To strengthen the validity of case study findings, triangulation is an applied process of using multiple data collection methods, data sources, analysts or theories (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996).

The use of a variety of data sources, in a study involving space and persons, permits the researcher to combine strengths and correct some of the deficiencies of any one source of data (Patton, 1987). With regard to space, under the multiple-case study research methodology four different universities were selected of different location, foundation and size. In each university, various data were obtained by a review of institutional websites, brochures, self-reported data, survey, interviews and collected documents. In addition, for the purposes of data collection, surveys and interviews with academic and administrative staff were selected to ensure a balance of discipline, age, gender, academic title and study abroad.

Triangulation emphasises the value of collecting and analysing data with by methods; so-called methodological triangulation. Methodological triangulation using multiple
methods to study a single phenomena (Denzin, 1988) has been employed as a means to offset the weaknesses inherent within one method with the strengths of other methods. For that reason, this thesis employed multiple methods based on the “mixed methods approaches” in qualitative and quantitative methods (Creswell, 2003).

The research applied both quantitative survey methods (surveys) and qualitative methods (in-depth interviews) from the data collection phase to the interpretation phase. These two methods can be complementary (Fairbrother, 2007). While statistical data from the survey provides a numerical overview of both internationalisation and the contribution of returning scholars, data from the in-depth interviews enabled the researcher to provide a more in-depth picture based on lived experience. In addition, fieldtrips to the selected case universities provided the researcher with additional observations and unique materials. Various methods in the research complement each other and contribute to provide a more comprehensive understanding of the internationalisation and the returnee’s contribution.

**Validity and reliability**

Validity and reliability serve as principles to determine what makes a research investigation credible. In the abstract, validity refers to the extent to which an empirical measure adequately reflects the real meaning of the concept under consideration, and reliability is interpreted as the ability to replicate the original study using the same research instrument and to get the same results (Babbie, 2001). Regardless of the type of research, validity and reliability are concerns that can be addressed through careful attention to a study’s preceding steps of conceptualisation, data collection, analysis, interpretation and presentation of findings (Merriam, 1998). The quality of a case study can be judged via four types of tests; construct validity, internal validity, external validity and reliability (Yin, 2003).

Construct validity refers to whether the measures used by the researchers can be shown to correspond to the abstract “construct” under investigation (M. L. Smith & Glass, 1987).
To increase the construct validity this research made use of multiple sources of evidence and chains of evidence. As mentioned in the previous section, triangulation was employed to examine multiple sources of evidence on the phenomena of internationalisation and contribution of returning scholars. These sources consisted of documents from the government and case-study universities, survey data from academic and administrative staff, and in-depth interviews with government officials, university administrators in charge of internationalisation, heads of school and numerous academic staff.

The chain of evidence refers to clear links between case study questions, protocol, citations to specific evidentiary sources in the database, database and report (Yin, 2003). The research hinged around three research questions:

- What are the perceptions of internationalisation in the university?
- How has the university implemented internationalisation?
- What impact do returned scholars have on the university?

These research questions led to the design of the protocol questions and the data collected was categorised into three areas: perceptions of internationalisation, implementation of internationalisation and contribution of returning scholars. Finally, the data is summarised in the following four chapters, each chapter reporting on the case study results in one of the four universities, ordered under the same three headings:

- perceptions of internationalisation
- implementation of internationalisation
- contribution of returning scholars

Internal validity is concerned with the question of how research findings match reality. Merriam (1998) states that triangulation using multiple sources of data or multiple methods to confirm the emerging findings enhances internal validity. In multiple-case
studies, a general explanation that fits each of the individual cases, the so called, "explanation building," is often established through comparing the findings of an initial case against the initial theoretical propositions (Yin, 2003). The current research used a multiple-case study design, employing triangulation to strengthen internal validity. While describing and explaining certain phenomena within internationalisation, reference is made to data collected from the national level to the university level. In addition, explanation building, which was established to reflect theoretical viewpoints from the literature review and case results patterns from each case, was re-applied to analyse individual cases.

External validity is concerned with the extent to which the findings can be generalised to other settings (Schumacher & McMillan, 1993). In qualitative research a case is selected precisely because the researcher wishes to understand the particular in depth, not to find out what is generally true of the many (Merriam, 1998). This research, therefore, as a mainly descriptive case study, has the goal of broadening understanding by providing a detailed description of the study's context to enable readers to understand similar situations rather than to generalise from results. To enhance the external validity Merriam (1998) suggests using thick description and multiple-case design. Rich description allows readers to determine how closely their situations match the research situation, and whether findings can be transferred. Multiple-case design maximises the diversity of the phenomenon of interest, allowing readers to test the applicability of the results to a range of other situations. The research focuses on four case studies providing detailed description of each case. The unique particulars of each university is described in the section devoted to the university setting, while internationalisation and the returnees' contribution to that process is described as related to that setting.

In case studies, reliability refers to the following principle: "if a later investigator followed the same procedures as described by an earlier investigator and conducted the same case study, the later investigator should arrive at the same findings and conclusions" (Yin, 2003). The challenge is to render the whole process, including preparation, data gathering and analysis, visible, and thus enable a later investigator to
repeat an earlier study (Stenbacka, 2001). To prevent any reliability problems Yin (2003) suggests that the procedures followed in each case study should be clearly documented step by operational step. To strengthen reliability, this research describes each step of the data preparation gathering and analysis process later in this chapter.

**Ethical considerations**

Qualitative researchers working from and relying interviews or observations need to be particularly sensitive to ethical principles, because of the sensitivities of face-to-face interactive data collection, and reciprocity with participants (Schumacher & McMillan, 1993). Creswell (2003) emphasis that, because many ethical issues arise during the data collection and analysis of the research, a researcher needs to respect the participants and the sites for research. The research targeting four case Korean universities and their members followed the research guidelines of the University of Sydney Ethics Committee (see Appendix A).

The researcher received approval from the four targeted Korean universities. Once the research instruments were finalised, the researcher initiated the ethics review of research involving humans and approval process. A letter seeking research approval was sent to each university, appended by supporting documents which included a brief research summary, institution survey protocols, and an introduction to the researcher. All four research sites granted research approval (see Appendix B).

The anonymity of interview subjects and confidentiality of research data was protected throughout the research process. Prior to the interview, all informants were given an explanation of the study via Participant Information Sheets (see Appendix C) and a Participant Consent Form (see Appendix E) was signed by each participant before the interview began. With the permission of the informants, almost all interviews were recorded and the results were stored in a locked file cabinet, only accessible to the researcher. All transcripts, coding analysis documents and the final written report employed codes to refer to the interviewees. Subjects were identified simply as academic
staff members according to their universities, e.g. HGU 9. Since the number of staff in charge of internationalisation at each university was very small, they were also coded as other administrative staff. The code did not identify in which school or discipline, if any, the academic or administrative staff worked.

Data collection

In order to obtain rich data, the researcher developed instruments for interviews and surveys. During the field work data was collected from three primary sources: interviews, a questionnaire survey and documents.

Instrumentation

The three main data collection procedures used for this study were in-depth interviews, questionnaire surveys and document gathering. While questionnaire surveys are useful for collecting information and providing structured, numerical data and comparatively straightforward analysis (L. Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2000), in-depth interviews yield information at great depth (Kayrooz, 2005). Documents from case-study universities enriched the information on internationalisation. In order to investigate the research questions these three main data collection procedures were structured according to the following data analysis frame (Table 4.2).
Table 4.2 Data analysis frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main categories</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Main sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University setting</td>
<td>Status of Uni Year and background of foundation</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of departments, students, academic staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Characteristics &amp; Culture</td>
<td>D, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational aims</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of internationalisation</td>
<td>International perceptions in aims and strategies</td>
<td>D, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International perceptions of academic staff</td>
<td>I, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Necessity</td>
<td>I, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rationales</td>
<td>I, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obstacles</td>
<td>I, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>I, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Risks</td>
<td>I, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of internationalisation</td>
<td>Internationalisation aims and strategies</td>
<td>D, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching, learning and research</td>
<td>D, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching and learning process</td>
<td>D, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courses in English</td>
<td>D, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>D, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International programs and activities</td>
<td>D, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International students &amp; academic staff</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International alliances &amp; collaboration</td>
<td>D, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exchange programs for students &amp; academics</td>
<td>D, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extracurricular activities</td>
<td>D, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional management for internationalisation</td>
<td>D, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International office</td>
<td>D, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperation between International Office with department</td>
<td>I, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff management</td>
<td>D, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution of returning scholars</td>
<td>Proportion of returnees</td>
<td>I, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reason for return</td>
<td>I, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceptions of returnees</td>
<td>I, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison with local educated staff</td>
<td>I, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special contributions</td>
<td>I, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficulties in teaching &amp; research</td>
<td>I, Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficulties of daily life</td>
<td>I, Q</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Documents (D); Interview (I); Questionnaire survey (Q)

The study relied on interviews as the primary means of obtaining data. As an “interview guide” for in-depth interviews, the researcher prepared a Participant Consent Form, a Participant Information Sheet, and interview protocols. Interview protocols were
developed based on the issues that were central to the research questions that were identified through a literature review of existing studies on internationalisation and international academic mobility.

Interview protocols were prepared for three different targets: governmental officials at the national level and administrators and academic staff in university level (see Appendix G). The protocol developed was a semi-structured interview comprising of one section devoted to internationalisation policies or perceptions, and another section on the contribution of returning scholars. For administrators, the first section was designed to elicit information on internationalisation strategies and their implementation but for academic staff that section was replaced with questions concerning their perceptions of internationalisation and its implementation. The interview protocols were prepared concurrently with the questionnaire forms, thus enabling the two different instruments to complement each other. Interview protocols were mainly structured to gather data on deeper perceptions and personal experience.

The questionnaire survey was targeted to collect data in three areas: perceptions of internationalisation, its implementation, and the contribution of returning scholars’ to internationalisation. As a survey of the literature revealed that no such instrument existed, care was taken to formulate questions to elicit responses related to the dimensions of perceptions, implementation, and returnees’ contributions.

In order to gather more accurate and relevant data, separate questionnaire forms were prepared for administrators and academic staff (see Appendix I). The questionnaire for administrators hinged around questions on international programs in a school, while for academic staff questions elicited their perceptions of internationalisation, international programs in the university, individual international activities, returnees' contributions and biographical details. Some questions were added for returnees regarding their repatriation and experiences on return home.

Documents were collected about the university and internationalisation. Materials from the university web site and internet sites were gathered continuously. During fieldwork, internationalisation plans, proposals, progress reports, university development plans, memoranda, annual white papers, handbooks, brochures, and syllabi were the main targets of collection.

When all the instruments had been prepared, a pilot study was conducted to test components of the data collection and analysis protocols. Interviews were conducted of visiting Korean academic staff in Sydney and a questionnaire survey was conducted by e-mail targeting both visiting Korean academic staff in Sydney and those in Korea. The pilot study informed the design of this study in three key respects. Firstly, the sample of participants was adjusted. The subjects targeted for interview regarding internationalisation at the department level were adjusted from deans to heads of schools. Secondly, the interview guide and questionnaire were substantially modified. The number of questions in the questionnaire was reduced and detailed questions were added to the interview guide. Some questions were discarded and some modified, in order to make them more effective in eliciting useful information. Thirdly, the mode of recruitment of subjects was modified. Many pilot study subjects advised that the face-to-face approach of the researcher might lead to a low response rate in the survey. Accordingly, the method of recruitment of questionnaire survey subjects was changed from stratified random sampling based on university personnel lists to the identification of possible new subjects through "snowballing" where each key informant personally suggests other possible subjects.
Interview

The interviewees were recruited informally, via networking and snowball methods. The researcher selected possible interviewees according to the previously prepared quota matrix. While some interviewees were introduced by acquaintances or other fellow university members, some were randomly recruited via e-mail. When the interview was completed, the researcher asked the interviewee to suggest other informants. As building on prior relationships and introduction by known people work well in Korean society, busy academic staff introduced through this manner were still willing to participate in the research. The snowball and network approaches, however, intrinsically often lead to a certain lack of representativeness, so the researcher examined the quota carefully and selected informants accordingly.

A total of fifty-seven subjects were interviewed on the basis of their institution, position, discipline, faculty, rank, gender, and previous overseas’ research experience. In order to investigate the national policy internationalisation and its implementation, one highly-ranked official in the Ministry of Education and Human Resource Development concerned with higher education was also interviewed. In each university, the chief international affairs administrator or key personnel charged with the planning and practice of internationalisation was interviewed, resulting in a total of 6 interviewees, as follows: SNU (2), Yonsei (1), KNUE (2), and HGU (1). Interviews with heads of schools were conducted with 12 personnel, as follows: SNU (4), Yonsei (4), KNUE (2), and HGU (2). To investigate international perceptions of internationalisation, individual activities, and the returnees’ contributions and experiences, a total of thirty-eight academic staff were interviewed: SNU (14), Yonsei (12), KNUE (6), and HGU (6).
Table 4.3 Characteristics of interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>SNU</th>
<th>Yonsei</th>
<th>KNUE</th>
<th>HGU</th>
<th>MOE</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic staff</td>
<td>14 (70)</td>
<td>12 (71)</td>
<td>6 (60)</td>
<td>6 (67)</td>
<td>38 (67)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of School</td>
<td>4 (20)</td>
<td>4 (24)</td>
<td>2 (20)</td>
<td>2 (22)</td>
<td>12 (21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalisation director</td>
<td>2 (10)</td>
<td>1 (6)</td>
<td>2 (20)</td>
<td>1 (11)</td>
<td>6 (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disciplines</strong>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard-Pure</td>
<td>1 (5)</td>
<td>1 (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard-Applied</td>
<td>6 (30)</td>
<td>5 (29)</td>
<td>3 (33)</td>
<td>14 (25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft-Pure</td>
<td>4 (20)</td>
<td>8 (47)</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 (21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft-Applied</td>
<td>9 (45)</td>
<td>3 (18)</td>
<td>10 (100)</td>
<td>6 (77)</td>
<td>28 (49)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-academic staff (administrator)</td>
<td>1 (5)</td>
<td>1 (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty rank</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>10 (50)</td>
<td>11 (65)</td>
<td>6 (60)</td>
<td>4 (44)</td>
<td>31 (54)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>6 (30)</td>
<td>4 (24)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (22)</td>
<td>12 (21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>4 (20)</td>
<td>2 (12)</td>
<td>2 (22)</td>
<td>8 (14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>3 (30)</td>
<td>1 (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-academic staff (administrator)</td>
<td>1 (5)</td>
<td>1 (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixties and above</td>
<td>1 (5)</td>
<td>1 (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifties</td>
<td>9 (45)</td>
<td>8 (6)</td>
<td>3 (30)</td>
<td>3 (33)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>24 (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forties</td>
<td>9 (45)</td>
<td>8 (47)</td>
<td>2 (20)</td>
<td>4 (44)</td>
<td>23 (40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirties</td>
<td>1 (5)</td>
<td>1 (47)</td>
<td>4 (40)</td>
<td>2 (22)</td>
<td>8 (14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country of highest degree obtained</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>6 (30)</td>
<td>6 (35)</td>
<td>5 (50)</td>
<td>2 (22)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>19 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>14 (70)</td>
<td>11 (65)</td>
<td>5 (50)</td>
<td>7 (78)</td>
<td>38 (67)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15 (75)</td>
<td>13 (77)</td>
<td>7 (70)</td>
<td>8 (89)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>44 (77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5 (25)</td>
<td>4 (24)</td>
<td>3 (30)</td>
<td>1 (11)</td>
<td>13 (23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20 (100)</td>
<td>17 (100)</td>
<td>10 (100)</td>
<td>9 (100)</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td>57 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N (%)  
*Classification of disciplines followed Biglan’s model. The specific schools/faculties of each discipline are listed in Table 4.1

The interview was conducted during a three month fieldwork period in 2006. Each interview took between 30 minutes to 90 minutes. For some interviewees who were too busy to complete all the questions in the one session, the interview was continued in a second session. Interview sessions with chief international officers took more time in order to investigate the details of various internationalisation strategies and
implementation. For the convenience of the interviewees, the interview venue tended to be the informant’s office. At the beginning of each interview, participants read the Information Sheet and signed a Consent Form. With the participant’s permission, the interview was then digitally recorded for later transcription. Fifty-five of the fifty-seven interviewees in this study gave their permission for the interview to be recorded. Notes were also taken during the interviews.

**Questionnaires**

For the questionnaire, the researcher first contacted key informants asking them to introduce him to additional participants. The researcher explained the purpose and details of the study and asked informants for a list of their colleagues, based on a diversity of age, gender, discipline, and country of highest degree. Then, with the key informants’ permission, the researcher sent e-mails and visited the personnel chosen to meet the survey quota. In the two relatively smaller universities, HGU and KNUE, an “e-mailing and visit” approach was used more frequently to distribute and collect questionnaires. However, in the two larger universities, some key informants acted as collection points for data, while the researcher also visited or simply used e-mail to collect data.

Table 4.4 Questionnaire survey response rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HGU</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Yonsei</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>SNU</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate (%)</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. H=Heads of schools; F=Faculty

Table 4.4 shows the response rate by university and position. A total of 76 heads of schools and 352 academic staff were contacted for the survey. The number and rate of response was 60 (78.9%) for heads of school and 227 (64.5%) for academic staff, which encourages substantial confidence in the results. Academic staff with a higher level of
managerial responsibility, e.g. Head of Schools, are referred to in this thesis as administrators. Regular faculty members are referred to as academics.

Table 4.5 Characteristics of questionnaire survey for administrator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>SNU</th>
<th>Yonsei</th>
<th>KNUE</th>
<th>HGU</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disciplines</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard-Pure</td>
<td>2 (12)</td>
<td>1 (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard-Applied</td>
<td>6 (35)</td>
<td>8 (35)</td>
<td>4 (44)</td>
<td>18 (30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft-Pure</td>
<td>6 (35)</td>
<td>5 (22)</td>
<td>1 (11)</td>
<td>12 (20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft-Applied</td>
<td>3 (18)</td>
<td>9 (39)</td>
<td>11 (100)</td>
<td>4 (44)</td>
<td>27 (45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty rank</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>10 (59)</td>
<td>12 (52)</td>
<td>8 (73)</td>
<td>5 (56)</td>
<td>35 (58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>5 (29)</td>
<td>7 (30)</td>
<td>3 (27)</td>
<td>1 (11)</td>
<td>16 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>2 (12)</td>
<td>4 (17)</td>
<td>2 (22)</td>
<td>8 (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>1 (11)</td>
<td>1 (11)</td>
<td>1 (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixties and above</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifties</td>
<td>10 (59)</td>
<td>2 (4)</td>
<td>10 (56)</td>
<td>23 (38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forties</td>
<td>7 (41)</td>
<td>20 (87)</td>
<td>4 (36)</td>
<td>4 (44)</td>
<td>35 (58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirties</td>
<td>1 (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country of highest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degree obtained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>7 (41)</td>
<td>5 (22)</td>
<td>4 (36)</td>
<td>2 (22)</td>
<td>18 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>10 (59)</td>
<td>18 (78)</td>
<td>7 (64)</td>
<td>7 (78)</td>
<td>42 (70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16 (94)</td>
<td>15 (65)</td>
<td>10 (91)</td>
<td>7 (78)</td>
<td>48 (80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1 (6)</td>
<td>8 (35)</td>
<td>1 (9)</td>
<td>2 (22)</td>
<td>12 (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>17 (100)</td>
<td>23 (100)</td>
<td>11 (100)</td>
<td>9 (100)</td>
<td>60 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N (%)*

Classification of disciplines followed Biglan’s model. The specific schools/faculties of each and university of each discipline are listed in Table 4.1

Table 4.5 indicates the characteristics of survey participants for administrator (head of school). Sixty participants consisted of 17 (28%) at SNU, 23 (38%) at Yonsei, 11 (18%) at KNUE and 9 (15%) at HGU. By disciplines it consisted of 3 (5%) in Hard-Pure, 18 (30%) in Hard-Applied, 12 (20%) in Soft-Pure, and 27 (45%) in Soft-Applied.
Table 4.6 Characteristics of questionnaire survey for academic staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>SNU</th>
<th>Yonsei</th>
<th>KNUE</th>
<th>HGU</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disciplines*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard-Pure</td>
<td>9 (12)</td>
<td>9 (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard-Applied</td>
<td>37 (47)</td>
<td>27 (34)</td>
<td>16 (53)</td>
<td></td>
<td>80 (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft-Pure</td>
<td>18 (23)</td>
<td>21 (27)</td>
<td>1 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft-Applied</td>
<td>14 (18)</td>
<td>22 (28)</td>
<td>40 (100)</td>
<td>13 (43)</td>
<td>89 (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>35 (45)</td>
<td>41 (52)</td>
<td>23 (58)</td>
<td>11 (37)</td>
<td>110 (49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>17 (22)</td>
<td>18 (23)</td>
<td>6 (15)</td>
<td>6 (20)</td>
<td>47 (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>24 (31)</td>
<td>18 (23)</td>
<td>4 (10)</td>
<td>6 (20)</td>
<td>52 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td>7 (18)</td>
<td>7 (23)</td>
<td>18 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixties and above</td>
<td>4 (5)</td>
<td>3 (4)</td>
<td>6 (15)</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifties</td>
<td>25 (32)</td>
<td>18 (23)</td>
<td>14 (35)</td>
<td>8 (27)</td>
<td>65 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forties</td>
<td>35 (45)</td>
<td>46 (58)</td>
<td>15 (38)</td>
<td>11 (37)</td>
<td>107 (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirties</td>
<td>14 (18)</td>
<td>12 (15)</td>
<td>5 (13)</td>
<td>11 (37)</td>
<td>42 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of highest degree obtained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>28 (36)</td>
<td>21 (27)</td>
<td>16 (40)</td>
<td>10 (33)</td>
<td>75 (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas</td>
<td>50 (64)</td>
<td>58 (73)</td>
<td>24 (60)</td>
<td>20 (67)</td>
<td>152 (67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>64 (82)</td>
<td>54 (68)</td>
<td>29 (73)</td>
<td>24 (80)</td>
<td>171 (75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14 (18)</td>
<td>25 (32)</td>
<td>11 (28)</td>
<td>6 (20)</td>
<td>56 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78 (100)</td>
<td>79 (100)</td>
<td>40 (100)</td>
<td>30 (100)</td>
<td>227 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N (%)  
Classification of disciplines followed Biglan's model. The specific schools/faculties of each and university of each discipline are listed in Table 4.1

Table 4.6 shows the characteristics of survey participants for academic staff. The total number of respondents consisted of 78 (34%) at SNU, 79 (35%) at Yonsei, 40 (18%) at KNUE and 30 (13%) at HGU. The distribution of these academic staff amongst the disciplines according to Biglan's categories was as follows: 18 (8%) in Hard-Pure, 80 (35%) in Hard-Applied, 40 (18%) in Soft-Pure, and 89 (39%) in Soft-Applied. As KNUE is a teacher training university with only a faculty of for education, respondents at this university all belonged to the Soft-Applied category of discipline. 33% of academic staff surveyed had acquired their highest degree in Korea compared to the remaining 67% who had acquired their highest degree overseas. A total of 171 (75%) of informants were male and 56 (25%) were female.
Documents

Data obtained in documents from the selected universities on internationalisation proved valuable in depicting a holistic picture of university internationalisation, in concert with the other data collected. Document gathering was carried out at each site of both published and unpublished sources including white papers, development plans, curriculum handbooks, annual statistics, relevant internal studies, policy statements, media releases, newsletters, and interdepartmental memos. General materials such as curriculum handbooks, annual statistics and brochures were gathered to collect data that provided a general understanding of the case-study universities. More specifically, documents related to internationalisation such as development plans, internationalisation strategies, and international relations reviews were collected to scrutinise definitions, rationales, goals, programs, and strategies of internationalisation. Some specific documents such as syllabi and evaluation plans were also collected to help describe the implementation of internationalisation through the curriculum.

Data analysis

Merriam (1998) describes data analysis as a complex process of making sense of data. This is a two stage process consisting preparing, exploring, and analysing the data, followed by data validation (Creswell & Clark, 2007). Through this process, the raw data is converted into meaningful findings. In a multiple-case study, each case-study is treated as a comprehensive and distinct case through the whole process of analysis. In addition, the multiple-case study adds cross-case analysis which strengthens the findings. The process of data analysis in this research, therefore, has been conducted at two levels: internal analysis within each case study, and cross-case analysis.

Data obtained from the case universities was first prepared for analysis through transcribing and translating the interviews, coding questionnaire data and organising documents. Interview data was transcribed in full, every word spoken by an informant being transcribed to avoid losing any meaning. To ensure the accuracy of the
transcription, the audio files were listened to repeatedly. Coding survey data was conducted separately, as there were two types of survey questionnaires: one for administrative staff and another for academic staff. Data was coded, via a codebook, and various documents including published and electronic materials were organised. The data prepared for analysis was then explored to determine the appropriate statistical test and develop a qualitative codebook.

Software programs were employed for data analysis. The survey data was analysed by the quantitative statistical program, SPSS and interview data was analysed by the qualitative program, NVivo. Statistical data analysis relied mainly on descriptive statistics. General frequencies and percentages of items in each question were examined and Chi-square data was selectively used to determine differences between groups. Interview data was coded in three areas: perceptions of internationalisation, implementation of internationalisation and contribution of returning scholars. Each major theme also had several subthemes. For example, perceptions of internationalisation were ordered by the subthemes of necessity, rationales, obstacles, benefits and risks. Interviewee responses were coded at the subtheme level.

While the analysed data was described, specific findings and data from survey interviews and documents were tested through triangulation. For instance, statistical data represented in the item of "obstacles to internationalisation," were validated by cross-checking with interview data and relevant document data. In this manner, data from each university was analysed on a single-case basis. Finally, cross-case analysis was conducted through findings from four single-cases. Any convergent evidence regarding the facts and conclusions for the case was identified. Then, individual case findings were brought together, and reconsidered in the light of other individual cases, and any general conclusions drawn.
Conclusion

This chapter has summarised key aspects of the research methods, namely to investigate the research questions through multi-case study using both qualitative and quantitative approaches. In order to investigate perceptions of internationalisation, implementation of internationalisation and returning scholars' contributions, four universities were selected based on consideration of types, location and size. Data was collected through in-depth interviews, document gathering and questionnaire survey at each university. Data from each university was analysed on a single case basis. During data analysis findings from the interviews, documents and questionnaires were tested through triangulation. Finally cross-case analysis was conducted to review the individual case findings and draw general conclusions.
CHAPTER FIVE  

CASE STUDY ONE: HANDONG GLOBAL UNIVERSITY

Introduction

Responding to the challenges and opportunities offered in the context of globalisation, many universities are making great efforts to internationalise their institutions. Via the process of internationalisation, universities aim to educate their students in global citizenship, to keep up with their peers, contribute to the national and international community, and remain or become great universities (Biddle, 2002). While the response among institutions differs, internationalisation efforts often consist of the development and expansion of international activities, study-abroad programs, students and faculty exchange programs, international studies within their curriculums, and international research cooperation (Hser, 2005).

In spite of HGU’s short history, the institution being established in 1995, it has developed into an excellent university in Korea. As seen in its name, Handong Global University, HGU has proclaimed its international aspect as a major focus of overall university development. HGU has implemented internationalisation across the whole university, recruiting international students and scholars, expanding various international activities and programs, and managing organisational units for internationalisation. As a key element of the institution’s cultural atmosphere, Christianity was instrumental in the solid reputation on internationalisation and development of university. In addition, the role of foreign educated and careered Korean scholars was significant.

In order to investigate internationalisation of HGU, the research examines the university setting, perceptions of internationalisation, implementation of internationalisation in teaching and learning, international activities and institutional management, and returning scholars’ contribution to internationalisation.
The university setting

HGU located in Pohang city in Gyeongsangbuk-do\(^3\) which lies in the south-eastern region of the Korean peninsula, bounded by the East Sea to the east. In 2006, the population of Pohang was about a half million. Major industries were the wholesale and retail, restaurant and hospitality sectors but with the world’s leading steelmaker, POSCO, located in the region with other industrial complexes, Pohang has been transforming itself into an industrial and advanced science city (Pohang City, 2007).

Opened in 1995, Handong Global University (HGU) is a teaching oriented small-scale private university located in the regions. Established with eight engineering schools and two schools in humanities & social sciences, initially HGU was focussed on engineering disciplines. However, following the establishment of schools in humanities & social sciences, the character of the university has emphasised both humanities & social sciences, and engineering. In 2006, HGU employed 138 academic staff with 3,474 students in 12 undergraduate schools and 356 students in 5 graduate schools (Handong Global University, 2007a). The undergraduate schools consist of Spatial Environment System Engineering, Mechanical & Control System Engineering, Computer Science & Electronic Engineering, Industrial & Media Design, Life & Food Science, International Studies, Languages & Literature, Management & Economics, Law, Social Science & Industrial Education, Communication Arts & Science, and Counselling & Social Work.

The main characteristics of the university are evident in the Handong vision statement.

Handong Global University will be a “world changing global Christian university,” educating twenty-first century leaders for Korea and the world who embody excellence in both academics and Christian moral character, in particular, honesty and service (Handong Global University, 2001a, p. 10).

HGU has been underpinned by Christian values from its establishment on land donated by a Christian entrepreneur. Its educational aims explicitly describe its background as

---

\(^3\) Province
"...based on the educational aims of Korea and Christianity..." (Handong Global University, 2001b). As a education-oriented university, HGU intends to cultivate leaders who "will change the world through a spirit of love, humility and service for the glory of the God," "live to serve communities, nations and the world," and "re-establish the true purpose of education and rebuild destroyed biblical creationism and morality" (Handong Global University, 2001a). Regarding the Christian fervour of academic staff, Y. A. Kim (2004) who has been deeply involved at HGU from its foundation as the HGU President’s wife, states that the President and other academic faculty members were gathered to foster the growth of Christian values at the university.

On this Christian basis HGU has established three specialised foci; academic excellence, globalisation and honesty. In spite of its short history, HGU has gained a reputation of excellence in education. Since 1996, HGU has several times been chosen by the Korean Ministry of Education as the winner of the Educational Reform Award for University Excellence. Due to its high quality of education, HGU has succeeded in both attracting excellent students nationwide and gaining employment for its graduates with major corporations. From the beginning, the average score of incoming students on the national tertiary entry test, the Academic Aptitude Test for University, has been within the top 10% (Handong Global University, 2003b), and HGU graduates have been accepted by Korean major conglomerates and top tier graduate schools (S. W. Lee, 2004).

HGU’s ambitions as a global university are apparent from its English name which was changed in 2001 from Handong University to Handong Global University. HGU has specialised its curriculum in internationalisation in order to educate elite students who will work in the new global era. While some fully internationalised departments such as the International Law School (ILS) lead its internationalisation, other departments equip its international profile through English language programs, curriculum content and personnel. In addition, HGU has strengthened its international dimension through building alliances with other prestigious foreign universities. It has increased collaboration and cooperation in education and research via established international networks such as the Global Engineering Education Exchange (GEEE) in the Institute of
International Education (IE) in America, and other overseas institutions through exchange agreements (Handong Global University, 2007b). The International Cooperation Centre (ICC) is a core organisation for the vigorous implementation of all the internationalisation strategies at HGU.

The university has a focus on character building through Christian-based education and activities, implementing the Christian commandment, love your neighbour, through such activities as volunteering work for community. Student-involved activities such as teaching students at Sunday school, assisting elderly people and orphans and cleaning the environment are all a part of the HGU curriculum (Handong Global University, 2003b). Under the pastoral guidance of a professor, students belong to a team where they care for each other and volunteer for neighbours and other community service. Dormitories, in which more than 80 per cent of students live, also provide various character education programs (Handong Global University, 2003c).

Perceptions of Internationalisation

In response to external and internal demands, HGU has stressed internationalisation from its inception in 1995. Internationalisation has always been emphasis among its specialised foci from its first stage of five specialised foci (specialised education, IT education, education for the practically-skilled, character education, globalisation education) to HGU's current three foci: academic excellence, globalisation, honesty.

HGU's internationalisation aim, as revealed in the current second foci of globalisation, is "cultivating internationalised talents via specialised education in the context of university internationalisation" (Handong Global University, 2001c). It has been motivated by the need to meet the demands of a contemporary world and to accomplish its educational mission. The demands of the contemporary world, Korea, and the local society were
analysed using SWOT analysis\(^4\) to help clarify the external opportunities and threats, and internal weaknesses and strengths of the university prior to developing HGU's internationalisation plan. From a global viewpoint, there is both unlimited competition and cooperation in the global village era so students need to be professionally competent and proficient in their chosen discipline and treat foreign cultures with respect. From a national viewpoint, there is a perceived need to improve competitiveness and cooperation with other developing countries via the cultivation of human resources including the Koreans at home, Korean diasporas and foreign students. In the local context, the city of Pohang has committed itself to respond to globalisation in order to become a centre of high technology in the East Sea region (Handong Global University, 2001c). From the viewpoint of the university HGU also surveyed their opinion of faculty staff and paid particular attention to the input from the returnees.

While external demands have stimulated the international dimension of HGU, the educational aim of the university to "contribute to the development of local community and prosperity of the nation and human beings through the cultivation of creative talents" (Handong Global University, 2001a) indicates the direction of its response. Facing challenges at the local, national and global level, HGU seeks to widen its opportunities through its efforts to educate students to take their place in the world. Its vision statement declares the purposes for which students will be educated in the context of internationalisation

Handong Global University will send forth leaders including: ...Honest global servants who live to serve communities, nations, and the world, especially developing countries, through their professionalism and ethics (Handong Global University, 2001a, p. 9).

When interviewed academic staff expressed a general perception of internationalisation as adjusting to global standards (HGU9), educating students to achieve international and

\(^4\) SWOT Analysis is a strategic planning method for auditing an organisation and its environment evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of organisation, and opportunities and threats of external environments involved in a project.
intercultural competence (HGU7), and international cooperation via deep understanding of foreign culture (HGU5).

One participant described the characteristics of HGU’s internationalisation as related to HGU’s ideals:

The characteristics of internationalisation of HGU seem to include two purposes. It is not merely for education. The idea of HGU is change the world via Christian spirit. Without international competence we cannot change the world. Accordingly, we implement internationalisation for the purposes of excellent education and the realisation of Christian values (HGU3).

The following summarises and discusses the responses obtained through the questionnaire surveys (tabulated) of thirty academic staff and nine administrators and from the nine participant interviews with one administrator of internationalisation at HGU, three heads of schools and five academic staff.

Table 5.1 Rationales for internationalisation at HGU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationales</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing international and intercultural understanding of university members</td>
<td>6 (20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising quality of education to a world-class level</td>
<td>15 (50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing the knowledge and skill base in intercultural relations and communications for students to respond to the demands of our society and private sectors</td>
<td>22 (73.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserving and promoting national culture</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing the university’s international reputation, adding revenue and attracting more students</td>
<td>4 (13.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to national identity and development</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting university academic achievements via cooperation with overseas institutions</td>
<td>6 (20.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Respondents were asked to select the two most important items.

The rationales for internationalisation given by faculty members in the survey indicates their understanding of the importance of internationalisation and in which direction it should be implemented. The highest priority was placed on the rationales of (Korean) society and private sector demand for graduates with a strong knowledge and skill base in
intercultural relations and communications (73.3%) and the importance of improving the quality of education to a world class level (50.0%). In order to respond to the demands the HGU faculty members understand that internationalisation needs to educate students to be more adaptable to a changing world and improve their quality of education.

Table 5.2 Necessity of internationalisation at HGU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very strong</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Very weak</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 (66.7%)</td>
<td>8 (26.7%)</td>
<td>2 (6.7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Internationalisation efforts seem to be strongly supported by the faculty. In the question of how you do rate the need for internationalisation in your university, 93.4% strongly agreed on the need for internationalisation.

Table 5.3 Obstacles to internationalisation at HGU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacles</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of government support</td>
<td>5 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of policies and strategies for internationalisation</td>
<td>5 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of finances within the university</td>
<td>15 (50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative inertia or difficulties</td>
<td>3 (10.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of facilities</td>
<td>5 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of reliable and comprehensive information</td>
<td>1 (3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of staff for internationalisation</td>
<td>15 (50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficiently trained or qualified staff to guide the process</td>
<td>5 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level of interest by university members</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties in recruiting international students/staff</td>
<td>4 (13.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items

In the process of internationalisation, universities often face obstacles. In response to the question on the main obstacles to internationalisation at HGU, academic staff listed lack of finance within the university (50.0%) and lack of internationalisation staff (50.0%). HGU (2001c) has stated that a limitation in achieving its internationalisation agenda consisted of the continuing demands for further investment in education facilities, as a function of it being a newly-established university. During the first stage of
internationalisation from 1995 to 2000, HGU had spent about 62% of its internationalisation budget on infrastructure: to establish a language centre, guest house and IT infrastructure (Handong Global University, 2001c). The lack of finance has made it difficult to employ enough administration staff to implement its internationalisation goals. For example, in 2006, the Internationalisation Cooperation Centre, the core centre for internationalisation in HGU, consisted of one director and two staff members, who together manage all international affairs, from counselling international exchange program students to making agreements for international cooperation with foreign institutes. It has proved hard to meet all the demands from each school. Compounding this lack of specialist staff, individual schools do not have staff members dedicated to internationalisation affairs with the exception of the International Law School (ILS).

During interviews academics mentioned the language barrier, especially English (HGU 1, 2, 8), the lack of keen interest in attaining international/cultural competence (HGU 1, 5, 9), a lack of finance (HGU 3, 7), disadvantages accruing from the university's location in the regions (HGU 2), and excessive workloads for academic staff (HGU 6). In spite of the university's emphasis on English, it is not an easy job to overcome the language barrier, while academics felt students needed to exhibit a more active attitude towards gaining international competence. In accordance with survey results, one academic staff detailed financial barriers.

Basically, the most frequent barrier we have faced is (lack of) finance, which has existed since our foundation. For example, when we have more urgent tasks international competence, and international events are left behind. Administration is a difficult area. The university has translated administrative documents into English. Accordingly administrative staff have to be trained and these tasks are costly (HGU 3).
Table 5.4 Benefits of internationalisation at HGU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement in quality of university</td>
<td>13 (43.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building international networks</td>
<td>14 (46.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening research cooperation</td>
<td>7 (23.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of international students</td>
<td>5 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending diversity in teaching and learning</td>
<td>9 (30.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural awareness</td>
<td>9 (30.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to advanced knowledge</td>
<td>1 (3.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items.*

When asked about the benefits of internationalisation in the survey, faculty members chose two main benefits: building an international network (46.7%) and improving the quality of the university (43.3%). Extending international networks is a means towards internationalisation at university and a number of respondents acknowledged that their efforts at internationalisation did enhance international networks of cooperation for HGU.

In addition, academics perceived that one of the main issues in internationalisation, quality of the university, was improved through internationalisation.

In interviews, several academics expressed the benefits as being felt more in the area of teaching. Internationalisation is expected to equip students with international competence and accordingly widen their worldwide job prospects (HGU 5, 6, 9). Other benefits listed were the reputation of the university (HGU 1), recruitment of students from Korea and overseas (HGU 3) and improvements in quality of university (HGU 7).

In this school situation, the benefits of internationalisation ...I think the ideal would be to produce people who, in some sense can be effective in society. Because the world is becoming much smaller, because certain languages are used, and certain skills are used, these people (educated in an internationalised university) can be more relevant in society. They can, I guess, have an impact in society. The students can be more effective and have more impact than students who do not have that kind of situation (HGU 9).
Table 5.5 Risks of internationalisation at HGU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss of cultural identity</td>
<td>11 (36.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain drain</td>
<td>1 (3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased costs</td>
<td>24 (80.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased competition</td>
<td>1 (3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constriction of teaching and research activities</td>
<td>7 (23.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarisation</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No risk</td>
<td>7 (23.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Respondents were asked to select the two most important items.

When responding to the item regarding the risks of internationalisation, faculty members chose items as follows: increased costs (80%) and loss of cultural identity (37%). Lack of finance was perceived as a major obstacle to the growth of internationalisation. HGU only emerged from deficit budgets for the first time in the year 2004. As a university which has heavily relied on donations from its foundation to the annual budget (Y. A. Kim, 2004), expending more on internationalisation would be a major concern.

The next most frequent concern was the risk of loss of cultural identity, that internationalisation would erode Korean culture, and lead to an Americanised form. In interviews, academics, actually, did not express serious concerns at such risks of internationalisation at HGU, but generally expressed concern at potential risks of internationalisation in Korea. Regarding cultural identity, one academic cited the harmful influence of internationalisation, when Korea recklessly imports foreign things:

(In terms of risks to cultural identity) culture is like the history, environment, philosophy, spirit, religion of a country. These have been successfully rooted here for a long time. Those elements, which are far from the surface, are hardly changed. We have our own ideals and philosophy. Culture reflects the social situation and spirit. ... in the Korean case, we were late developers regarding enlightenment, modernisation, and industrialisation. So we have hastened to catch up. Then, continually we have caught the tail (of change). In my view, we still have a tendency to humble ourselves and receive foreign things with the attitude that foreign things are always good (HGU 6).
Implementation of internationalisation

As a process of change, internationalisation impinges upon all areas of the institution. Under the 2001 plan, internationalisation in HGU has focused on three areas; internationalisation of the curriculum, competence-based education for global citizenship and development of infrastructure (Handong Global University, 2001c). The first two areas belong to teaching and learning. The last one includes all other international activities and management. Here along with other elements, international dimensions are scrutinised in teaching and learning, activities and administration.

Teaching, learning and research

As an education-oriented university, teaching and learning is an essential area for internationalisation in HGU. Two notable features of the internationalisation of teaching and learning is an increase in courses taught in English and an enhancement of the international and intercultural content in the curriculum to cultivate global talents and enhanced competitiveness and intercultural competence.

Foreign language learning has been a concern for the internationalisation of curriculum in higher education (Metchlif, 1998). Obviously in HGU, English is the prevailing foreign language. On the question of which is the most frequently used foreign language in research and teaching, 93% of faculty members said English. English proficiency is required for students and faculty members. Practical English courses are compulsory for all first year students and a certain level of English fluency is needed for graduation. The overall ratio of courses taught in English at the undergraduate level was about 26% in 2006 (J. W. Han, 2006), well above the national average of about 2.2% (MOEHRD, 2007a). For academic staff the ability to lecture in English is a condition of employment (Handong Global University, 2002). HGU encourages faculty members to teach in English. When they teach a subject in English, additional work load credit is given. In order to support faculty members to teach in English, HGU provides seminars on how to teach in English (Handong Global University, 2003a).
Performance ratings for courses taught in English are positive but there are difficulties too. In the interview, academic staff generally agree with the necessity of courses being taught in English and the positive effect they produce. Regarding the positive effect and reaction of students, one academic commented:

I don't have any courses in English. There are some difficulties teaching in English. For example, students will face an examination for national certification in their job area, so Korean lectures are better than English lectures for them. However, in class sometimes I teach in English. Most of them like it. Many terms in my area come from English, so I think if I explain terms in English, students can understand their exact meaning (HGU1).

One academic, who currently teaches courses in English, explains the difficulties.

I teach in English even if there is only one international student but if there are only domestic students I sometimes use Korean. ... teaching in foreign language in Korea, I believe that lecturers need Korean fluency so that they can teach in both language.... (because) students find it hard to catch the content...conceptualising is not easy...(HGU2)

The strategy of teaching courses in English seems to head internationalisation in HGU. In the survey, it was chosen as the most successful program element in HGU's internationalisation (Figure 5.1).
Figure 5.1 International programs and strategies at HGU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program/Strategy</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student/faculty exchange programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of international students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses taught in foreign languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalised curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International conference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of credits from overseas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International research collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint degree programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint academic programs with international partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area and international centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance education abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni development programmes abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student clubs and associations for international activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International and intercultural campus events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of internationalisation in mission statement and policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services for international students studying on campus</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate financial support and resource allocation systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward and promotion policies to staff for internationalisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items that have been successful and are needed to strengthen internationalisation.

Internationalisation of the curriculum was a further fundamental factor in the internationalisation of HGU. While courses in English are designed to enhance foreign language proficiency, international content in the curriculum is designed to foster international and intercultural competence. English has been selected as the prevailing foreign language and international content has been included, not only in specific courses or units, but widely across the curriculum.
The internationalisation strategy has been achieved in four ways: a completely international school providing courses in English; courses that include international studies as a major focus; units that include international content as a major focus; and units that include some international content. HGU’s International Law School (ILS) is equivalent to a graduate school, providing a three year JD (Handong Global University, 2006a). In the ILS, all courses taught in English contain an internationalised curriculum. Examples of courses including international studies as a major focus include “Global Management” in Management & Economics, and “U.S and International Legal Studies” in the School of Law, which are fully internationalised both in language and content (Handong Global University, 2003a). All units contain international issues taught in English. An example of a unit that is fully internationally oriented is “International Planning Development.” This is taught in English using English textbooks, even though most students in the class are Korean. Units that include some international content, provide general opportunities for all students to be exposed to international content, even if they do not take any specific unit designed for internationalisation. Most courses remain in this category.

In spite of this active, systemic implementation of internationalisation of curriculum, it was chosen as the most important item that needed strengthening. 27% of academic staff chose this item, followed by joint academic programs with international partners (23%), servicing of international students studying on campus (23%) and appropriate financial support and resource allocation systems (23%).

Regarding the role of research in internationalisation, HGU has implemented strategies to strengthen research cooperation with sister institutions abroad, and also pursues research cooperation with institutions in developing countries (Handong Global University, 2002). Via established international networks such as the Global Engineering Education Exchange (GEEE) conducted by Institute of International Education (IIE) and Council of Christian Colleges and University (CCCU) in America, HGU has strengthened faculty and student exchange. Examples of research cooperation with institutions in developing
countries included HGU’s establishment of the Institute of Handong Information Technology (IHIT) in Argentina, and cooperation with the Authority for Protection and Management of Angkor and the Region of Siem Reap (APSARA) in Cambodia. However as an education-oriented university, the university has not been as active in research cooperation as in the education area. In the survey, 17% of academics responded that international research collaboration should be strengthened, but no one affirmed the item as successful in HUG’s international programs and strategies (see Figure 5.1).

**International programs and activities**

International activities and academic agreements are commonly used as indicators in university internationalisation. In 2006, the number of foreign universities with which HGU has international academic agreements was 50 (Handong Global University, 2006b). These agreements mainly cover faculty and student exchange schemes, research collaboration, and cooperative programs. Most of these networks were in North America (45%), followed by Asia (45%), Europe (7%), and South America (4%) (Handong Global University, 2007b). HGU’s aim is to intensify exchange and cooperation with institutions in advanced countries such as the United States and United Kingdom, while at the same time widening its networks in developing areas such as China, Mongolia and other Asian countries.

Domestic students’ international activities mainly occur through exchange programs and short-term visits. The number of students taking part in exchange programs in 2006 was 52, which represented 1.3% of the total number of students enrolled that year (Handong Global University, 2007c). Short-term visiting programs are very popular with domestic students travelling overseas during the university vacation and there are many different types and destinations. During summer and winter vacations, about 30% of domestic students each year travel overseas to participate in such programs as English and computer educational programs for indigenous people, and volunteering activities like supporting schools in remote rural areas, and NGO activities (Handong Global University, 2003c).
Many Christian students go abroad for the purpose of missions. As distinct from other universities' internationalisation programs, we operate projects with developing countries to assist them. In order to attend the programs students go to the countries during vacation (HGU5).

Successful recruitment of foreign students and scholars is often emphasised as a catalyst of international activities on campus. Unlike other Korean universities, the ratio of international members at HGU is quite high. Recruitment of international students was the second ranked item among successful strategies in the survey (see Figure 5.1). While there are a limited number of international students from OECD countries, HGU successfully attracts international students from developing countries. In 2006, HGU had 149 international students in degree courses (MOEHRD, 2007b) which was equivalent to 4.4% of the total student enrolment in all the undergraduate and graduate schools and there were 49 visiting international students enrolled via exchange programs (Handong Global University, 2007c). In that same year there were around 12 foreign full-time scholars representing about 8.7% of the total number of full-time academics (MOEHRD, 2007d).

Among international programs, HGU has established a joint degree program, the Master of Business Administration (MBA), at the Institute for Finance and Economics (IFE) in Mongolia (Handong Global University, 2002). In spite of this successful joint degree program in Mongolia, which is a part of HGU’s support strategies for institutions in developing countries, academic staff remain eager to establish other types of joint academic programs (see Figure 5.1). In the survey, “joint academic programs with international partner” was the second ranked item among international strategies needed to strengthen internationalisation at HGU.

Regarding extracurricular activities, HGU provides supports for international students based at International House (I-House) and some activities were also supported by the Student Council (G. H. Choi, 2006). International students share I-House with some domestic students. This system allows international students to adjust to the Korean
environment and domestic students to an international atmosphere. The Student Council provides English internet message boards, orientation for incoming international students, home-stay programs during university holidays and Korean festive days, and an international zone on campus. The aim is to introduce HGU to international students through pairing one domestic student with an international student. Home-stay programs are planned to assist international students while I-House is closed during the holidays and they also offer a cultural exchange experience during national festive days. The international zone consists of an international café and international lounge where students can meet, socialise and engage in cultural activities (G. H. Choi, 2006). In spite of this systemic support to international students from the university and student council, in the survey, the item, “services for international students studying on campus” was the second ranked amongst strategies needed to strengthen internationalisation at HGU (see Figure 5.1).

Institutional management for internationalisation

Implementation of internationalisation depends on effective strategies and administrative support. Core implementation systems in HGU are its Internationalisation Task Force and the International Cooperation Center (ICC). The Head of the Internationalisation Task Force is the HGU Vice President and other university directors are committee members. The purpose of this task force is to discuss and resolve matters of internationalisation, such as policies, strategies and programmes. The ICC is under the direct control of the President. The tasks of this centre consist of conducting international cooperation affairs, international exchange programs, and support for HGU’s overseas aid associations. While the International Task Force decides and leads plans and programmes for internationalisation, the ICC implements international affairs (Handong Global University, 2001c). In order to successfully implement a new structure and scheme into an organisation without it being rejected, the title of the director of the new structure, the support of the chancellor and agreement of faculty is important (Biddle, 2002, pp. 16-17). These are essential in Korean universities where hierarchical and bureaucratic decision-making processes and governance are pivotal.
In HGU, the President's objectives and support are sufficiently clear and strong to ensure successful implementation of internationalisation into the organisation. The Director of ICC explains:

...The centre is under the immediate control of the Planning Centre. The order of rank is President - Director of Planning Centre - Director of ICC. The President has a great concern for internationalisation so I attend the educational affairs meeting (which is only for highly ranked directors). The President consults me even about building construction....

The ICC is the core centre for internationalisation in HGU consisting one director and two staff members. The centre manages all international affairs such as counselling of students on international exchange programs, making agreements for international cooperation with foreign institutes, establishing offshore branches, managing overseas support organisations, selecting foreign students, and selecting exchange students (Handong Global University, 2001c). In the questionnaire survey, while 44% of heads of school perceive that the cooperation between ICC and their schools is positive, an equal number of 44% are neutral and 10% were negative. This equally positive and neutral attitude towards cooperation seems to reflect the fact that ICC handles international programs mainly at the university level, while each school implements international programs independently without strong support.

Based on trust, we have autonomy (within the organisation). If there is a need for an international program, a professor initiates that. If the program proves successful then the university supports it. As there is not enough financial support, nobody prevents academic staff from implementing a program which is carried out with funds they have gained themselves. ...(Many international) programs are implemented by a school (department) itself with the general support of the ICC (HGU 4).

**Contribution of returning scholars**

Mobility of academics is one of the main dimensions in depicting the international aspect of the university. Academics members, who possess international competence, are often expected to take a pivotal role in various international activities. This section examines
the returnees’ contribution at HGU, outlining the proportion of returnees, reasons for return, perceptions of returnees, their activities compared to indigenous scholars, returnee activities, and returnee difficulties in teaching/research and daily life.

At HGU, foreign-educated Korean scholars who obtained their highest degree in foreign countries are the majority among faculty. In 2006 the proportion of Korean academic faculty who earned their highest degree overseas was about 70%. In the survey, 85% of returnees answered that they had lived overseas for at least five years, while 40% of them had lived overseas for more than ten years. The ratio of returnees who had working experience in their research areas was 70% and their average working period was about 6.5 years. The abundant overseas experience of returnees contrasts with that of indigenous scholars. No indigenous scholar had lived overseas for more than 5 years, and only 20% had overseas work experience in their relevant area.

Table 5.6 HGU returnee reasons for return

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family situation such as parents’ request or family reunion</td>
<td>7 (35.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable job offer in Korea</td>
<td>13 (65.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties of daily life in foreign country</td>
<td>4 (20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To contribute to the development of national science and knowledge</td>
<td>5 (25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better career prospects in Korea</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repayment of obligations to Korea such as scholarship or patriotism</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to find the right job overseas</td>
<td>2 (10.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HGU’s mission and vision</td>
<td>4 (20.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items*

The two main reasons for return cited by peripatetic scholars in HGU were an acceptable job offer in Korea (65.0%) and family situation such as parents’ request or family reunion (35.0%). In interviews, participants mentioned that the major reasons comprised more than one factor:
I thought it was a good opportunity. My abilities would be utilised and, because my family and parents were in Korea, I had thought I might return to Korea one day, at least for a period of time. While I was thinking those things, I got an offer from the President of HGU (HGU4).

While peripatetic scholars already had intentions to eventually return for reasons of family matters and contribution to Korea, a job offer from Korea acted as a major impetus.

Table 5.7 Perceptions of returnees' impact on development at HGU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very positive</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Very negative</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous scholars</td>
<td>1 (10.0%)</td>
<td>6 (60.0%)</td>
<td>3 (30.0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripatetic scholars</td>
<td>7 (35.0%)</td>
<td>12 (60.0%)</td>
<td>1 (5.0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (26.7%)</td>
<td>18 (60.0%)</td>
<td>4 (13.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Foreign educated scholars are expected to have a certain role in development and internationalisation in HGU. In the survey, while the peripatetic scholars themselves had a higher positive perception of their contribution in general, domestically-educated academics also perceived the impact of the returnees on university development to be a positive one (86.7%). The main reasons presented in interviews for positive perceptions of the returnees' role in the development of the university were: their adoption of advanced systems, knowledge, and methodologies; their relevance to the university's mission of internationalisation; their international competence; their varied experiences both in Korea and overseas; their attitudes as scholars, bilingual abilities, and broadened viewpoints.

Most academics agreed that the returnees played a positive role in the development of HGU and acknowledged the returnees’ international expertise, networks and advanced knowledge:

When scholars return from overseas, basically, they are able to update foreign knowledge, methodologies, and academic trends. They can meet global trends (in teaching and
research). In addition, their viewpoints are fresh and new for students...they can motivate students. Their experiences are useful. For example, in the School of Management and Economics, there was a chair-professor who had worked at the UN for a long time. He played a vital role in hosting a World Bank international conference... (HGU 3).

Table 5.8 Returnee influence on internationalisation of HGU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very positive</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Very negative</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous scholars</td>
<td>1 (10.0%)</td>
<td>8 (80.0%)</td>
<td>1 (10.0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripatetic scholars</td>
<td>9 (45.0%)</td>
<td>10 (50.0%)</td>
<td>1 (5.0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20 (66.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10 (33.3%)</td>
<td>18 (60.0%)</td>
<td>4 (6.7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perceptions of the returnees' role in HGU's internationalisation are also highly positive. 93.3% of academics responded that the returnees' influence on internationalisation was positive. Again a greater number of peripatetic scholars had a higher positive perception of the returnees' influence. Only 10% of the indigenous scholars had a very positive view of the contribution of returnees whereas 45% of peripatetic scholars had a very positive view of their own contribution. Academics listed returnee strengths as international competence, ability to lecture in English, suitability to the university's international orientation, international exchange, introduction of advanced systems, and fostering international networks.

Returnees play a key role in the internationalisation of HGU. Their foreign experience and fluency in English are used when directing international programs and lecturing in English. Their international networks also play an important role in extending HGU's international networks. For example, faculty exchange, which originated via returnees' personal networks, has now developed into formal academic agreements with foreign universities. Academic staff attributed this development to returnees' position as bridge-builders.

Some described it this way to me: people like me who can speak some Korean, some English and have skills in teaching and things like that. In some sense, we are people; someone described as bridge-builders. Because in a university like this, you have
completely American faculty, you have also completely Korean faculty. They can make links between the foreign faculty and domestic faculty. Kind of communicators, bridge builders ... (HGU 9).

Table 5.9 International activities of academic staff at HGU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Indigenous scholars</th>
<th>Peripatetic scholars</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching international students in class</td>
<td>2 (20.0%)</td>
<td>16 (80.0%)</td>
<td>18 (60.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in international conferences</td>
<td>7 (70.0%)</td>
<td>14 (70.0%)</td>
<td>21 (70.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing academic papers in international journals</td>
<td>4 (40.0%)</td>
<td>11 (55.0%)</td>
<td>15 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting international research projects</td>
<td>2 (20.0%)</td>
<td>4 (20.0%)</td>
<td>6 (20.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having students conduct international research</td>
<td>4 (40.0%)</td>
<td>6 (30.0%)</td>
<td>10 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving funding for international research</td>
<td>5 (50.0%)</td>
<td>4 (20.0%)</td>
<td>9 (30.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting research with foreign researchers</td>
<td>2 (20.0%)</td>
<td>5 (25.0%)</td>
<td>7 (23.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>10 (33.3%)</td>
<td>20 (66.7%)</td>
<td>30 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* These proportion were based on indigenous and peripatetic scholars' activities for two years (mid 2004 - mid 2006)

As both lecturers and researchers, returnees' contributions are scrutinised on both fronts. Table 5.9 indicates the international activities of indigenous and peripatetic scholars respectively, in the areas of teaching, conferences, publications, research projects, students research projects, funding and research collaboration. Generally, there were similarities between the activities of peripatetic and indigenous scholars in the selected areas. Of the seven areas listed returnees were more active (80%) than domestic scholars (25%) in teaching international students in class. However, domestic scholars (50%) were more active than returnees (20%) in receiving funding for international research. In all other areas, the activities of peripatetic and indigenous scholars were similar.

While the small sample limits wider inferences being drawn about the implications across the university, the underlying reason for similar levels of international activities among scholars holding domestic and foreign degrees is presumed to be that the universities' continuing strategies of internationalisation from its foundation has strengthened academics' activities. Compared to returnees indigenous scholars have faced extreme
competition during the recruitment process and from the process of internationalisation which may have led them to be more active in international dimensions.

Academics holding domestic degrees have experienced stress (in the internationalization of the university). While the university has changed (in the process of internationalisation), they have felt behind. Some of them have left university even though they love the university (HGU6).

However, as an education-oriented university, the research area is not strong as the teaching area. In the area of publications, research, student research, funding and research collaboration, scholars in both groups had relatively low levels of activity compared with other cases (see Chapters Six, Seven, Eight).

On the other hand, one academic staff member brought up a fundamental question as to the returnees' contribution. He asserted that the most distinctive feature of returnees is their foreign language fluency; however, international activities seem not to be based on the countries where they were educated, but rather on their willingness to act.

Even if they study abroad, their fundamental academic abilities seem to not to have grown ... but certainly their English has improved ... in the academic association where I belong, I come in contact with many returnees. (Their ability is) about the same. Scholars who are active and interested in (international activity) even though they haven't been studying overseas, they are active. It is not whether they study overseas or not, but the differences of mind and will to act (HGU5).

In spite of the returnees' similar profile in teaching and research areas, with the exception of teaching international students, their contribution to internationalisation in planning and implementation is significant. As a returned scientist from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) of U.S., the current HGU President has led internationalisation at the university. In addition, the centre of internationalisation, ICC, has been led by returnees. One academic staff described returnees' unique contribution to internationalisation throughout its short history, saying while internationalisation and globalisation for education was proclaimed in the 1990s in Korea, internationalisation strategies at HGU were planned mainly by returnees (HGU 2).
In the process of implementation of activities and programs, returnees' overseas experience and their networks often enhance the university's network. One academic staff member expressed how his personal networks were first applied to the program in his department, and subsequently developed to inviting a foreign scholar to HGU, in connection with a government supported project.

I have personal networks with Germany. This year I am going to invite a professor from an institution in Germany. In this summer vacation, our two graduate students are going to visit the institution. ... I have friendly relations with the professor. A year ago last June I invited him to visit HGU for ten days at my own expense. This year (our team) is participating in the in NURI project. The university will support the cost (and other administrative services) of the invitation (HGU 7).

Table 5.10 Difficulties of life for returnees at HGU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty of employment</td>
<td>2 (10.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readjustment to Korean life and customs</td>
<td>8 (40.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and language problems of children</td>
<td>10 (50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate income</td>
<td>10 (50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political and social conditions in Korea</td>
<td>3 (15.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate facilities and living condition</td>
<td>1 (5.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items

The returnees' full contribution to the university, however, can be hindered by the difficulties they face in the process of readjustment to a Korean environment. Returned scholars occasionally face difficulties readjusting to the Korean lifestyle. Questioned about the difficulties of daily life in their early stages of their return, returnees at HGU, most commonly listed their children's education and language problem (50.0%), and inadequate income (50.0%) as the major challenges.

Returnees, in many cases, resumed their career as a part-time lecturer, with inadequate income. This led to financial problems in the early stages of readjustment. Regarding

---

5 The New University for Regional Innovation (NURI) project is a government-funded project to strengthen the capabilities of colleges and universities located outside the Seoul metropolitan area.
their children’s education problems, one academic staff spoke of the difficulties caused by a different education environment.

Fortunately, I have not experienced much because I returned when my children were young. But I found many academic staff who returned with children in middle and high school experienced conflicts at home (when I worked at other university). Because of that, some of them either became Gireogi Appa [wild goose daddy]⁶ or went back overseas again themselves. Modes of education are different to those of America. Such as the cramming system of education in middle and high schools, entrance exams-central competitive system, and education which does not stimulate creativity cause the most serious dissatisfaction (HGU 3).

Table 5.11 Difficulties in study and research for returnees at HGU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scarce resources and poor facilities for work and research</td>
<td>6 (30.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid administrative system</td>
<td>8 (40.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive teaching and administrative workload</td>
<td>14 (70.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited communication with international academics</td>
<td>2 (10.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid research atmosphere stemming from school ties, relations based on hometown, and the Confucian tradition.</td>
<td>5 (25.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The difficulty of dissemination of advanced knowledge to academia in a given condition</td>
<td>1 (5.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items

Regarding difficulties of academic life, excessive teaching and administrative workloads (70.0%), and a rigid administrative system (40.8%) were the two most commonly mentioned items. As a small and young institution, HGU places a heavy workload on academics. In one interview, an academic staff member stated that academics face difficulties in research due to the excessive workload.

We seem to have a greater teaching load. We have a small number of academic staff so that each staff member is in charge of many subjects. Moreover, for character education, (I) talk and counsel on all aspects of a student’s life... for that reason, a week goes so quickly. It is like running out of fuel that was filled up during the vacation. It is like being drained. I don’t have time to do my research. So, I have to do research all day long during the vacation (HGU 1).

---

⁶ A wild goose daddy is a daddy who sends his wife and children overseas for the purpose of education and lives alone in Korea.
In contrast to the survey results, academics did not mention the rigid administrative system in interviews but expressed difficulties stemming from the university's location in Pohang.

Location in Pohang is also little a bit difficult. A lot of conferences are held in Seoul, many lawyers are in Seoul, so if you want to take part in those kind of meetings, you have to travel the whole day - take the KTX (Korea Train Express), go to Seoul, spend the whole day there, then come back. It is not easy, that level can be challenging (HGU 9).

A further item mentioned was the loss of local networks. If a returnee had spent many years overseas, he or she could well suffer a lack of local networks. One academic illustrated his experience, referring to the Korean academic atmosphere where relationships are crucial:

When a new project was launched, there was a separate group which got funding for the project... Nobody let me know that... Unlike scholars who became professor at an early stage, I had live overseas and I returned in my forties... It was really hard to get project funding (HGU 2).

Conclusion

HGU has a specific profile in Korean university internationalisation. As a small, newly-established private university with no particular international reputation and located well outside the metropolitan area, it is more of a teaching university but HGU has established its own model of internationalisation. Internationalisation at HGU is based on its specific academic culture and demands. These demands and its Christian value system penetrate the aim and strategies of internationalisation.

The interpretation of internationalisation at HGU is in response to global demands, and the cultivation of global Christian talents with knowledge and intercultural competence within the context of a well-regarded university with international standard. In a changing environment, HGU has recognises opportunities and developed an internationalisation strategy which is consonant with its own educational ideals. Faculty members acknowledge the necessity of internationalisation of HGU and their perception of
internationalisation is consistent with the direction of HGU’s internationalisation. Internationalisation can be both beneficial and risky for universities. On the one hand, HGU faculty perceive internationalise efforts as the way to improve the quality of education and extend its international network. On the other they were unable to invest further resources into the internationalisation plan, which may hinder investment in other areas, and concerns were also expressed as to a possible loss of cultural identity.

The process of internationalisation has been implemented across the whole campus, based on well organised strategies. As an education-oriented university, HGU has strengthened its internationalisation of the curriculum, increasing lectures in English, and international content and activities. HGU’s international activities and programmes are both active and balanced, involving cooperation with institutions in both developed and developing countries. While HGU has developed academic knowledge via cooperation with major overseas institutions, it also supports newly developing institutions through its academic collaboration. Student short-term visiting programs are also very active. However, joint academic programs and international research collaboration are expected to strengthen more. In the administration area, ICC is the centred for the internationalisation process. In spite of its well organised and active involvement in the process, due to a lack of personnel, it is hard for ICC to meet all the demands from all the university departments.

As the majority within the HGU academic faculty, returnees have contributed significantly to university development and internationalisation. In the area of teaching and research, the most active area for returnees was lectures in English. However, as almost all academic members were involved in internationalisation, the returnees’ profile in other teaching and research areas was similar to that of indigenous scholars. With regard to planning and implementation of strategies and programs, returnees were more deeply involved using their international competencies and networks. For returnees, the education and language problems of their children, inadequate income, and excessive teaching and administrative workloads were the major difficulties they faced during the period of their readjustment to Korea on their return.
To sum up, HGU as an education-centred university has developed distinctive features in internationalization. Through its systemic approaches to internationalisation, HGU has maintained a relatively high proportion of international students and faculty members within the university and its dynamic international activities. In general the role of the returnees in internationalisation is crucial, especially in planning and implementing universities’ international programs. Individual returnees lead more in teaching in English, however, in other international activities, the returnees’ performance is similar to the domestic scholars’. This indicates that currently internationalisation at HGU is an important activity for all members of faculty.
CHAPTER SIX  CASE STUDY TWO: KOREA NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATION

Introduction

University culture provides a feasible focus of scrutiny in the internationalisation of the university (Bartell, 2003). It is influenced by university structure but Sporn (1996) also emphasises the specific external environment as a main factor. For Korea National University of Education (KNUE), the two main elements of the external environment to be considered for internationalisation are the national teacher education system in which KNUE is embedded and the international aspects in primary and secondary schools where graduates of KNUE are to work.

In order to uphold the quality of education, the teacher education system in Korea has as its goals the training of qualified teachers and the maintenance of their competence. Teacher education for primary and secondary school teachers has historically been conducted separately. Most primary school teachers are educated at one of the eleven national universities of education. Founded in each province the eleven national universities of education are relatively small universities, solely offering a four-year undergraduate degree program, specialising in the education of primary school teachers. Two other institutions that educate a small proportion of primary school teachers are the comprehensive universities KNUE, and Ewha Womans University that offer four-year degree programs. Secondary school teachers are educated differently. They are educated either in colleges of education or in teaching courses at colleges or in a graduate college of education in various comprehensive universities.

With the exception of a few international schools, the international dimensions at most primary and secondary schools are restricted within narrow limits to international activities and international aspects within the curriculum. On assessing school curriculum nationwide it appears that only 455 (4.8%) of schools from primary to high school had
established sisterly relations with foreign counterparts in the year 2000. Such schools operate student visiting programs, home-stay programs, sport programs, and language programs for teachers (MOEHRD, 2000). The curriculum at a national level does not specify a particular subject within which international education is to be taught, but individual subjects within the curriculum develop students' international competence and abilities (J. S. Park & Kim, 1999). Under the 7th national education curriculum, English as a foreign language is taught from year 3 at primary school. Other subjects that cover relatively broad international components are Ethics, Social Science, World History, foreign languages.

In order to investigate internationalisation of KNUE, the research again examines the university setting, perceptions of internationalisation, implementation of internationalisation in teaching and learning, international activities and institutional management, and returning scholars' contribution to internationalisation.

The university setting

KNUE is located at Chungwon-gun in Chungcheongbuk-do7 which located in the central region of South Korea. Chungwon is a rural city, with a population of about 140,000 inhabitants in 2006, the main industry being agriculture. However, taking advantage of its close proximity to the main traffic routes and the regional capital city of Chungcheongbuk-do, Chungju, Chungwon has gradually changed itself into an industrial city (Cheongwon-gun, 2006).

KNUE, which was founded in 1984, is a national education research-oriented university, specialising in teacher education. KNUE was established in response to demands to strengthen the institution of teacher education and educate highly qualified teachers. The demand for an integrated system of teacher education came from a reconsideration of the

---

7 "Gun" is a Korean administration unit as equivalent to County; and the administration unit "Do" is equivalent in meaning to Province.
wisdom of having separate institutions for primary and secondary school teachers in Korea. Teacher education at that time was separated into national universities of education for primary school teachers but into colleges of education in comprehensive universities for secondary school teachers. The establishment of the KNUE was designed to develop research in education and in-service programs/courses for both teachers and educational administrators (Korea National University of Education, 2004, p. 39).

KNUE opened in 1985 with a student enrolment of 520, and a range of teacher education in 19 departments in the undergraduate school, from kindergarten to secondary school level (Korea National University of Education, 2004). In 2006, its educational programs had broadened to 22 departments within four colleges at the undergraduate level with a student enrolment of 3,001. Its four colleges are the 1st College (Education Sciences) consisting of Early Childhood Education and Elementary Education; 2nd College (Humanities and Social Sciences) consisting of Korean Language Education, English Education, German Education, French Education, Ethics Education, Common Social Studies Education, Social Studies Education, Geography Education and History Education; 3rd College (Natural Sciences) consisting of Mathematics Education, Common Science Education, Physics Education, Chemistry Education, Biology Education, Earth Science Education, Home Economics Education, Technology Education, Computer Education, Environment Education; 4th College (Arts and Physical Education) consisting of Music Education, Fine Arts Education, and Physical Education. A further 3,059 students were enrolled in full or part-time study at the master and doctoral level in 59 different departments. The number of full-time academic staff was 185 in that same year (Korea National University of Education, 2007a).

From the beginning KNUE was a university specially designed for teacher education. Its programs are characterised by its three educational aims: “cultivating elite teachers who will lead education in Korea; spearheading educational development; and contributing to the growth of the nation and the prosperity of the world” (Korea National University of Education, 2007a, p. 4).
In keeping with its aims, KNUE focuses on three functions: pre-service education, in-service education and educational research. Pre-service in KNUE is implemented in 22 departments within the four colleges. Unlike other universities, KNUE students, who come from across the nation, through recommendations from the Office of Education Superintendent in each province, are exempted from entrance and tuition fees\(^8\). 140 credits are required for graduation including four credits for six weeks in-school practice teaching. The university stresses the value of character education via free of charge but obligatory dormitory life for all first and second year students. In 2005 85% of all undergraduate students reside in dormitories where an additional curriculum operates to develop their character as well as an esprit de corps for teaching. The career aim of graduates is teaching, and about 70% of graduates go on to become teachers in 2005 (Korea National University of Education, 2005b).

In-service education is implemented via an attached Centre for In-service Education (CIE). The CIE is a nationwide training centre for developing and supplying programs for teacher training. There are two types of programs. One is a certificate training (upgrading program) for principals, directors and level-1 (advanced level) teachers, and the other is an administrative skill program training principals, directors and teachers in official duties (The Center for In-service Education, 2005). This unique function of nationwide education training, which was transferred from the MOEHRD, enables KNUE to provide integrated national education for teachers and administrators at all level.

KNUE’s close connection to schools is in line with its focus on the research of education theory and its application. In graduate schools with 139 majors where most students consist of teachers and educational professionals, research strengths enable the application of educational theory to school circumstances. In graduate schools more than half the students are teachers undertaking full-time research. In the graduate schools of education, almost all students are teachers study part-time. Based on the study and experience of educational specialists and teachers, the Center for Educational Research

---

\(^8\) Student fees at a national university are comprised of entrance fees, tuition fees and university support fees.
(CER) has developed curriculums for each subject and an in-service training methodology for teachers. Four affiliated research institutes are dedicated to research on issues of primary and secondary education which of significance in Korean education (Korea National University of Education, 2004).

The general context of internationalisation at KNUE is one of increasing international demands and strong localised demands. As a teacher education university, students are educated to be teachers in Korean schools. Therefore, KNUE has only a few international students at the graduate level. Most of the international programs are short-term visiting programs and international conferences. KNUE does not have a separate independent organisation for internationalisation nor specialised international graduate schools. Although it does not have an independent organisation for internationalisation, the division of International Affairs under the subdivision of Planning & Relations in the Office of Planning & Research manages international programs.

**Perceptions of Internationalisation**

In today's more globalised world, the ideal of internationalisation often has a pivotal role in a university, in terms of its strategies and approaches. It is common to find an international emphasis embodied in the aims of education in a university proclaiming its contribution to the world beyond the nation-state. The aim also reveals its international perception in keeping with the objectives and goals of the university. Academics' perceptions, on the other hand, may be a better guide to the reality of internationalisation, as they have a major role in the administration, education and research of the university. Perceptions of internationalisation of KNUE have been scrutinised concerning both in university aims and academics' perceptions.

The internationalisation of KNUE derives from its aims. One of its three educational aims is that of "contributing to the growth of the nation and to the prosperity of the world." Its internationalisation intention is seen more explicitly in its vision: "Cultivation of excellent teachers who are able to contribute to the realisation of the ideal of nation, and
humankind.” One of the three foci of the vision is a “response to globalisation and openness” (Korea National University of Education, 2005b, p. 43).

Various international dimensions are revealed in sources such as the Curriculum, University Handbook, Development Plan and International Affairs of KNUE. The document most comprehensive in its coverage of internationalisation strategies is the International Affairs of KNUE which directs international exchange and collaboration. “The aim of international exchange and collaboration is to become an advanced teacher education university, leading the transformation with international experience and competence” (International Affairs of KNUE, 2006).

Table 6.1 Necessity of internationalisation at KNUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very strong</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Very weak</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 (32.5%)</td>
<td>27 (67.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regardless of different understandings of internationalisation, faculty members agree as to the necessity of internationalisation of KNUE. Responding to the question of how you estimate the necessity for internationalisation in your university, all respondents strongly agreed on the need for internationalisation.

Within the context alluded to above of few international students and foreign academics on campus, and principal aim to educate mainly Korean students to become teachers in Korean schools, the KNUE raises some interesting questions on what internationalisation means to staff, and which international dimensions they stress.

In that part of interviews that dealt with the meaning of internationalisation, academics’ perceptions varied but fell into two main categories. Most interviewees responded that internationalisation at KNUE comprised of an international exchange of personnel and collaboration with foreign institutions (KNUE 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10), while several also referred to it improving the quality of education (KNUE 1, 6, 8, 9).
Internationalisation is a series of activities to receive theories and experiences from foreign countries and initiate our own theories and experiences to them via the international exchange of academics (KNUE 3).

As a university is a place for academic purposes, internationalisation is to improve our university via academic and personnel exchange with foreign universities whose research areas are advanced (KNUE 8).

Table 6.2 Rationales for internationalisation at KNUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationales</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing international and intercultural understanding of university members</td>
<td>7 (17.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising quality of education to a world-class level</td>
<td>28 (70.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing the knowledge and skill base in intercultural relations and communications for students to respond to the demands of our society and private sectors</td>
<td>11 (27.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserving and promoting national culture</td>
<td>4 (10.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing the university’s international reputation, adding revenue and attracting more students</td>
<td>5 (12.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to national identity and development</td>
<td>7 (17.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting university academic achievements via cooperation with overseas institutions</td>
<td>15 (37.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Respondents were asked to select the two most important items

The meaning of internationalisation for faculty members revealed from interviews was supported by questionnaire survey results. Responding to the question of what are the most important rationales for internationalisation for your university, 70% of respondents indicated improvement of the quality of education. Academic achievement of the university via cooperation with institutions in other countries and cultures (37.5%), and extending the knowledge and skill base in intercultural relations and communications for students (27.5%) followed. For faculty members, the purpose of internationalisation is to improve the quality of education, academic achievement and cultivate talents in international competence via academic and personnel exchange with foreign universities.
Table 6.3 Obstacles to internationalisation at KNUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacles</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of government support</td>
<td>3 (7.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of policies and strategies for internationalisation</td>
<td>18 (45.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of finances within the university</td>
<td>20 (50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative inertia or difficulties</td>
<td>8 (20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of facilities</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of reliable and comprehensive information</td>
<td>2 (5.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of staff for internationalisation</td>
<td>5 (12.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficiently trained or qualified staff to guide the process</td>
<td>4 (10.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level of interest by university members</td>
<td>14 (35.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties in recruiting international students/staff</td>
<td>5 (12.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items.

When academic members were asked to state what they believed were the two main impediments to further university internationalisation, they listed the following, in order: lack of finance within the university (50%), lack of policies and strategies to promote internationalisation (45%), and a low level of interest by university members (35%).

Finance is perceived as the most serious obstacle and it is a fundamental factor, considering the competitiveness of funding and the fact that governmental and industry funding tend to be concentrated more on practical areas. For implementation of internationalisation, stable and continuous funds are necessary. Unlike many other private universities located in non-metropolitan areas that suffered from lack of income, KNUE as a national public university, has a stable income provided by the government. However, it would not be sufficient to implement a new international project with a large budget.

In order to attract international students, substantial funding is required and the implementation of suitable programs, international conferences, seminars and activities also need secure income. It is theoretical but I think without a secure and sustainable income, the program will only be a one-off item (KNUE 2).
Other major perceived obstacles such as the lack of policies and strategies to promote internationalisation, and the low level of interest by university members, seem to relate to KNUE's fundamental characteristics. In interview, academics linked obstacles to the KNUE's special mission of teacher education (KNUE 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10). "It is hard to match KNUE's characteristics with the purpose of international exchange. KNUE is a teacher-education institution where students have the goal to become school teachers" (KNUE 7).

Due to the uniqueness of teacher education, it was hard to find benchmark institutions and exchange institutions... One of the difficulties caused by internationalisation is that, regardless of the purpose of KNUE as a university that educates highly qualified teachers and as a leader in education, KNUE leans towards research. I think we can overcome this imbalance. If we not only strengthen the research area on the internationalisation and international collaboration dimension, but also strengthen teaching areas, we can minimise these side effects. But in the early stage of internationalisation, it seems there are some difficulties due to research areas being inclined toward internationalisation, such as international research collaboration and international cooperation (KNUE 10).

Except for students in foreign language education departments, KNUE students' concern for foreign language and culture was not strong. To be a teacher, a student has to pass a very competitive teacher appointment test in his/her last year, and long-term exchange programs would detract from the time available to prepare for the test. Accordingly, the majority of students choose to stay home, rather than engage in exchange programs with foreign institutions.

It depends on the concept of internationalisation, but, if I consider specific elements of internationalisation such as international exchange and international information, KNUE's academic staff and students are placed at a disadvantage compared with those of other comprehensive universities. In terms of composition of personnel (number and research area of academics), we are have difficulties in international exchange. And as the teacher appointment test is always uppermost in students' minds, it seems that they cannot afford to pay attention to other countries. International competence is not an important matter for them. They need to pass the test first (KNUE 9).

In this context, academics were not content with KNUE's internationalisation plan and programs. Despite professions of great concern for internationalisation, in practice, university members seemed to focus more on local teacher education demands.
Table 6.3 Benefits of internationalisation at KNUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement in quality of university</td>
<td>21 (52.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building international networks</td>
<td>15 (37.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening research cooperation</td>
<td>24 (60.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of international students</td>
<td>1 (2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending diversity in teaching and learning</td>
<td>4 (10.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural awareness</td>
<td>9 (22.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to advanced knowledge</td>
<td>5 (12.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items

The main benefits of internationalisation academics perceived were international networking and promoting the quality of education. Academics' professed priorities for internationalisation were as follows: strengthening research cooperation (60%), improvements in quality of university (52.5%) and building international networks (37.5%).

In interviews, academics generally considered the benefits of internationalisation to be research cooperation and knowledge exchange for academic staff, and student exchange and intercultural experience for students (KNUE 7, 10). Academics expected that internationalisation might lead to various forms of research cooperation, yield workshops which might develop into a way to collect information on foreign teacher education systems, and introduce advanced technology such as teaching methods and materials (KNUE 1, 3). Referring to the building of networks, one academic staff expressed the view that it would widen student exchange (KNUE 6), while regarding the recruitment of international students, where currently no tuition fees were payable by international students, another academic doubted this would change in the near future (KNUE 10).
On the other hand, academic staff perceived increased costs, polarisation and increased competition as the main risks to internationalisation at KNUE. To the question of what are the main risks of internationalisation to your university, respondents chose the following: increased costs (82.5%), polarisation (45.0%) and increased competition (20.0%). Increased costs, the most serious obstacle to internationalisation, were also identified as the biggest threat to the university. Due to the financial burden universities that are still developing cannot afford to join the main stream of internationalisation and compete with advanced universities who reap their benefit of international exchange and collaboration. In addition, an international program requiring substantial funds may threaten other non-international programs. While an international program can bring an international reputation to a department, an innately non-international department may be disadvantaged. When a specific function is stressed for an international program, other functions of the university can be downgraded. Accordingly this closely links to apprehensions regarding polarisation.

In interviews, academic respondents expressed concerns about the possible loss of cultural identity, connecting this risk to KNUE’s mission as a teacher education institution, as well as issues of competition and academic dependence. Expressed concerns for cultural identity were that imitation of foreign ideals and practices is quite alien to the educational, cultural and political system in which the institution belongs, and will lead to a loss of identity.
It is possible that our culture and ethos are neglected in teacher education. If students in teacher education institutions are educated in imported foreign systems where foreign matters are more stressed and that is how their view of teacher are established, their influence on students at school in the future will be significant. This is linked to our national existence.... We should also consider education dependence in the international education export system. If our knowledge is inferior, then we may slide down to a dependent position in knowledge (KNUE1).

Cultural conflict would be a serious outcome that one could predict. For a teacher education institution, an institution for generation education, we need to take into consideration cultural conflicts in tradition and cultural perceptions of future teachers (KNUE 2).

Another scholar expressed concern about the effects of competition in education saying: “If we educate students with the aspect of competition behind the internationalisation, practically, there would be a risk that substance disappears but competition remains” (KNUE 9). In the Korean context where competition is already severe in the higher education system, emphasising the value of competition in internationalisation threatens such fundamental values of education as cooperation, the search for truth, and mutual benefits.

**Implementation of internationalisation**

While a comprehensive internationalisation plan has not yet been established in the development plan, the university curriculum and other documents describe KNUE’s directions regarding internationalisation but go little beyond the level of slogan. In general, KNUE has plans for partnership programs for personnel exchange and research collaboration. In the area of internationalisation of the curriculum, KNUE emphasises language education and in the research area it emphasises preparation of teacher education programs for Korean unification (Korea National University of Education, 2005b).

The most detailed plan for international exchange and collaboration is the one labelled International Affairs of KNUE. It contains strategies for agreements with foreign institutions and personnel exchange, including various student exchange and in-service
teacher exchange programs with prominent teacher education universities. As international exchange has been too narrowly focused on Northeast Asian and North American institutions, KNUE plans to spread the exchange to other areas (Korea National University of Education, 2007d).

Teaching, learning and research

In order to educate students for a future where local and global issues are irrevocably intertwined, internationalised content and internationalised process are significant in teaching and learning. Regarding content and process of teaching and learning, there are no international schools, majors and courses in KNUE in either undergraduate or graduate schools. In spite of declarations of support for international education in the university curriculum and the amount of international content revealed in curricula (Korea National University of Education, 2005a), declarations prioritising international education have not been followed by a concrete plan. Hence, in contrast to the other three case studies, it is the international content of curriculum that was investigated at KNUE, a more locally embedded institution than the others three universities.

The fundamental direction of the curriculum of KNUE comprises four items aimed at globalising the education system and making it IT friendly. The KNUE curriculum states that “in order to prepare for a knowledge-based future society and global change, [the curriculum] aims at the informationisation of education and the development of education from an intrinsic viewpoint” (Korea National University of Education, 2005a, p. 4). Among the six curriculum aims of the general education units, one aim closely linked to internationalisation is described as “establishing Korean identity and cultivating the global competent citizen” (Korea National University of Education, 2005a, p. 4).
Table 6.5 Proportion of undergraduate courses with an international focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>In-depth Courses</th>
<th>*Unit credits</th>
<th>**Unit credits containing international elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College I</td>
<td>Education Sciences</td>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>16 (9.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>25 (13.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Korean Language Education</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>22 (11.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>English Education</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>52 (27.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ethics Education</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>25 (13.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Studies Education</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>31 (16.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mathematics Education</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>22 (11.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College I</td>
<td></td>
<td>Science Education</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>24 (13.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Practical Arts Education</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>19 (9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Music Education</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>26 (14.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fine Arts Education</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>25 (13.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>22 (11.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College I</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2248</td>
<td>309 (14.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College II</td>
<td>Korean Language Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>234</td>
<td>77 (32.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>226</td>
<td>184 (81.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>German Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>234</td>
<td>192 (82.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>245</td>
<td>203 (82.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethics Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>225</td>
<td>97 (43.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common Social Studies Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>257</td>
<td>121 (45.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Studies Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>261</td>
<td>82 (31.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geography Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>233</td>
<td>119 (51.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>241</td>
<td>124 (51.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College II</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2166</td>
<td>1199 (55.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College III</td>
<td>Mathematics Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>186</td>
<td>13 (7.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common Science Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>208</td>
<td>26 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physics Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
<td>11 (5.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
<td>15 (7.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biology Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>190</td>
<td>11 (5.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Earth Science Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>196</td>
<td>32 (16.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home Economics Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>203</td>
<td>24 (11.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technology Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>192</td>
<td>11 (5.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>204</td>
<td>11 (5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>204</td>
<td>35 (17.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College III</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>189 (9.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College IV</td>
<td>Music Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
<td>28 (17.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Arts &amp;</td>
<td>Fine Arts Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>183</td>
<td>60 (32.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Ed)</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>132</td>
<td>7 (5.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College IV</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>477</td>
<td>95 (19.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6853</td>
<td>1792 (26.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Core and elective unit credits in the major area and, core and elective unit credits in the general education area in 2006

**Total unit credits of unit containing international elements / Total unit credits per department

Table 6.5 indicates the proportion of international content in the curriculum. This statistic was obtained via an analysis of the curriculum in all undergraduate departments in 2006. A unit dealing entirely or partially with international or intercultural issues or a foreign language was considered as a unit containing international content. Using this definition, overall, 26% of all units contained international content. On average 14.2% of the courses in College I which covers Early Childhood Education and Elementary Education...
contained internationalised units. Students who chose English Education as their in-
depth course studied more internationalised units, 27.8%. College II, the Humanities and
Social Sciences college, provides the greatest amount of internationalised units, namely
55.4%. More than 80% of the curricula provided in the three foreign language education
departments deal with foreign languages and cultures. About half the units in other
departments such as Social Studies Education, Geography Education and History
Education contain international and intercultural content. A specific intercultural focus in
the Ethics Education and Social Studies Education departments is North Korea. Although
there is no direct collaboration with North Korean institutions, the departments provide
students with information on geographical, social and cultural encounters with North
Korea. At 9.6%, the proportion of international content of units in College III the Natural
Sciences college, is the lowest in KNUE, whilst College IV, Arts and Physical Education,
provides 19.9% of the internationalised curriculum. Disciplines in the Natural Sciences
have few international and intercultural components in their curriculum. In the Arts,
however, western culture is dominant in Music and Fine Arts. Students are more
interculturally exposed when they learn various trends in the Arts.

In order to respond to globalisation and openness, KNUE provides curricula for
understanding globalisation in the general education area. Regardless of its full or partial
involvement, a total of 26% of internationalised units means that future teachers in
KNUE have been educated in aspects of international competence. However, KNUE has
not yet established a systemic plan for the internationalisation of the curriculum and this
may hinder the implementation of internationalisation of the curriculum reducing its
effect. As the Korean metaphor states it takes more than pearls to make a necklace. In
spite of a clear amount of international and intercultural content in the curriculum, the
absence of an internationalisation strategy has brought few concrete results. In the
questionnaire survey concerning the two most successful international programs and
strategies at KNUE none of the academics chose curriculum with international
dimensions. On the other hand in the same survey when asked to state the two items most
needed to strengthen internationalisation at KNUE (Figure 6.1), 22.5% of respondents
chose curriculum with international dimensions which rated as the second highest perceived need after international research collaboration (27.5%).

Regarding foreign languages in internationalisation, KNUE lists English, German, French, Japanese and Chinese as options for teacher education without any preference for any specific language (Korea National University of Education, 2005b, p. 122). The dominant foreign language in teaching and research, however, is English. In the survey of foreign languages in teaching and research, 81.6% of respondents selected English as the most frequently used language. The proportion of courses taught in a foreign language is low. In some foreign language departments, about 10% of units are taught in a foreign language. Other departments provide a 2 credit English class which is equivalent to one percent of the total credits needed for graduation. Overall, the proportion of classes taught in a foreign language is about 2.5% in 2006. Regarding the relatively low ratio of courses taught in foreign language, despite the necessity of internationalisation, one academic does not necessarily see the low ratio as a negative factor, but rather a product of the special conditions of teacher education.

Practically there aren't many students who take courses (taught by foreign language). Before the implementation of lectures in foreign language, improvement of foreign language fluency of students is a prerequisite, foreign language education needs to be intensified (in order to improve the foreign language proficiency of students). However, as graduates of teacher education institutions systemically and practically rarely become teachers in foreign countries confronting foreign culture, we need to view from different angles internationalisation and the level of its implementation in teacher education institutions compared with other comprehensive universities (KNUE 2).

With regard to published research, in 2006, academics at KNUE published about 400 articles in both national and international journals which on average equals 2.2 articles per person, of which only about 0.1 articles were published in international journals (Korea National University of Education, 2007c). While KNUE faculty members acknowledge the importance of international research activities, this relatively low rate of publication in international journals shows that the international aspects of research at KNUE were much less active than local aspects. In fact, KNUE has developed systems to support academics to carry out international research. There is, for example, a sabbatical
programme that allows full-time academics to visit overseas for about one year after working at university for five years providing them with the opportunity to extend their international research (KNUE 3). However, as Figure 6.1 indicated, academics are eager to extend their research horizons to the world via university internationalisation. The most important item identified by academics to strengthen internationalisation was international research collaboration. Only 3% of academics agreed that it was successful but 28% responded it needed strengthening.

Figure 6.1 International programs and strategies at KNUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program/Strategy</th>
<th>Needed to Strengthen</th>
<th>Successful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student/faculty exchange programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of international students</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses taught in foreign languages</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalised curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International conference</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of credits from overseas</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International research collaboration</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint/dual degree programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint academic programs with international partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area and international centre</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance education abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni development programmes abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student clubs and associations for international activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International and intercultural campus events</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/faculty short-term overseas visiting program</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of internationalisation in mission statement and policies</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services for international students studying on campus</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate financial support and resource allocation systems</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward and promotion policies to staff for internationalisation</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items that have been successful and the two that are needed to strengthen internationalisation.
International programs and activities

Regarding exchange, partnerships and other international activities, in 2006, KNUE had had international partnerships with 21 universities in six countries (Korea National University of Education, 2007d). By region, it has 14 (66.7%) partnership universities in Asia and seven (33.3%) in non-Asian areas. Most of its counterparts are in China (6), Japan (5) and U.S.A (4) which together comprise 15 (71%) of its 21 partner universities. In effect, its partnerships are concentrated on Northeast Asia and North America. The agreements mainly cover research collaboration and personnel exchange. Specific cases in the agreements are in-service programs with American institutions where KNUE sends English teachers to attend intensive English programs for four weeks.

As there is a low level of demand for student international exchange programs (Korea National University of Education, 2006), in general, international programs tend to be confined to specific areas such as short-term exchange programs for students via sister relationships with equivalent overseas institutions. Through these partnerships KNUE operated short-term student visiting and language programs sending 179 students, 3% of the total student enrolment in 2006, overseas. The cost varies depending on the destination region but KNUE underwrites around 50% of the cost. In year 2006 only two KNUE students were enrolled in exchange programs, while there were 10 Visiting Professors (Korea National University of Education, 2007d). Currently, the proportion of international personnel at KNUE is low. The number of international students enrolled at KNUE in 2006 was 3, 0.1% of all students (MOEHRD, 2007b). The number of foreign academic staff was 7 (4%) of a total of 185 academic staff in the same year (Korea National University of Education, 2007b) but all of them held the post of visiting scholar which does not lead to tenure.

Institutional management for internationalisation

In terms of its institutional management of internationalisation, KNUE has not yet established an organisation which is fully in charge of internationalisation. The closest to
such an organisation is the division of International Affairs. This is a small office, staffed by one individual, which is under the subdivision of Planning & Relations in the Office of Planning & Research. While the Planning & Relations Division manages the agreements with foreign institutions and assign the work to each organisation, follow-up work is devolved to each division, department and college (Korea National University of Education, 2007d). With the strong support of the President, the Planning & Relations Division actively extended its partnerships with foreign institutions in various areas in the world but limited power and resources of the division of International Affairs restricts the overall internationalisation capabilities of the university.

Due to the limited size and authority of the Division for International Affairs at KNUE, it cannot meet the demand from departments. In the questionnaire survey, heads of department were negative about cooperation between their department and the Division of International Affairs. While 18% of the heads were positive, 37% were negative and the rest (55%) were neutral. Causes of this dissatisfaction included the role of the Planning & Relations Division as initiator of international agreements, following which implementation is devolved to academic and other departments. Accordingly departments rarely contact the Planning & Relation Divisions regarding international affairs. Secondly, there are few personnel to handle international affairs. As mentioned, currently, there is only one staff member in the Planning & Relations Division who is fully in charge of international affairs and the person assigned to this role is shifted regularly. The circulation assignment system which brings frequent personnel change, thus hindering job competence in Korean public officials, is one of the main obstacles to achieving efficiency in organizations (J. S. Lee, 2002). This shifting system, mainly in national universities, impedes job specialisation. Because of the lack of personnel and inappropriate conditions, and the limited role played of the Planning and Relation Division, departments' needs for advice and support regarding international affairs may not be satisfied.
Contribution of returning scholars

The increasing number and importance of the international mobility of academics has aroused intense scholarly interest. In the higher education sector it is acknowledged that peripatetic scholars expedite scientific exchange and expansion via disseminating knowledge. Their advanced knowledge, cultural awareness and networks can boost scientific development. In spite of its short history, KNUE has become a leading university in teacher education in Korea. Now KNUE’s plans are to employ internationalisation as a strategy to become a leading teacher education university in the world (Korea National University of Education, 2005b). As with the other case studies, and Korean higher education more generally, returnees are an important part of the story of internationalisation. Therefore, it is reasonable to scrutinise returnees’ role in the development of knowledge and the internationalisation of KNUE. In this part the perceptions of returnees, their international activities, and the difficulties they face on return are discussed.

As in other cases, returnees at KNUE have two major characteristics: the majority have a research background in the U.S. and have quite long experience overseas. Among the Korean professoriate at KNUE, the number of those who held a foreign highest degree in 2006 was 91 (51%) (Korea National University of Education, 2007b). The proportion of those with an American degree was much higher than those from other countries. 70 (77%) academics had returned from the U.S whilst the number of academics who had obtained their highest degree from countries other than the U.S was only 21 (23%). In the survey, 83% of returnees responded that they had stayed abroad for five years or more (including their overseas study period), and 29% had an average two year work experience overseas in their relevant research field. Unlike short-term visitors, returnees at KNUE have long-term foreign experience which may influence not only their academic development but also their cultural awareness. The U.S., as a world academic centre, attracted the majority of scholars while returnees from the U.S. may graft their advanced knowledge into KNUE. The exclusion of other countries may hinder diversity and mean that research inclines toward American ways.
Table 6.6 KNUE returnee reasons for return

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family situation such as parents' request or family reunion</td>
<td>14 (58.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable job offer in Korea</td>
<td>16 (66.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties of daily life in foreign country</td>
<td>3 (12.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To contribute to the development of national science and knowledge</td>
<td>8 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better career prospects in Korea</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repayment of obligations to Korea such as scholarship or patriotism</td>
<td>1 (4.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to find the right job overseas</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items.

In the survey, returnees' two major reasons for return were acceptable job offer in Korea (66.7%), and family situation such as parents' request or family reunion (58.3%). When contemplating return job opportunities were the most significant factor for returnees. Korean identity was also important. In interviews, participants stated that they wanted to work in Korea because of family matters or Korean identity.

Participant: As my family lived in Korea, I returned just after the acquisition of the degree.
Interviewer: If you had had a good offer there, do you think you might have remained overseas?
Participant: No (KNUE 8).

(The reason was) simply my parents. As a Korean, when I departed Korea, I probably had the intention to return in my blood (KNUE 6).

Table 6.7 Perceptions of returnees' impact on development of KNUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very positive</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Very negative</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous scholars</td>
<td>1 (6.3%)</td>
<td>10 (62.5%)</td>
<td>4 (25.0%)</td>
<td>1 (6.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16 (100.0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripatetic scholars</td>
<td>7 (29.2%)</td>
<td>15 (62.5%)</td>
<td>2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24 (100.0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8 (20.0%)</td>
<td>25 (62.5%)</td>
<td>6 (15.0%)</td>
<td>1 (2.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40 (100.0 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic staff in general perceived the contribution of returnees to university development positively. In the survey, 82.5% of respondents had positive perceptions of their contributions and only 2.5% perceived them negatively. Academics expected that in the teaching and research area, returnees will bring developments via their advanced knowledge, newly developed theories and in-depth personal relationships with foreign academics. In the intercultural arena, they are expected to bring cultural diversity via introducing culture from their place of study abroad and, in the international areas, their international competence are considered beneficial leading international activities at the university.

In interview, many academics mentioned that returnees introduce new methodologies and theories bringing diversity in knowledge but at the same time some of them also expressed concerns about academic dependency.

While lots of foreign-educated scholars returned to universities, the atmosphere has changed. The change came with the importation and application of new methodologies and theories. I think, indirect influence is noteworthy when returnees, who stayed overseas working in a different research style and atmosphere, do research work here. In teacher education, especially subject-matter education, KNUE would be the institution employing biggest number of returned scholars, nationwide. Accordingly KNUE has significantly influenced education methodologies at school level. However, but there are also minor negative aspects. It seems that they lean too heavily towards an American style of teaching and research and there is a tendency to rely entirely on such a foreign style. They seem lack to adapt and adjust foreign things to our situations. In addition, there is a lack of cooperation between foreign educated scholars and domestically educated scholars (KNUE 3).

Table 6.8 Perceptions of returnees' impact on internationalisation at KNUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very positive</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Very negative</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>1 (6.3%)</td>
<td>12 (75.0%)</td>
<td>3 (18.8%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripatetic</td>
<td>2 (8.3%)</td>
<td>18 (75.0%)</td>
<td>4 (16.7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3 (7.5%)</td>
<td>30 (75.0%)</td>
<td>7 (17.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The role of returnees was also perceived positively in university internationalisation. 82.5% of respondents had positive perceptions and 17.5% were neutral. Foreign experience, foreign language ability, personal networks and an open-mind were listed as advantages in guiding international cooperation. KNUE has built on returnees experience of internationalisation, considering their host countries and institutions as primary targets for international cooperation agreements (Korea National University of Education, 2005b, p. 227). Hence, returnees are precious sources for international cooperation.

When the university has a project, it is stated explicitly that the returnees can offer a foothold. ... There was one case. A group of researchers had a project and one of them had returned from Britain. Because he was able to collect data from British universities via his former supervisor, the data collection and cooperation were concentrated on Britain. This is just what happened in one department but I think it is a kind of contribution. If all the members of the research group had consisted of only domestically educated scholars, one would have been perplexed to move to the next step (KNUE 6).

In my case, I work with a lot of assistance from returnees. ... For example, currently I am preparing an international symposium between Korea, China and Japan. I work with assistance of colleagues who have returned from China and Japan. When I carried out cooperation programs or tried to find universities (to cooperate), if there were any problems, when I asked, they helped me (KNUE 7).

Table 6.9 International activities of academic staff at KNUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Indigenous scholars</th>
<th>Peripatetic scholars</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching international students in class</td>
<td>2 (12.5%)</td>
<td>3 (12%)</td>
<td>5 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in international conferences</td>
<td>9 (56.3%)</td>
<td>15 (62.5%)</td>
<td>24 (60.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing academic papers in international journals</td>
<td>6 (37.5%)</td>
<td>15 (62.5%)</td>
<td>21 (52.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting international research projects</td>
<td>3 (18.8%)</td>
<td>5 (20.8%)</td>
<td>8 (20.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having students conduct international research</td>
<td>1 (6.3%)</td>
<td>3 (12.5%)</td>
<td>4 (10.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving funding for international research</td>
<td>7 (43.8%)</td>
<td>13 (54.2%)</td>
<td>20 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting research with foreign researchers</td>
<td>3 (18.8%)</td>
<td>7 (29.2%)</td>
<td>10 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16 (40.0%)</td>
<td>24 (60.0%)</td>
<td>30 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. These proportion were based on indigenous and peripatetic scholars' activities for two years (mid 2004 - mid 2006)

Understandably perhaps, returnees were more internationally active than indigenous scholars. Table 6.9 compares the international activities of peripatetic and indigenous
academic staff. In the questionnaire item regarding international activities in the last two years, peripatetic scholars were more active in all areas other than teaching international students in class. The difference between the two groups over the six items is not statistically significant according to the Chi-square test but based on the simple statistics of frequency it is assumed that peripatetic scholars are more active. Especially, in items such as publication in international journals, having students conduct international research and research collaboration with foreign researchers, peripatetic scholars were more active than indigenous scholars.

In spite of returnees’ greater international activities, some indigenous scholars are sceptical as to the actual contribution of the returnees. Some point out that because of the lack of the number of international programs, they do not explicitly contribute to internationalisation of KNUE.

Because the university does not have many programs with foreign universities, (returnees’ contribution) is not highlighted and (returnees) don’t play an important role, I think. ...Perhaps they have mutual exchange via personal relationship. But in the exchange between an institution and an institution, they are not sufficiently utilised. In my personal viewpoint, rather than via institution, they contact (their counterparts) personally... (KNUE2).

Table 6.10 Difficulties in teaching and research for returnees at KNUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scarce resources and poor facilities for work and research</td>
<td>8 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid administrative system</td>
<td>10 (41.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive teaching and administrative workload</td>
<td>10 (41.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited communication with international academics</td>
<td>2 (8.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid research atmosphere stemming from school ties, relations based on hometown, and the Confucian tradition.</td>
<td>8 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The difficulty of dissemination of advanced knowledge to academia in a given condition</td>
<td>2 (8.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difficulties</td>
<td>3 (12.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Respondents were asked to select the two most important items.
Excessive teaching and administrative workloads (41.7%) and the rigid administrative system (41.7%), which were two most serious difficulties inhibiting returnee research when they re-entered Korean institutions. This finding signals one way to facilitate the contribution of returnees. The survey result does not indicate the current situation in KNUE but one academic alluded to excessive teaching loads and a hierarchical atmosphere hindering academic work for newly employed young academics.

When I wrote dissertation and interned as a researcher, I had lots of themes to research. As you know the Korean system, is different to those of America, although I was an assistant professor, it was hard to do my research, which I liked to do due to the high administrative workload. Excessive teaching! Once I taught 21 hours per week. ...Because of excessive teaching for newly employed lecturers, I think they experienced some loss of sensibilities in research. Anyway, our cultural trait is that young academics have to hold the fort, I think, that would be a stumbling block. Strict relationship between senior and junior, a kind of hierarchy (KNUE1).

Table 6.11 Difficulties of life for returnees at KNUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty of employment</td>
<td>10 (41.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readjustment to Korean life and customs</td>
<td>4 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and language problems of children</td>
<td>5 (20.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate income</td>
<td>11 (45.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political and social conditions in Korea</td>
<td>5 (20.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difficulties</td>
<td>3 (12.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items

When asked about the difficulties faced in daily life when they returned to Korea, the two most frequent responses were inadequate income (45.8%) and uncertainty of employment (41.7%). These two items are closely linked to inadequate working opportunities in teaching and research areas. One member of academic staff, who took a secure full-time working position in the research centre when he returned, expressed feelings of deprivation compared to the financial condition of his colleagues who had stayed in Korea (KNUE1). However, more serious cases were those who returned without a secure job offers:

When I returned, I felt like a child. (Even though I had acquired a PhD), I was not ready to start again financially from zero at my age. It was hard due to the lack of finance rather
than difficulties of cultural readjustment. As a part-time lecturer, because the wages were too small, I faced difficulties in terms of finance. And it was also hard to have a part-time teaching position at universities (KNUE 4).

Returnees therefore, often start their career from a part-time lecturing job. It is difficult for both male and female returnees to get a full-time job. Female academics have experience greater difficulties getting employed (KNUE 6, 8) One female returnee expressed the challenge they face:

As female academics have less opportunity to be hired at university even though they have same degree, it was hard for me to enter a tenure track from a part-time position. Before becoming a tenured academic I could not relax, as I did not know when I would get such an offer, it was like when you are writing your PhD degree. You feel anxious about when will I complete the thesis and will I acquire my degree? Acquiring a secure job was like that. Except for that experience, I did not have serious difficulties (during the readjustment period) (KNUE 8).

Conclusion

The unique features of KNUE stem from the particular situation of the teacher education system in Korea. Internationalisation of KNUE has at least two different aspects, relative to other universities. One is the Korean orientation of this education-oriented university which leads to conflict between the openness of the education sector to the world, and the preservation of national identity. The other is its response to the demand of schools. There is no obligation for teachers to teach an international curriculum, but there is an increasing demand in education for international understanding at the school level (MOEHRD, 2000).

The aim of internationalisation of KNUE is to assist the university become an advanced teacher education university, leading institutional transformation with international experience and competence. Academics expected that the purpose of internationalisation was to improve the quality of education, and academic achievement, and to cultivate talents with international competence via academic and personnel exchange with foreign universities. While academics considered internationalisation is beneficial for research cooperation and quality of university, increased cost was considered to be the most serious risk. Two major obstacles are lack of finance and lack of strategies.
Implementation of internationalisation strategies at KNUE has been affected by its more locally-embedded academic culture and aims of education. It is focused on teacher education with an emphasis on international research collaboration and exchange programs. While a comprehensive internationalisation plan has not yet been established, the main international aspects of KNUE are partnership programs for personnel exchange and research collaboration. International Affairs of KNUE covers personnel exchange including various student exchange programs, teacher in-service programs with prominent foreign teacher education universities and visiting professor programs. Academics perceived exchange/visiting program were active but they responded that KNUE needed to strengthen its international aspects in research collaboration and internationalisation of curriculum.

Returnees, who comprise around half of the professoriate in KNUE, were seen positively in terms of their impact on internationalisation. Practically, they had more international activities compared to indigenous scholars. After their return, peripatetic scholars maintain personal networks with scholars in the host country and their international competence enables them to be more active on the international front. However, inadequate international programs have meant that the contribution of peripatetic scholars is not overly evident at the university level.

In spite of the strong perception of the necessity of internationalisation, KNUE has only implemented some international programs in limited areas. Successful collaboration programs could be extended but most of all, the university’s approaches to internationalisation need to be widened in other areas. The contribution of peripatetic scholars in various areas is valuable and now KNUE has to find the way to offer more opportunities for returnees to contribute to the internationalisation of the university overall.
CHAPTER SEVEN CASE STUDY THREE: YONSEI UNIVERSITY

Introduction

Internationalisation is high on the agendas of national governments and institutions of higher education. Internationalisation in Korean universities entered a new phase after 1995 when the government promulgated the 5.31 Educational Reform where keynotes of the proposal were Segyehwa[globalisation] and Gukjehwa[internationalisation]. Internationalisation was accelerated by the followed policies: “Brain Korea 21” for cultivating the elite via promoting world-class research-oriented universities, “Study Korea Project” for inviting international students, and “Internationalisation of Higher Education Strategies” for strengthening the international competitiveness of higher education institutions.

Since the 1960’s when Yonsei University established its International Division, Yonsei has widened its international education. The Graduate School of International Studies was opened in 1987 and Yonsei then opened the Underwood International College in 2006. Intrinsically international from its inception, Yonsei University is now entering a new phase. In 2005, Yonsei announced a new university development plan, Yonsei 2020, where internationalisation strategies were embedded. In addition, Yonsei plans to construct the Songdo Global Academic Complex in the neighbouring city of Inchon, aiming to become a major East Asian hub of education and research. Yonsei is a case of internationalisation whose implementation is not a marginal or specialized aspect of the university, but the mainstream driving force for the whole institution.

In order to investigate internationalisation of Yonsei, the research utilises the common framework for each case study: the university setting, perceptions of internationalisation, implementation of internationalisation in teaching and learning, international activities and institutional management, and returning scholars' contribution to internationalisation.
The university setting

Yonsei University is located at Seoul, the capital of Korea. With about 10 million inhabitants, Seoul is the nation’s economic, political and cultural centre. It is also the national hub of higher education. Taken advantage of their location, universities in Seoul have taken the lead in national higher education. Major Korean universities in Seoul attract talented high school graduates and scholars and students both domestic and international who prefer the universities there. Governmental and private funding sources also tend to focus more on a few leading universities in Seoul. Graduates from those universities likewise tend to occupy leading position in political, business, academic and legal communities.

Yonsei was established in its present form as an integrated university and medical complex in 1957 when Yonhi University and the Severance Union Medical College and Hospital were formally united. The history of Yonsei dates back to 1885, when King Gojong opened the first modern Korean hospital, the Gwanghyewon, under the direction of missionary Dr. Horace N. Allen. Later in 1904 the medical centre was renamed the Severance Union Medical College and Hospital in recognition of Mr. L.H. Severance for his donations to the school (Yonsei University, 2005b).

The Chosun Christian College was founded in 1915, by Dr. H.G. Underwood, a Protestant missionary. Later it was renamed Yonhi College. Its status remained during the Japanese colonial period until the establishment of the Republic of Korea when it was upgraded to become the comprehensive Yonhi university (Yonsei University, 2005b).

The spirit of these two predecessor institutions, founded by Christian missionaries in the modern Korean enlightenment period, has succeeded in engraving itself on the University of Yonsei. From its early days Yonsei has been founded on the basis of three distinctive ideas of enlightenment, Christianity and cooperation (Yonsei University, 1985). The Severance Union Medical College and Hospital during the Gwanghyewon period, for example, contributed to Korean modernisation through importing advanced knowledge.
Its foreign doctors educated students in the bases of Christianity with self-sacrifice in a so-called “hermit country,” as the Joseon Dynasty was referred to by the missionaries, and the institution was run cooperatively through the support not only of overseas benefactors but also the modern Korean government.

Yonsei is a comprehensive private university comprising two campuses, one in Seoul and the other in Wonju, Gangwon province. The Seoul campus targeted in this research consisted in 2006 of 16 colleges at the undergraduate level with 17,476 students and 16 graduate schools with 10,319 students (Yonsei University, 2007f). The number of full-time academic staff was 1,472 conducting teaching and research across all the academic disciplines in Liberal Arts, Business & Economics, Business, Science, Life Science & Biotechnology, Engineering, Theology, Social Sciences, Law, Music, Human Ecology, Education Sciences, University College, Medicine, Dentistry and Nursing (Yonsei University, 2007f).

Yonsei’s mission is to be “a centre of learning based on the principles of Christian teaching, which strives to educate leaders who will contribute to society in the spirit of truth and freedom” (Yonsei University, 2006). Recently it established the “Yonsei 2020 Vision & Strategy” based on its mission, which will direct its future status. The three core objectives of the Yonsei 2020 Vision & Strategy consist of creating Servant Leadership, Research Frontiers and Innovative Culture. Servant leadership refers to the nurturing of leaders who will serve their neighbours and devote themselves to the world community by strengthening fundamental education, inbound globalisation and volunteering. Research frontiers refers to securing global competitiveness in research through nurturing

---

9 Servant leadership means leadership to serve neighbours and the people as a servant. According to Greenleaf (2002), servant leadership is a philosophy which supports people who serve first, and then lead as a way of expanding service to individuals and institutions. In Christianity, the concept of servant leadership can be traced back to Jesus, who taught his disciples: “You know that those who are regarded as rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their high officials exercise authority over them. Not so with you. Instead, whoever wants to become great among you must be your servant, and whoever wants to be first must be slave of all” (Mark 10:42-45).

10 Inbound globalisation is a strategy to transform the campus attracting foreign students and scholars.
the talented, promoting selected fields of research, enhancing interdisciplinary work and industry-academic cooperation. Lastly innovative culture stresses the imperative of promoting research excellence and education through a refocus in administrative service and improvement of governance (Yonsei Vision Committee & SERI, 2005).

General feature of internationalisation at Yonsei is that it approaches internationalisation via strategies embedded in the long-term university development plan. The Division of International Education & Exchange (DIEE)\(^{11}\) manages the implementation of strategies. Amongst the teaching departments, it is the Graduate School of International Studies (GSIS) at the graduate level, and the Underwood International College (UIC) at the undergraduate level that lead the change in internationalisation. The majority international students in degree courses are concentrated in these two colleges/schools whilst non-degree programs, such as Korean language programs, attract thousands of foreign students annually.

**Perceptions of Internationalisation**

Underpinned by its historically international background, Yonsei has nurtured aspirations for internationalisation from its foundation. Its two predecessors, the Severance Union Medical College and Hospital and the Chosun Christian College, founded by foreigners in the enlightenment period of Korea, were places of encounter between Western and Korean culture. Yonsei academics tend to perceive the university as an institution established on a strong international foundation which remains a key strength.

One idea came into my mind when I heard internationalisation is the foundation of Yonsei. Because Yonsei was established by missionaries, Western things were acceptable to Yonsei from the beginning. It is one reason why Yonsei leads international academic exchange amongst Korean universities. It is the basis of our various international exchange programs. I'd like to say it is a main motive (Yonsei 9).

\(^{11}\) In order to approach internationalisation more systemically, it reorganised to Office of International Affairs (OIA) in 2007.
A characteristic of Yonsei's internationalisation is that it is a part of a well-integrated university development plan, “Yonsei Vision 2020” which was developed following a thorough SWOT analysis. This institutional vision directs all institutional aims and strategies towards fostering a world-class university. In the context of this institutional vision Yonsei has proclaimed its fundamental direction of university education for students as follows:

Yonsei nurtures leaders who serve their neighbours and devote themselves to the world community. We strive to be a university that is beloved and trusted around the world for servant leadership that seeks to fulfill its duty to society through education and service (Yonsei University, 2006).

Yonsei perceives internationalisation as one of the three strategies to establish its status as a world-class institution. Within the Yonsei Vision 2020, three fundamental strategies were articulated: globalization, specialization, and digitalization. Its international aspects are emphasised within the first strategy, globalization indicates where, “notably the deep and pervasive internationalisation of the campus via the extension of international education and efforts to increase numbers of foreign students and scholars” (Yonsei Vision Committee & SERI, 2005).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationales</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing international and intercultural understanding of university members</td>
<td>6 (7.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising quality of education to a world-class level</td>
<td>61 (77.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing the knowledge and skill base in intercultural relations and communications for students to respond to the demands of our society and private sectors</td>
<td>51 (64.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserving and promoting national culture</td>
<td>4 (5.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing the university’s international reputation, adding revenue and attracting more students</td>
<td>6 (7.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to national identity and development</td>
<td>5 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting university academic achievements via cooperation with overseas institutions</td>
<td>23 (29.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items

In paralleling to the university’s official approach to internationalisation, Table 7.1 shows that academic staff perceptions reveal an emphasis on the more practical aspects of
internationalisation. Understandings of internationalisation vary according to individual definitions but when asked to choose the two main rationales, the majority of academics expressed an interest in raising the quality of education to a world class level (77.2%) and enhancing the knowledge and skills base in intercultural relations and communications for students to respond to the demands of Korean society and the private sectors (64.6%).

In interviews, academics mentioned various perceptions of internationalisation; which can be summarised into prerequisite purposes and main activities. While scholars understood the main thrust internationalisation to refer to connection, exchange, collaboration and networking (Yonsei 10, 11, 15, 16), some indicated that the exchange should be based on Korean identity (Yonsei 11, 13, 15). Ultimately internationalisation is expected to lead to the further development of the university, improving the quality of education for students in a globalised environment (Yonsei 2, 16).

The reason we have to internationalise our university is to intensify competitiveness, by improving the quality of education for students. What is globalisation? Let me be more specific. When students graduate from a university, they seek employment. Then the job they are likely to get will blur the boundaries between the domestic and foreign. Even if they seek employment in Korea, currently, how many foreign companies have come to Korea? Foreign firms have about a 40% stake in the major Korean electronics firms. Even purely domestic companies have to compete with foreign companies in the domestic market and global market to survive. That is the reality in a globalised world. In order to prepare for this, universities have to educate students to global standards (Yonsei 2).

Within the context of globalisation, academic staff consider internationalisation to be the way to improve the quality of education and educate students with knowledge and skills that are pertinent to the global market but still based on national values.

Table 7.2 Necessity of internationalisation at Yonsei

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Necessity</th>
<th>Very strong</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Very weak</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very strong</td>
<td>35 (44.3%)</td>
<td>38 (48.1%)</td>
<td>6 (7.6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The high priority attached to internationalisation is also shown in academic staff perceptions of the necessity of internationalisation. Responding to the question of how you estimate the necessity for internationalisation in the university, 92.4% of academics strongly agreed on the need for internationalisation.

Table 7.3 Obstacles to internationalisation at Yonsei

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacles</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of government support</td>
<td>11 (13.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of policies and strategies for internationalisation</td>
<td>33 (41.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of finances within the university</td>
<td>41 (51.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative inertia or difficulties</td>
<td>6 (7.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of facilities</td>
<td>5 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of reliable and comprehensive information</td>
<td>5 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of staff for internationalisation</td>
<td>30 (38.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficiently trained or qualified staff to guide the process</td>
<td>5 (6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level of interest by university members</td>
<td>11 (13.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties in recruiting international students/staff</td>
<td>10 (12.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items

The main obstacles perceived by academics were lack of finance (51.9%), lack of policy and strategies for internationalisation (41.8%), and lack of staff for internationalisation (38.0%). Given the perception of internationalisation as a means to become a "world class university," a research-oriented university should give the uppermost priority to funding. Insufficient funds consequently result in a lack of staff for internationalisation. "Lack of policies and strategies for internationalisation" indicates the perceived importance of internationalisation policies and strategies. Academic staff agreed with the university's emphasis upon internationalisation but felt that the details, policies and strategies for internationalisation may be inadequate. As a comprehensive university, definitions, understandings, approaches and demands for internationalisation are varied. Some respondents raised a fundamental question as to the direction of internationalisation (Yonsei 7, 11, 16). Others, while accepting the institution's approach, demanded more active strategies (Yonsei 6, 12).
Internationalisation policies at Yonsei consist in practice of lectures in English, research publication in international journals and incentives to academic staff for those activities. But if we do those, why should Koreans have to lecture in English about content learned through the Korean language and why should English writing be so highly valued? Given this context, then staff who speak English like Americans are seen as better than Koreans... (Yonsei 11).

Internationalisation should be an integration of the local and global where locals are networking at the global level and accomplish something. But if we implement internationalisation very simplistically based on uniform criteria such as becoming one of the top 100 world-ranked universities, and improving our English, we may lag behind. We may lose creative activities. It will eventually weaken academia... (Yonsei 16).

Although perceptions of the university’s internationalisation strategies may vary, the apparent contradiction between the apprehensions expressed above and the fact that internationalisation is a key part of Yonsei’s overall development strategy raises an interesting issue. Measuring results by indices such as the number of courses taught in English and articles published in international journals is liable to distort the university’s strategies, raising pressures on academic staff to concentrate on achieving a certain dimension of internationalisation. In addition, in the development stage of internationalisation, the lack of adequate support, and explicit strategies and guidelines, or recognition of differences between disciplines may lead to a lack of involvement by staff.

Table 7.4 Benefits of internationalisation at Yonsei

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement in quality of university</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building international networks</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening research cooperation</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of international students</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending diversity in teaching and learning</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural awareness</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to advanced knowledge</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items
Asked about the benefits of internationalisation, academic staff placed more value on the following three items: quality of education (58.2%), research cooperation (51.9%), and international network (43.0%). Improving the quality of education, research collaboration and international networking were seen as more desirable than recruiting international students, promoting intercultural awareness to university members, and accessing advanced knowledge.

In interview, respondents saw the benefits of internationalisation in terms of mutual exchange of personnel and knowledge (Yonsei 9, 10, 19), improvement in quality of the university (Yonsei 3, 4, 6, 8, 12, 13), better education for students (Yonsei 2, 14), international networking (Yonsei 16), and enhanced reputation (Yonsei 5, 8).

It is significant. It is not just like teaching English to students at kindergarten, primary and secondary schools. Our students at the university communicate in a foreign language [English]. Since international students are coming, the curriculum will be internationalised. Then, [Yonsei's] students will first have self confidence and their competitiveness will be improved. To be internationalised, things such as the quality of lectures and facilities have to first reach an international level, so that [international] students will come. ... University members will attain international competence and in terms of facilities and human resources [Yonsei] will be a world level university (Yonsei3).

These responses are in line with the perceived rationales for internationalisation (Table 7.1) where academic staff emphasise the quality of education and cultivating talent more than international and intercultural understanding. In addition, the low priority attached to accessing advanced knowledge seems to indicate that academic staff perceive international networks and research collaboration as a matter of mutual benefit, rather than a one-sided relationship. This presumably reflects the perceptions of respondents that Korea is now an advanced country.
Table 7.5 Risks of internationalisation at Yonsei

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss of cultural identity</td>
<td>12(15.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain drain</td>
<td>11(13.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased costs</td>
<td>65(82.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased competition</td>
<td>19(24.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constriction of teaching and research activities</td>
<td>17(21.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarisation</td>
<td>11(13.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No risk</td>
<td>15(16.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items.

In terms of risk, by far the most-frequently mentioned was increased costs (82.3%) followed by increased competition (24.1%). In a globalised context where universities compete regardless of their national boundaries, academic staff at Yonsei, which is one of the best funded Korean universities, felt that increased costs was both a burden that had to be borne for the sake of internationalisation but also a risk for the university. Recruiting qualified academic staff, establishing more facilities and tailored programs for internationalisation, will draw funds from other sectors in a context of scarce financial resources causing an imbalance in academic development. It also implies that internationalisation is a threat to newly developing universities in general leaving them behind due to their lack of resources. Given that internationalisation is a major route towards achieving the status of a top-tier world class university, inadequate funds may actually result in a slippage of their rank. Consequently, internationalisation can result in developing universities moving to the bottom tier in their global order.

Interestingly, only a mere 15.2% of staff were concerned about "loss of cultural identity." This response was clarified through interviews with academic staff regarding "loss of cultural identity." In terms of cultural identity, some articulated their concern about the relative contraction of Korean culture and language (Yonsei 7, 11, 13).
I agree that internationalisation contributes to the development of Yonsei but current approaches have some problems. I'd like to say that the meaning of existence is in the tension between the centrifugal and centripetal force. Like existence itself, if internationalisation is strong in centrifugal force but weak in centripetal force, there will be problems ... Yonsei was established by a missionary, Underwood. Our university is the fruit of this encounter of Western and Eastern culture and has developed out of this integration. This is one of the ideals of this institution. Korean and Western studies have developed together in this context. However, for some time, Yonsei has leaned toward the West. From now on, the internationalisation process has to be in integrated... (Yonsei7).

However, some in the opposite camp argued that this presupposition of the loss of cultural identity is too defensive and asserted that the process of intercultural transformation will result in a gain for Korean culture, rather than a loss (Yonsei 2, 4, 5).

Some would say that internationalisation might erode such things such as our identity and Korean language... But we should consider both sides of internationalisation. For example, in terms of inbound internationalisation, when foreign scholars and students come to Yonsei, is it only us who absorb foreign knowledge and standards? Of course not! Foreign students will learn Korean studies or East Asian studies. These are very Korean things. They come to Yonsei to learn in those programs. In order to attract more international students we have to provide highly quality programs. Why is this a loss of Korean culture? Instead, we can develop Korean studies to a world level. It can be global standard Korean studies... (Yonsei 2)

This disagreement on cultural identity seems to have been caused by different understandings of the results of internationalisation. In spite of leading groups in internationalisation insisting that internationalisation may lead to the further development of Korean studies, some scholars doubt the positive impact of the current internationalisation on Korean culture and identity.

**Implementation of internationalisation**

With the catchphrase, “Inbound Internationalisation,” Yonsei is pursuing an internationalisation strategy which attracts more international students and scholars. Three projects for inbound internationalisation are “pursing higher forms of internationalisation,” “establishing dormitories for international students and scholars” and “nurturing global students with multi-lingual and multi-cultural competence” (Yonsei Vision Committee & SERI, 2005, pp. 52-55). This does not simply mean an increase in
foreign students but a whole institutional transformation to secure quality in education and research, and spread this to all parts of the organisation in order to become a more attractive institution for foreign students and scholars.

**Teaching, learning and research**

With regard to teaching and learning, the number of courses in English is a key measure of internationalisation in the Korean higher education context. At university level, the increase of courses taught in English was considered an important criterion. For the most frequently used language in teaching and research, 94.9% of academic staff choose English. In 2006, Yonsei opened 17.5% of undergraduate courses in English and it plans to reach 40% by 2010 (Yonsei University, 2007e).

Along with a strong emphasis on lectures in English, the internationalised curriculum containing international content and activities in the process of teaching and learning is becoming more important. Internationalisation approaches in teaching and learning can be divided into three levels. The most international group are the international departments such as the Underwood International College (UIC) and the Graduate School of International Studies (GSIS) where all courses provided are taught in English with significant international and intercultural curriculum content. The second leading group consists of the departments where a special international oriented program is provided such as the Global MBA in Yonsei's Graduate School of Business. The Global MBA is one of the courses offered in the School of Business. In this course all subjects are taught in English and the curriculum is international and intercultural. The rest of Yonsei has a domestic profile, in which, nonetheless, international content in the curriculum and subjects taught in English is gradually increasing. For example, in the Department of Psychology in the College of Liberal Arts, about 10% of subjects were taught in English in 2006 (Yonsei 9).

These varied approaches are based on the characteristics of departments where some have an intrinsically high international profile in curriculum and a high proportion of
international students whilst other departments attract indigenous students and have classroom activities with little international content as they have few international students. The curriculum in the GSIS, for example, consists of a full range of international and interdisciplinary content.

The class is taught in English in a seminar style. Class materials are foreign papers (written in English). International students make up 50% or more of the class. The atmosphere of the class is very international. ... (Yonsei 8)

Most of the other departments have more local content but the curriculum is filled with international subject matter or is strongly influenced foreign university teaching practices. The curricula in these departments is set by adopting from those of the world class universities and through the process of teaching and learning various international activities are provided even though the international content in the curriculum is relatively low.

Under the influence of Europe and the U.S. the curricula in my department were revolutionised two years ago ... Specialised elective courses are set for eight weeks in Year Four. In these courses students select any foreign universities with which we have an international agreement or remote areas in a developing country (Yonsei 14).

In the College of Music, there is a "Master Class," designed to invite foreign experts for two weeks of lectures and performance that has been set up as a two credit course. Each semester we invite four foreign academics and they hold lectures and musical performances (Yonsei 1).
Figure 7.1 International programs and strategies at Yonsei

Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items that have been successful and the two that are needed to strengthen internationalisation.

With a strong desire for internationalisation, academic staff stressed the importance of the curriculum. For the two items needed to strengthen internationalisation, they listed "internationalisation in curriculum" at the top (32%) (Figure 7.1). The development of an internationalised curriculum is a comprehensive and practical way for internationalisation. For academic staff at Yonsei, internationalised curricula are those with an international orientation in content aimed at educating students to develop a strong knowledge and skill-base in intercultural relations and communications which is
the second most frequent answer for the rationale for internationalisation (Table 7.1).

Internationalisation can result in the development of specialised curricula with various programs designed to attract and teach more international students (Yonsei 2, 4, 8, 10). It can also mean the development of high quality curricula with international accreditation or incorporation of those curricula into the curricula at Yonsei (Yonsei 3, 9). Amid various viewpoints about the internationalised curriculum, what academic staff in Yonsei desire is to implement internationalisation at a very practical level. The curriculum can be developed to suit the different demands and directions of internationalisation among departments.

As a research-oriented university, research and international collaboration is becoming important at Yonsei. In 2006, Yonsei had 131 affiliated research institutes. Research funds totalled $200 million in the same year (Yonsei University, 2007c). According to the data from MOEHRD (2007e), Yonsei was ranked second in Korea and 106 in the world with a total of as 1,857 research articles published in SCI-indexed journals. In 2005, Yonsei established the “Global 5-5-10” program which states Yonsei’s goals to achieve global ranking in the top 10 in at least five fields within the next five years. Under the “Global 5-5-10,” the university has selected twelve fields on which the university funds will be concentrated, and selected research teams from successful departments were also awarded BK21 funds from the government. One of the teams, the Institute for NanoBio Molecular Assembly, has extensive worldwide collaborative networks with institutions such as the University of Bologna, and Stanford University. This team also provides support to academic staff and students to attend international conferences and undertake short-term overseas research attachments, and invite foreign scholars (Yonsei University, 2007b, p. 15). The team often invited Nobel Chemistry prize winners to speak at conferences at the university (Yonsei 3).

The School of Psychology is not one of the teams in the twelve selected groups/disciplines but it is one of 33 teams in Yonsei which are participating in the

---

12 Science Citation Index (SCI) maintained by Institute of Scientific Information (ISI) in U.S. is a database of published scientific articles. The MOEHRD data analysis was based on a CD-ROM database.
second stage of the BK 21 project, extending its international profile. Nine academic staff out of thirteen in the department are involved in the project with post-doctorates and research students. The team project does not involve all academic staff in the department but, because it is closely linked to the department, it boosts research capabilities in the department supporting international collaboration, presentations of graduate students in international conferences, invitation of international scholars, research publication in English and courses in English (Yonsei University, 2007b).

The selection of these areas for intensive support was designed to develop some promising areas to world-level, the within circumstances of an overall scarcity of resources in the university. It is likely to secure the development of the selected areas; however, disregarding questions of how progress towards these goals will be measured, it will also result in other areas competing intensely with each other for the remaining scarce resources.

**International programs and activities**

By 2006, Yonsei had established international agreements with 536 foreign institutions across 57 countries where a total of 600 Yonsei students attended exchange programs (Yonsei University, 2007c). In the same year, Yonsei attracted 617 international students in undergraduate and graduate schools, which was about 2.2% of all students (MOEHRD, 2007b). In the same year full-time foreign academic staff numbered 52 which was about 3.5% of all full-time academic staff (MOEHRD, 2007d).

For incoming international exchange students, Yonsei has instituted an International Fall/Spring Semester. This is a one or two semester short-term visiting program where all courses are taught in English except for the Korean language course. These are tailor-made programs introducing Korean culture for visiting international students from sister institutions during the vacation. For domestic students, Yonsei has designed the

---

13 This includes the 282 institutions joined worldwide under the International Student Exchange Programs (ISEP)
following programs: the Study Abroad Program, Visiting Students Program, Global Internship Program and Outgoing Exchange program. The Study Abroad Program, Visiting Students Program and Outgoing Exchange program are designed for coursework in foreign counterpart tertiary institutions. The Global Internship Program is a practical program designed to study international business practices (Yonsei University, 2007d).

Dual or Joint degree programs have been implemented in some departments. The College of Law has a dual degree program with the Washington College of Law at the American University in U.S. Participants are required to study for two semesters at Yonsei University Graduate School and two semesters at the American University Washington College of Law to be conferred degrees from both universities (Yonsei University, 2005a). The Dual Degree Program at Graduate School for International Study requires the student to take courses for one year at Yonsei and another year at the University of Geneva as a result of which they gain a Master’s degree from Yonsei and MBA from University of Geneva (Yonsei University, 2007a).

Some existing extracurricular international activities are the Buddy Family & Homestay Program, Language Exchange, Buddy Program and Global Lounge. The Global Lounge is a multi-functional space designed to foster international exchange with students, using Internet and satellite broadcasting services and international programs. The Buddy Family & Homestay Program, operated by Global Lounge, is aimed at international students who like to gain a broader and deeper insight into Korea from living with Korean families. The Language Exchange and Buddy Program matches international students and Korean students on a one to one basis for sharing language and experiences across different cultural backgrounds (Yonsei University, 2007d).

The international programs and activities ranked most active by academic staff was the student/faculty exchange programs (63.3%), followed by courses taught in foreign languages (32.9%) and international conferences (27.8%) whereas internationalised curricula (31.6%), international research collaboration (30.4%), and recruitment of international students (25.3%) were listed as the items most needed to strengthen
internationalisation. Joint academic programs with international partners (20.3%) and appropriate funding and resource allocation systems (20.3%) consistent with above analysis were listed as inactive and needed reinforcement (Figure 7.2).

**Institutional management for internationalisation**

Internationalisation strategies are realised through organisational commitment. From 1966 the International Division has been operated to manage international affairs (Yonsei University, 2007d). Through its continuing investment and efforts via the International Division, Yonsei has developed its own internationalisation model (Ha, 2007). In the face of the new internationalisation challenges governance is becoming important in the organisation. In 2000 Yonsei established a committee to coordinate internationalisation across the whole institution where previously several organisations with an international focus had worked separately (Yonsei University, 2000). Yonsei established the International Relations General Committee for the discussion and resolution of issues relating to international affairs among the various departments. The committee is under the direct control of the President and the head of the committee is the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The executive organisation for international affairs is the Division of International Education & Exchange (DIEE). It is in charge of international affairs such as agreements, exchange programs, the international semester, special programs and international dormitories.

Academic staff perceive that the university president as having strong intentions for internationalisation plain clarified in the university. The DIEE leads cooperation with the teaching and research departments and other administrative units within the university. Satisfaction with levels of organisational effort to cooperate between departments and DIEE, however, remained neutral. 17.4% of heads of department responded that the cooperation was positive whereas, 69.6% were neutral and 13% were negative. This result might be caused by the widening gap between increasing demands for internationalisation efforts but insufficient support. While most of international affairs are executed at the UIC, GSIS and DIEE, international activities are also increasing in each
department. Others departments which are not equipped with international administrative staff need more support from the DIEE but the DIEE mainly deals with international affairs relating to the whole institution.

When a department invites a foreign scholar, costs, a place to stay and other incidental matters follow. For those matters, we need more support from DIEE. With the trend of increasing international students, there is also an increasing demand from them for issues such as visa problems and other difficulties. The DIEE’s service seems not to extend to all these matters. For example, one of my colleagues spent much of his time to help his foreign students’ visa problems. I hope the DIEE can cover all of these kinds of matters. When we had an international seminar, the department spent all budget. If we received financial and administrative support from the university, it would be better. If we ask the DIEE, it is a very bureaucratic process. It seems more complicated. I do not know whether there is a clear assigned role between each department and the DIEE, but normally, each department deals with its own international matters while the DIEE deals with international affairs related to the whole university (Yonsei 9).

Facing demands for systemic approaches to internationalisation, in 2007, Yonsei established the Office of International Affairs (OIA) replacing the former DIEE. It was reorganised for the purpose of effective implementation of internationalisation and to support individual colleges and departments. Its structure is not that of an affiliated department but one of the main administration offices governed by a dean. The office consists of the “International Relations Section” for internationalisation planning, international protocol, and exchange programs, and the “International Scholars and Students Service Section” for supporting international scholars and students (Yonsei University, 2007d).

**Contribution of returning scholars**

Of the academic faculty at Yonsei University, those who had gained their highest degree abroad were in the majority. Among Korean full-time academic staff at Yonsei in 2006, 51.6%\(^{14}\) acquired their highest degree overseas. In the survey, almost all of the peripatetic scholars (98.3%) had at least 5-years overseas experience and 39.7% had lived overseas for more than ten years, in contrast to indigenous scholars of whom only 4.8% had lived

\(^{14}\) With the exception of academics in the Faculty of Medicine, of whom more than 90% are domestic PhD holders, the proportion of foreign PhD holders in all other departments is 84.8%.
overseas for more than five years. The majority of returnees commenced their foreign education at the graduate level having obtained their bachelor degrees in Korea. While 8.6% began their foreign education at the undergraduate level, most returnees commenced their overseas education either at the Master's (46.6%) or Doctoral level (98.3%). Working experience in the related research area after acquisition of the degree is often considered a way to deepen and intensify knowledge. Among the returnees, 56.9% had work experience in the relevant area and the average overseas work period was 2.2 years, which was in contrast to the 14.3% of indigenous scholars with overseas work experience who generally had shorter overseas work experience periods.

Table 7.6 Yonsei returnee reasons for return

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family situation such as parents’ request or family reunion</td>
<td>25 (43.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable job offer in Korea</td>
<td>35 (60.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties of daily life in foreign country</td>
<td>8 (13.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To contribute to the development of national science and knowledge</td>
<td>18 (31.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better career prospects in Korea</td>
<td>6 (10.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repayment of obligations to Korea such as scholarship or patriotism</td>
<td>2 (3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to find the right job overseas</td>
<td>1 (1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean identity</td>
<td>3 (5.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items

Articulating the factors behind their homecoming, participants in the survey chose two main reasons: an acceptable job offer in Korea (60.3%) and family situation such as parents' request or family reunion (43.1%) being the most popular reasons given. Like other cases in the research (HGU, KNUE and SNU), while many factors were involved, work opportunities and family matters were the two major reasons. In interviews, regardless of age and gender, participants mentioned these two reasons as major factors. One senior academic explained the main factors behind his choice to return in terms of the favourable atmosphere for returnees.
In former days, it was strange! Now it is changed. We might have had the mindset that when we left, we thought we would come back. My seniors and my juniors as well. (That time) only a few remained in U.S. Then there were few teaching staff available to teach in Korea. In addition, there were lots of opportunities and we were able to contribute to the development of the fatherland. There were two causes. In terms of culture, we were educated (to be like that) and at that time, there was a program to invite (overseas Korean) scientists to return. Even removal costs were supported. So, there was a preferential treatment. I returned in 1982 through the programs. So to speak, there was warm welcome for returning (scientists), even though one had not accomplished great things. It is different these days (Yonsei 3).

One middle aged academic described the importance of family matters for his return:

The most important reason was family. My parents were in Korea. As the eldest son (in my family) I quit my stable job and I made a bombshell declaration to study abroad. (But) I received financial support from my parents. In terms of Korean feelings about family tradition as the eldest son, staying in the U.S. didn’t seem to be a possible way. If I had been alone, I would have searched for a job (in U.S.)....Another important thing was that I wanted to teach what I’d learned to students in Yonsei as soon as possible.... A job in Yonsei was not guaranteed but I might get a job in other university, and then might change to Yonsei... (Yonsei 5).

Table 7.7 Perceptions of returnees' impact on development of Yonsei

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very positive</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Very negative</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous scholars</td>
<td>1 (4.8%)</td>
<td>13 (61.9%)</td>
<td>6 (28.6%)</td>
<td>1 (4.8%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21 (26.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripatetic scholars</td>
<td>23 (39.7%)</td>
<td>28 (48.3%)</td>
<td>7 (12.1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58 (73.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24 (30.4%)</td>
<td>41 (51.9%)</td>
<td>14 (16.5%)</td>
<td>1 (1.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are high expectations that peripatetic scholars will make a major contribution to the development of the university and particularly to internationalisation. While peripatetic scholars themselves have a more positive perception of their role, most academic staff (82.3%) revealed positive perceptions of the influence of foreign educated scholars on university development in the survey. The main reasons for positive perceptions of their role in the development of the university were their contribution to the introduction of advanced knowledge and theory, international networks, international sensibilities, diversity of research, publication in international journals, research funding and internationalisation. By contrast, an insufficient understanding of domestic matters and
consequent inappropriate application of theory and methodologies to the Korean situation were identified as negative aspects.

Returnees have clearly contributed to Yonsei’s development through knowledge dissemination. While some disciplines were still at the early stage of development in the university, returnees introduced advanced knowledge and laid the groundwork for academic development.

We have caught up but still in the Natural Science, especially in Basic Science and Engineering as well, in terms of academic levels, the U.S., Canada and Japan are decades advance than us. (Study abroad) was supposed to be for us (at that time) an opportunity to learn cutting edge knowledge. When I studied at graduate school we did not have sufficient experimental facilities. We could not even study here. There were only a few academic staff there. Now we have more than twenty academic staff here. As there was huge scientific knowledge gap, the importance of the returnees’ contribution is difficult to express (Yonsei 3).

In the department we had a biomechanics class which was the first one to have been introduced into Korea. The professor, who taught the class in the early 1980’s when he returned, introduced the discipline. Research related to the area always became a “top-labelled” one in Korea. Those people who introduced new disciplines also established the curriculum. The thesis structure in the Master and Doctor Degree and the process was set up…. (Yonsei 12).

Table 7.8 Returnee influence on internationalisation of Yonsei

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very positive</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Very negative</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous scholars</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
<td>18 (85.7%)</td>
<td>3 (14.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21 (26.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripatetic scholars</td>
<td>22 (37.9%)</td>
<td>27 (46.6%)</td>
<td>9 (15.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58 (73.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22 (27.8%)</td>
<td>45 (57.0%)</td>
<td>12 (15.2%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academics also have positive perceptions of the returnees’ role in internationalisation (84.8%). The main reasons for their positive perceptions were their international networks, foreign language (English) fluency, international competence, publication in international journals, work with foreign scholars, guidance of students in international aspects, experience in advanced institutions, work in international agreements at Yonsei, and other vigorous international activities. On the other hand, neutral perception were
based on the lack of opportunities in internationalisation activities. It was claimed that
internationalisation was not a mainstream activity and because of time limitations, it was
hard to contribute to international dimensions other than research areas.

Due to academic developments over the past decades, the university is no longer an
under-developed environment in teaching and research but, within the context of
strengthening international knowledge networks, the role of the returnees is still
important. In the teaching and research area returnees have a key role to play with
vigorous international activities in internationalisation.

Table 7.9 International activities of academic staff at Yonsei

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Indigenous scholars</th>
<th>Peripatetic scholars</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching international students in class</td>
<td>11 (52.4%)</td>
<td>38 (65.5%)</td>
<td>49 (62.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in international conferences</td>
<td>18 (85.7%)</td>
<td>55 (94.8%)</td>
<td>73 (92.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing academic papers in international journals</td>
<td>17 (81.0%)</td>
<td>54 (93.1%)</td>
<td>71 (89.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting international research projects</td>
<td>3 (14.3%)</td>
<td>26 (44.8%)</td>
<td>29 (36.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having students conduct international research</td>
<td>1 (4.8%)</td>
<td>20 (34.5%)</td>
<td>21 (26.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving funding for international research</td>
<td>6 (28.6%)</td>
<td>30 (51.7%)</td>
<td>36 (45.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting research with foreign researchers</td>
<td>4 (19.0%)</td>
<td>27 (46.6%)</td>
<td>31 (39.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21 (26.6%)</td>
<td>58 (73.4%)</td>
<td>79 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. These proportions were based on indigenous and peripatetic scholars' activities for two years
(mid 2004 - mid 2006)

Table 7.9 compares and contrasts the contributions made by indigenous and peripatetic
academic staff in international activities, according to the areas of teaching, conferences,
publications, research projects, students research projects, funding and research
collaboration, over the last two years. Compared to indigenous scholars the peripatetic
scholars were more active. Across the general vigorous activities of peripatetic scholars
in all items their differences were significant in three other areas: performing
international research projects ($\chi^2 = 6.190$, df = 1, $p < .05$), having students conducting
international research ($\chi^2 = 6.978$, df = 1, $p < .01$), and conducting research with overseas
researchers ($\chi^2 = 4.892, \text{ df } = 1, p < .05$). Peripatetic scholars were three times as active on the dimension of “performing international research projects,” twice as active in “conducting research with foreign researchers” and seven times as active in “having students engaged in international research.”

Returnees’ distinct contribution to teaching is evident in their advantage in being more able to guide students towards an international research atmosphere, one with which they are more acquainted and more involved.

When I do my research, I open toward the world trends. As I come across (a world trend), I try to introduce these trends to my students. According to some viewpoints, research and teaching have the same direction. I keep doing international collaborative research and I make an effort to share what I have absorbed, with my students. Some of them I am going to send to foreign laboratories. On vacation, occasionally, I have visited institutions where related research is being conducted. When I introduced our strong research areas during seminars, they were very interested. Then we can start following collaborative research opportunities, sending my students there, supported by scholarships from the Korean Science and Engineering Foundation or the Korean Research Foundation. For my teaching, as a scientist in Industrial Engineering, currently, I teach a subject related to the museum. When I visited museums overseas, I observed exhibitions feeling out the trends and then I conceive projects for students. Then, from the following semester I apply this experience to the class arranging term projects. Like this, I always try to apply the learning from visiting to the research and lecturing (Yonsei 10).

The usefulness of their foreign experience and foreign language fluency in research and teaching are also of practical use in the implementation of internationalisation strategies. Their international networks play an important role in extending the international network in their institution:

It won’t be done without any prerequisite relations to establish a relationship with foreign institutions and scholars. Returnees work as a bridge. Through them and their networks, internationalisation is realised in many cases (Yonsei 9).

They are at the centre of resolving matters of institutional strategies and programmes. The head of the international office, the DIEE, was a returnee and returnees were also actively involved in other teaching, research and administrative areas.
It varies across disciplines but there is a tendency that when the university determines new internationalisation strategies, returnees are more frequently involved in the committee because of their foreign experiences. It is felt that they have developed an international sense while they conducted research with better facilities in better environments (which are our goals to reach) (Yonsei 5).

Table 7.10 Difficulties in teaching and research for returnees at Yonsei

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scarce resources and poor facilities for work and research</td>
<td>24 (41.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid administrative system</td>
<td>19 (32.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive teaching and administrative workload</td>
<td>43 (74.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited communication with international academics</td>
<td>1 (1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid research atmosphere stemming from school ties, relations based on hometown, and the Confucian tradition.</td>
<td>13 (22.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The difficulty of dissemination of advanced knowledge to academia in a given condition</td>
<td>4 (6.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difficulties</td>
<td>2 (3.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Respondents were asked to select the two most important items.

In general, returnees explicitly contribute to the university but there are some obstacles for them. The main difficulties they indicated that they faced when they returned to a Korean institution were an excessive teaching and administrative workload (74.1%), scarce resources and poor facilities for work and research (41.4%), and a rigid administrative system (32.8%). For newly-employed foreign educated academics, the research environment and administrative workload remain the major difficulties (B. E. Kim, 2007).

Some peripatetic scholars in Yonsei, going one step further, linked those difficulties to the academic atmosphere in Korea. Along with insufficient research facilities and an excessive workload, the group-centred culture in which researchers are expected to prioritise work for the department before their own individual work, one may feel deprived of sufficient personal research time in the Korean situation compared to the overseas research environment.
There is an emotional difference which makes it hard for returnees who have lived overseas for a long time to readjust to the Korean situation. Whilst a department in an overseas institution supports researchers in their individual research efforts, a Korean institution demands that individuals sacrifice themselves for the group. Rather than "individual selfish work," academic staff are expected to work for the department first, and then only in their rest time, can they work for themselves. ... Accordingly, returnees with long-term U.S. academic experience find it hard to readjust, and tend to have conflicts with colleagues in the department (Yonsei 5).

Female academics continue to face greater problems on their return home. One female returnee stated:

Western countries have systems to support women. When I had a job in an American university, there was a system. ... It was not just at university. Even though a woman may be more qualified, woman leaders are not viewed favourably in Korean society. For example, a project may offer an incentive for a woman to lead its research team. But the incentive does not work well, there are unseen criteria for projects led by women and others for teams led by men. Do you know what I mean? In addition, a project led by a woman will be smaller. It is like giving apparently preferential treatment to women academics but in fact only giving them a small size project which prevents them from applying for other larger projects. ... (Yonsei 10).

On the other hand, returnees may confront difficulties due to the differences between their acquired knowledge, and the demands of the wider Korean society. Returnees are expected to be an adapter of foreign knowledge to Korean soil rather than to be a simple carrier. As Altbach (1998) mentions, however, as the training that a returnee receives abroad may not be relevant to domestic concerns and may be dysfunctional in some ways, a returnee can often face conflicts in research, in the process of knowledge adaptation. One returnee asserted that, while she responded to the demands of Korean society, it was hard to develop the knowledge what she had learned in the U.S., which was what she liked to do. After several years, she felt that she lost her difference from domestically educated scholars (Yonsei 8).

Conflicts between peripatetic and indigenous scholars can also be problematic. As returnees may have advantages in terms of faster promotion and payments for lectures and publications in English, indigenous scholars as a minority group may resent their apparent disadvantages and apparent isolation from the wider world of international scholarship. One professor deplored the fact that academic staff in the area of Korean
Studies belong to a minority with little power or influence at the university (Yonsei 11). Another rejected the current internationalisation aspects, which he felt was attaching too much importance to English. Sustaining the point that the more important thing is the depth of research rather than writing in English, he argued that by simply providing translation service to indigenous scholars, the university could obtain academic development and internationalisation (Yonsei 7).

Table 7.11 Difficulties of life for returnees at Yonsei

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty of employment</td>
<td>8 (13.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readjustment to Korean life and customs</td>
<td>18 (31.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and language problems of children</td>
<td>26 (44.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate income</td>
<td>15 (25.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political and social conditions in Korea</td>
<td>12 (20.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difficulties</td>
<td>9 (15.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items.

When discussing the difficulties in daily life they faced when they returned to Korea, the two most frequent responses peripatetic academics gave were educational and language problems of the children (44.8%), and readjustment to Korean life and customs (31.0%). Inadequate income was ranked third (25.9%).

In interviews, participants voiced issues such as high competition (Yonsei 1), relationship within the kinship group (Yonsei 9, 10), economic difficulties (Yonsei 3, 5, 8, 11), and uncertainty of employment (Yonsei 5, 8) as problems on daily life on return. For returnees who gain a stable job, problems such as readjustment to Korean society, or feelings of relative poverty compared to their colleagues who remained Korea were not serious. However, returnees who did not have a stable job experienced severe economic difficulties with disappointment. One participant spoke of his experience and his observations for new returnees.
When I returned to Korea, I did not experience severe difficulties in life. For example, remuneration in Korea was a fourth of that of America. But didn’t I return with awareness of that? I don’t think that is a difficulty in daily life. When I observe young faculty, the most difficult problem they have is education for the children. ...They may have preferred education in America for their children where they can educate children in the education system they prefer. But we don’t have that system (in Korea). ... (Yonsei 6).

Conclusion

The particular feature of internationalisation at Yonsei is its roots in its historical cultural blending of West and East, from the very inception of the university. While retaining traces of the foreign founders’ spirit and Christianity in its internationalisation, Yonsei’s steady advance in the international dimensions has faced remarkable changes in the modern global era, where universities have encounter relentless global competition, and an unprecedented level of international exchange and cooperation.

Yonsei University has clarified its internationalisation process in the form of a comprehensive strategy. The internationalisation strategy is a part of a well-integrated university development plan, “Yonsei Vision 2020.” Amid a strong desire for internationalisation, academic staff recognise internationalisation as a means to raise the university’s quality of education to a world-class level. While they listed “improving quality of education” and “strengthening international cooperation of research” as two important benefits of internationalisation, “lack of finance” and “lack of polices and strategies for internationalisation” were listed as two major obstacles. In addition, “increased cost” was the most serious risk of internationalisation.

Advocating inbound internationalisation, Yonsei has advanced its international aspects with an active international exchange programs and conferences. In order to attract more international students, it has increased the proportion of lectures in English. Some specialised schools such as the UIC and GSIS lead internationalisation with a high proportion of international students, lectures in English and internationalised curriculum. At the same time, the university is strengthening the international aspects of all its
departments, proclaiming a pervasive internationalisation. In spite of its remarkable advance in its international dimensions, however, academic staff assert that the internationalised curriculum, international research collaboration and recruitment of international students still needs to be further strengthened.

As a majority of academic staff, peripatetic scholars contribute significantly to the university’s internationalisation. Both as teaching staff and researchers, peripatetic scholars were more active in international activities. Their vigorous international activities seem to be attributed to their international and intercultural competence, notably their foreign experience, foreign language ability and personal networks. Their contribution is not limited to teaching and research areas. They also have a key role in the extension of the institution’s international network. In the administrative area, they tend to play a greater role than indigenous scholars. For them, excessive teaching and administrative workload, and scarce resources and poor facilities were the key difficulties in their work and research. When linked to the Korean academic culture, these difficulties became problems of readjustment when they returned to Korea and challenges for their continuing research. Two major difficulties in daily life were education for the children and readjustment to Korean society.

In the context of the importance of internationalisation in Korean universities, Yonsei is fulfilling its internationalisation strategies as a part of a comprehensive university development plan. In spite of vigorous international activities and programs, however, some academic staff in various disciplines still questioned the effectiveness and adequacy of resources for university internationalisation strategies. In addition, the level of internationalisation was very different between leading and other groups which may deepen disparities with which internationalisation in practice is perceived. With regard to the contribution of peripatetic scholars, they are at the centre of internationalisation. However, as with other cases in this research, excessive workload and insufficient facilities and time for their own research programmes, are features which are linked to aspects of Korean academic culture, and seen as obstructing their contributions.
CHAPTER EIGHT CASE STUDY FOUR: SEOUL NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Introduction

Internationalisation, which has become a key issue in the development of higher education (de Wit, 2002), has also led the Korean government to steadily carry out various policies with regard to internationalisation, over the past two decades. In 1996, the open door policy of Korean higher education was established, in the context of the looming FTA (Free Trade Agreement) under the WTO system, followed at Seoul National University (and several other universities) by the establishment of a Graduate School of International Studies (1997), and an international student invitation policy (2001). The implementation of policies to open education services to international currents and forces, has at the same time strengthened Korean universities' competitiveness and taken their quality of education to a level on par with world class tertiary institutions (B. S. Lee et al., 2005).

Internationalisation at Seoul National University (SNU) took a new step when it founded the Office of International Center in 1997 reorganised in 2002 as the Office of International Affairs (OIA) to widen its mission. As the pre-eminent national university, with a 4-year presidential term, SNU has seen wide changes to its policies. International dimensions during the past decade were, explicitly identified as one of the top priorities in university policies. My visit to SNU in 2006 occurred in the midst of transformation of international aspects whereby a number of new programmes were being prepared turning internationalisation into a mainstream element within the university.

In order to investigate internationalisation of SNU, the research examines the university setting, perceptions of internationalisation, implementation of internationalisation in teaching and learning, international activities and institutional management, and returning scholars' contribution to internationalisation.
The university setting

Located in Seoul, the capital of Korea, SNU was founded in 1946, and modelled on the American university system (I. S. Son, 1991). After the Restoration of Independence in 1945, the only university established during the Japanese colonial period, the Gyeongseong (Seoul) Imperial University was combined with several other public professional schools to become the SNU. When it opened it was the first comprehensive national university in Korea, comprising and one graduate school and nine undergraduate colleges: College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, College of Engineering, College of Agriculture, College of Law, College of Education, College of Commerce, College of Arts, Medical College, and Dental College (J. Kim, 2000b).

SNU was founded in the context of social turmoil, conflicting ideas of de-colonialisation and democratic reforms during the U.S. Military Government period (1945-1948) (K. S. Kim, 2007). The foundation of SNU blended influences from America with a fading Japanese academic culture as part of fervour to establish a representative Korean university. As the first President of SNU, American, Harry B. Ansted, was appointed by the U.S. Military Government. A year later, responding to strong demand for a Korean president, Chun Ho Lee, a returned scholar from America, succeeded Ansted in the position (I. S. Son, 1991). The remaining vestiges of Japanese imperialism were rejected in favour of educational policies based on democracy and nationalism. SNU modelled its structure and systems on the American university style, however, it still retained remnants of the former Japanese style management practices (I. S. Son, 1991).

Thereafter the American influence was reinforced at SNU through American support after the Korean War, which included the increasing number of academic staff who had been educated at universities in the U.S. (G. Y. Park, 2005, pp. 198-199). K.S. Kim (2007, pp. 4-5) commenting on the foundation and development of SNU states that its current structures and operational environment, reflect various systems and models including the Korean traditional mentor-disciple relationship, the German model of a research
university adopted and altered by Japan, combined with the American system of tertiary education.

SNU in 2006 consisted of 16 undergraduate colleges with an enrolment of 19,812 students, and, at the graduate level, one graduate school and six professional schools with an overall total student enrolment of 10,311 (Seoul National University, 2006b). In the same year, 1,733 full-time academic staff were employed working in Humanities, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences, Agriculture & Life Sciences, Business Administration, Education, Engineering, Fine Arts, Human Ecology, Law, Medicine, Music, Nursing, Pharmacy, Veterinary Medicine, and Interdisciplinary Programs (Seoul National University, 2006b).

As the preeminent research university in Korea, SNU had 65 affiliated research centres in 2006 (Seoul National University, 2007a). In the same year the number of research articles published in SCI-indexed journals was 3,635, the highest ranking university in Korea and 32nd in the world (MOEHRD, 2007e). The annual expenditure on research ran as high as $288 million\(^\text{15}\) during 2005 (Seoul National University, 2006c).

As a comprehensive research-intensive university, SNU’s educational aim is to contribute to self-realisation, national development and the prosperity of humanity via teaching academic theories and methodologies, cultivating the talents which are needed at various areas in the society and stimulating research (Seoul National University, 2007a). Facing strong domestic and foreign demands, SNU has established a “vision towards the twenty first century” and has developed various plans to fulfil its aim.

The main feature of internationalisation at SNU has been its slow progress in internationalisation but recently as internationalisation has become a key issue for university development, leading transformation of the university. The core organisation for internationalisation is the Office of International Affairs (OIA) which leads its

\(^{15}\) 291.3 billion Won, calculated at the exchange rates of 1,013 Won to the US Dollar.
internationalisation strategies and programs. Among teaching and research departments, it is the Graduate School of International Studies (GSIS) that leads the university transformation in terms of internationalised curriculum, lectures in English, recruitment of international students and foreign scholars.

**Perceptions of Internationalisation**

Internationalisation, which was always a hot issue during the past few decades at SNU, became an urgent task at the beginning of the new millennium. The emphasis on internationalisation and its motives is revealed in the “vision towards the twenty first century” with its three foci being: a world-class university in pursuit of academic excellence; balanced development of the three fundamental functions of university: research, education and service to society; and the systematic development of existing knowledge and creation of new knowledge (Seoul National University, 2006a).

Based on this vision, internationalisation has continuously been emphasised in various development plans in which SNU has elucidated its intention to move toward becoming a "world-class university."

A world-class university means a university that is a centre for international knowledge in which the academics play a key role. SNU should contribute to the improvement of human welfare through having the capability to join the group of world-leading universities and pioneering advanced academic areas. Within a short term, (SNU) should be a core university in the Asian area, and then, be a core within the world academic system. While implementing personnel exchange and cooperative research with world leading institutions, (SNU) should widen academic and technical support to developing countries. Ultimately, SNU should be one of the preferred universities for elites worldwide to develop their academic skills and character (Seoul National University, 2002, pp. 3-4).

A key means to achieve this goal is the process of internationalisation. In addition, it was emphasised, international exchange is to be a mutual exchange of academic achievement between SNU and overseas universities, rather than a one-sided exchange, in which knowledge from advanced countries is passively imported (Seoul National University, 2002, p. 132). The emphasis on mutual exchange was derived from self-awareness of the
imbalance between inbound and outbound knowledge exchange, noting that if a university’s education and research is not attractive at the world level, an excess of one-way movement of knowledge will prevent balanced internationalisation. (S. S. Cho, Yu, Choi, Jae, & Park, 2001).

This perception of internationalisation was also revealed in the internationalisation strategies established in 2001.

The purpose of internationalisation is to prepare a system and facilities to ease access of students and academic staff to education and research in major foreign universities (outbound), and to ease access of international students and academic staff to education and research in SNU (inbound) (S. S. Cho et al., 2001, p. 3).

Hence, the overall perception of internationalisation in SNU in various plans can be summarised as follows: the means to become a world-class university and to prepare systems and facilities to stimulate an international exchange balanced between the inbound and outbound in education and research.

Academic staff at SNU tend to understand internationalisation as the mutual exchange of academic staff and students in research and education (SNU 12, 13, 14, 15, 16). Mutual exchange stresses the importance of the inflow of inbound international students and scholars, to balance the outflow of outbound Korean who encounter foreign culture. This ensures that internationalisation is more than a one-way process (SNU 13, 14, 19). Internationalisation, for some, means to align with global standards through joining a global system or adopting global standards so that a university provides internationally qualified education and knowledge, and educates students in international competencies (SNU 1, 3, 7, 10, 17). Fundamentally, the aim most frequently mentioned is to lift university quality to a world-level (SNU 14).

Internationalisation will have varied dimensions. Briefly, university members, academic staff, administrative staff and students, should be internationalised. And all areas, individually, should be internationalised. First, matters such as knowledge and information should improve to a world-level. It should be a fundamental aim. In order to achieve this aim, international exchange will be stimulated. In the past, international
exchange has been focused on one-way imports. Now we have to think of an exchange to contribute to the world society. On that point, rather than a one-way import of foreign culture, we should exchange on equal terms, intensifying research on our strengths such as Korean Studies, and developing those to a universal value system....(SNU 14).

Table 8.1 Rationales for internationalisation at SNU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationales</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing international and intercultural understanding of university members</td>
<td>5 (6.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raising quality of education to a world-class level</td>
<td>55(70.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing the knowledge and skill base in intercultural relations and communications for students to respond to the demands of our society and private sectors</td>
<td>40(51.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserving and promoting national culture</td>
<td>5 (6.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing the university’s international reputation, adding revenue and attracting more students</td>
<td>6 (7.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to national identity and development</td>
<td>10(12.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting university academic achievements via cooperation with overseas institutions</td>
<td>33(42.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items

In the survey of the rationales for internationalisation, the two rationales perceived as most important were raising the quality of education to a world-class level (70.5%) and enhancing the knowledge and skill base in intercultural relations and communications for students to respond to the demands of society and the private sector (51.3%). The top priority accords with SNU’s official plans of internationalisation aiming at turning SNU into a world leading university via strengthening the internationalisation system on campus (S. S. Cho et al., 2001).

Table 8.2 Necessity of internationalisation at SNU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very strong</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Very weak</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50 (64.1%)</td>
<td>26 (33.3%)</td>
<td>2 (2.6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notwithstanding varied perceptions, academic staff at SNU attach a high priority to internationalisation. Responding to the question of how you estimate the necessity for internationalisation at the university, 97.4% of staff strongly agreed, or very strongly agreed, on the need for internationalisation.
In spite of a general consensus as to the necessity of internationalisation, specific problems and obstacles to progress have alluded to. The former President of SNU, Ki Jun Lee (2007), has indicated several weaknesses of Korean universities which hinder internationalisation: weakness of specific administrative units to coordinate international affairs, the small proportion of international students, lack of recruitment of leading scholars, and inadequate education for a global environment. Weak administrative units may detract from internationalisation’s driving force and the successful implementation of its strategies. The lack of international students and academic staff is chronic in Korean universities, where the non-English speaking environment is not attractive.

Table 8.3 Obstacles to internationalisation at SNU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacles</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of government support</td>
<td>13 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of policies and strategies for internationalisation</td>
<td>40 (51.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of finances within the university</td>
<td>24 (30.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative inertia or difficulties</td>
<td>22 (28.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of facilities</td>
<td>1 (1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of reliable and comprehensive information</td>
<td>2 (2.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of staff for internationalisation</td>
<td>13 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficiently trained or qualified staff to guide the process</td>
<td>12 (15.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level of interest by university members</td>
<td>13 (16.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties in recruiting international students/staff</td>
<td>14 (17.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Respondents were asked to select the two most important items.

As the main obstacles to internationalisation at SNU, in the survey SNU academic staff listed lack of policy and strategies for internationalisation (51.3%), lack of finance (30.8%), and administrative inertia or difficulties (28.2%). Unlike the other cases (HGU, KNUE and Yonsei) in the research, academic staff at SNU perceived the lack of policy and strategies rather than finance to be the uppermost obstacle.
The policies and strategies seem fundamentally at odds with the diverse demands and very high expectations from various disciplines for a form of internationalisation that stands out from other Korean universities. One respondent stated that no matter what the differences among disciplines and scholars, the university pushed individuals to produce outcomes at a certain level following the university strategy (SNU 12). Concerning Korean identity and the unique responsibility of SNU in the Korean higher education sector, one interviewee insisted that SNU has a responsibility to establish a unique form of internationalisation that emphasises Korean Studies and values at an international standard (SNU 17).

The majority of scholars feel the necessity of internationalisation. At an individual level, scholars, who have taught students and conducted research nationally and internationally, do not have any problems with internationalisation. However, depending on the field of studies, there are some areas with less international exchange activities, and (less level of international activities) would be acceptable to those areas. But without sufficient infrastructure and supporting programs, international activities are forced to rely on individuals. It constitutes a heavy burden for those areas (SNU 12).

The third-ranked response, administrative inertia or difficulties, reveals the characteristics of the national university, where the organisational culture is conservative and bureaucratic. The autonomy of academic and administrative staff is restricted by their status as public servants (SNU 18) and in the bureaucratic system, administrative staff tend to be very conservative (SNU 1).

Administrative officials! For instance, we need frequent visits overseas for knowledge exchange. But there is a limitation. Two or three times.... Rules hardly change. For example, if there is some regulation which is causing an inconvenience, rather than trying to amend the regulation, administrative officials usually ask us to fit the rule (SNU1).

This inflexible administration system is an impediment to effective personnel management too. As the national university, SNU's autonomy of employment, promotion and dismissal of academic staff is limited by government regulations, which often causes delayed responses in the face of change (K. J. Lee, 2007). In addition, the national university often confronts difficulties in employing foreign staff (a key plank of
internationalisation), because of both salary caps for such individuals, and internal resistance from Korean scholars (Y. J. Lee, Lee, & Jeong, 2007).

Table 8.4 Benefits of internationalisation at SNU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement in quality of university</td>
<td>47 (60.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building international networks</td>
<td>32 (41.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening research cooperation</td>
<td>44 (56.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of international students</td>
<td>11 (14.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending diversity in teaching and learning</td>
<td>8 (10.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural awareness</td>
<td>10 (12.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to advanced knowledge</td>
<td>8 (5.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items.

Academic staff perceived the main benefits of internationalisation to be the improvement of the quality of the university (60.3%), strengthening research cooperation (56.4%), and structuring an international network (41.0%). SNU has opened itself more to foreign institutions and researchers, strengthening its international reputation in the process. The need to improve the quality of university is a pervasive view among academic staff. They expect that the implementation of internationalisation strategies by SNU will contribute towards turning SNU into a high standard world class university.

In the interview, academics mentioned selecting excellent foreign students (SNU 1, 10), strengthening SNU's competitiveness and influence (SNU 3, 13), widening one's academic horizon (SNU 18), strengthening research cooperation (SNU 4) and improving quality in university (SNU 2, 5), as key benefits of internationalisation.

When disciplines have opened to the world, it has led toward enhanced quality. When (a discipline is) internationalised, it may set its criteria to international standards. As a natural consequence, the quality will improve. It is for that reason that we internationalise (a discipline). The more that (disciplines) are internationalised, the more the general quality of education at SNU may be improved ... (SNU 2).
With regard to the risk of internationalisation at SNU, the most commonly perceived risk was increased costs (66.7%) however the next most common response (24.4%) indicates that a large group of academics do not see any risks to this process. That increasing costs of internationalisation is considered to be the most serious concern even at SNU, the best funded university in Korea, indicates that this is a national concern. The high response rate on the item, “no risk,” seems to indicate that many academic staff have the confidence that internationalisation presents the opportunity to be a world class university, rather than a threat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss of cultural identity</td>
<td>16 (20.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain drain</td>
<td>12 (15.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased costs</td>
<td>52 (66.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased competition</td>
<td>15 (19.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constriction of teaching and research activities</td>
<td>9 (11.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarisation</td>
<td>17 (21.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No risk</td>
<td>19 (24.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items

In interview, respondents detailed their viewpoints concerning the risks of internationalisation, while generally acknowledging that they did not perceive them to be serious risks. Most concerns were related to rapid progress without adequate preparation, and side-effects in the early stage of internationalisation.

Speed is a problem. An underpinning concept of internationalisation, I understood, is to deepen the national identity but (the Korean) society demands rapid and effective progress in internationalisation. We will struggle between these two. We will be in trouble if there is investment without outputs (SNU 17).

We have our own agenda in research and education. Those things that look uncompetitive and uneconomical at the moment tend to be ignored (not funded). This results in severe resentment from those who work in the areas. Secondly, under this intense competition, there is pressure to adopt concepts from America. I am concerned that we will be swamped by foreign idea and knowledge (SNU 1).
In the process of internationalisation, strategies such as offering more programs in English are seen as hindering the deepening of knowledge, as students could not cope (SNU 18). In addition, some academics expressed concern about the impact on the quality of education, when confronted at SNU by international students whom they view as below standard (SNU 2, 10). This might be a side-effect of the early stage of internationalisation. SNU has tried to increase the number of its international students but its non-English speaking environment and its relative obscurity outside Korea, it failed to attract brilliant students in the global competition among top-tier universities.

**Implementation of internationalisation**

With its aim to establish easy, access to education and research for students and academic staff from SNU at overseas institutions (outbound) and from overseas to SNU (inbound), SNU has implemented internationalisation based on an integrated, university-wide plan (S. S. Cho et al., 2001). According to the plan, there are internationalisation strategies three directions: first, improving education, research, governance and facilities to a world-class level; second, stimulating students and academic staff via the extension of exchange and cooperation with prominent foreign institutions; third, trying to remove impediments to internationalisation in the external environment of the university and to extend outside financial assistance (S. S. Cho et al., 2001). Internationalisation has been implemented in the four areas in the university, administration, research & IT, student and planning & other areas. Since time that the fieldwork of my research was conducted, along with a newly established long-term university development plan, internationalisation strategies have been amended to upgrade targets with specifiable outcomes (Seoul National University, 2007e).

**Teaching, learning and research**

Courses in English have been highlighted in internationalisation in Korea for two reasons: to attract more international students, and to enhance the education of the highly-skilled, including their international competencies (MOEHRD, 2006d, p. 11). SNU has increased the number of courses in English in order to provide more opportunities to
international students to gain experience in various fields and to provide domestic students with an English learning environment (Seoul National University, 2006c). The growing importance of English is in accord with academics' response. For the most frequently used language in teaching and research, 92.3% of academic staff choose English

In 2006, the proportion of courses in English in undergraduate level was about 5% which, was in stark contrast to those of neighbouring leading universities, Yonsei (17%) and Korea University (32%) (E. A. Cho, 2007). As a university in a non-English speaking country, there is continuing mismatch between offering lectures in English, and the quality of lecture. A former President of SNU, Wong Chan Jung, has expressed his concern at the excessive emphasis on English, saying that English lectures were important, but the quality of teaching would decrease if a university provided all its lectures in English (Hong, 2006).

Internationalisation of the curriculum means more than just providing courses in English in the context of an ongoing emphasis on international content, and activities for international competence and global competitiveness for students. A leading department at SNU is the Graduate School of International Studies (GSIS), which provides fully internationalised majors where almost all courses are taught in English with full international content and activities.

Other disciplines which have almost no national boundaries in curriculum content, such as Engineering and the Natural Sciences, have gradually increased international activities in curricula. In Engineering, for example, supported by the Korean government driven Brain Korea 21 projects, students spend a short-term (up to three months) or a long-term (from six months to one year) in visiting programs as part of their research (SNU4). Health Sciences represent a case of globalised content and localised application. Mainly English textbooks are used for classroom materials (SNU1) and academic staff, who have both a research and clinical role, teach students to apply borderless but locally specialised medical knowledge to Korean clinics.
On the other hand, some departments in Humanities, Social Sciences and Fine Arts are confronting new challenges. They have a low ratio of courses in English and low numbers of international students and faculty, but a relatively high emphasis on the preservation and development of Korean values. One academic insisted SNU has a responsibility to find a place for and formalise the incorporation of more traditional and ethnic matters things in internationalisation (SNU17). The Department of Korean Language and Literature presents one example of how to actively be involved through the internationalisation of the Korean language. Its graduate school offers a Korean as a Foreign Language Education Major where many international students are enrolled. In addition, as a certificate program, an instructional leadership program for Korean as a Foreign Language educates Korean language teachers for foreigners (Seoul National University, 2007b). This case shows how SNU has internationalised traditional Korean knowledge taking advantage of its leading position.

As a research-intensive institution, it is understandable that internationalisation in research is the uppermost priority in SNU. Reflecting the urgency accorded to fulfilling the university's goal, SNU has instituted supported for student and academic staff exchange programs, research in affiliated institutions, publication in foreign languages, attendance at, or hosting of international conferences, and collaborative research with foreign institutions (S. S. Cho et al., 2001).

In 2005, the number of long-term visiting academic staff (staying more than six months) was 60, which was about 4% of the total academic staff. In the same year SNU held 1,001 international meetings. The number of participants attending international conferences was 7,794 which was equivalent to about 5 visits annually for each academic staff (Seoul National University, 2005). With regard to SCI indexed articles, SNU published 3,635 articles in 2006 (MOEHRD, 2007e).

---

16 These meetings include seminars, symposia, workshops, conferences etc.
A particularly complex research issue is internationalisation of Korean Studies. While a major, Korean Studies at GSIS contributes to educating specialists in research on Korea with a comparative and interdisciplinary perspective, an affiliated institution, the Kyujanggak Institute for Korean Studies (KIKS) has internationalised Korean Studies, covering all aspects of Korean society and culture in both the traditional and modern periods (Seoul National University, 2007a). KIKS as the successor of Gyujanggak, the royal library and institute in the Joseon Dynasty, maintains the Gyujanggak collection and supports research projects in Korean Studies.

**International programs and activities**

SNU has extended the range of its international academic agreements with foreign institutions to enhance progress towards its stated goal of becoming a world-class university (Office of International Affairs, 2005). During the interview, the Dean of the Office of International Affairs (OIA), mentioned that some of the factors that the OIA considered when it made agreements were the location and stature of the institution with the ultimate goal of activating all the agreements, and maintaining the existing number/level of agreements. By 2006 SNU had established international agreements with 102 institutions across 32 countries. By region it had 40 (39.2%) in Asia, 28 (27.5%) in Europe, 21 (20.6%) in North America, and 12 (11.8%) in other areas. From those regions the three major countries were the U.S. (16.7%), Japan (13.7%) and China (7.8%) (Seoul National University, 2006b, pp. 67-69).

Taking advantage of the increasing number of international agreements, SNU students have begun to use various programs to gain international experience. In 2005, 125 undergraduate students out of a total enrolment of 19,338 attended exchange programs. In the same year 150 students from undergraduate and graduate schools attended short-term programs, such as visiting programs during the vacation, and summer or winter schools. One or two semester length visiting programs for graduate school registrants allowed 27 students to experience research overseas (Seoul National University, 2005, pp. 148-150).
The total number of SNU students studying overseas has increased but still remains no more than 1% of the total student enrolment.

SNU is more active in enrolling international students in degree courses at SNU due to its leading position amongst Korean universities. In 2006 the number of international students enrolled in SNU degree courses was 755 representing about 2.5% of the student body (MOEHRD, 2007b). Through non-degree programs such as exchange and visiting programs, SNU attracted 52 students in the same year. Of the international students 28.7% were Koreans residing overseas, followed by Chinese (34.3%), Japanese (5.9%), Americans (3.5%) and Mongolian (3.3%) (Seoul National University, 2006b, p. 40). In the same year, the number of foreign full-time tenured academic staff was 8 which represented 0.5% of all full-time academics (MOEHRD, 2007d).

Among international programs, joint and dual degree offerings closely relate to quality assurance and the joint development of curricula between higher education institutions in various countries. In 2006, SNU had graduate school programmes in the Colleges of Natural Science, Engineering, Business Administration, and Graduate School of International Studies. For example, the MBA at the Graduate School of Business Administration has operated a dual degree program with Duke University in the U.S. since 2003. In addition, the College of Engineering has operated dual degree program with the Ecole Nationale Superieure des Mines de Saint-Etienne (ENSMSE) in France (Seoul National University, 2007c).
Figure 8.1 International programs and strategies at SNU

Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items that have been successful and the two that are needed to strengthen internationalisation

Figure 8.1 shows responses to international programs and strategies in SNU. Asked to identify programs and strategies they felt were working well, academic staff more frequently selected international conferences (42%), student/faculty short-term overseas visiting programs (36%), and student/faculty exchange programs (32%). At the same time, student/faculty exchange programs (28%), joint academic programs with international partners (24%), and recruitment of international students (23%) were commonly selected as the programs and strategies needed to be strengthened. When these
two categories are put together, Figure 8.1 shows that academic staff hoped that SNU would strengthen exchange programs and recruitment of international students despite generally feeling that those items were successful. On the other hand, joint academic programs, and appropriate financial support and resource allocation systems were rarely selected as successful programs, but selected frequently as items needing reinforcement.

Institutional management for internationalisation

In the continuing process of internationalisation organisational strategies have often been emphasised. Because, in spite of an increasing number of academic programs and activities, if these programs are not underpinned by a permanent organisational commitment and structure they may die when supporting staff leave the institution, resources become scarcer, or new priorities emerge (de Wit, 2002, p. 124). The internationalisation process, basically, requires additional cost and long-term investment, and to ensure broad acceptance and effective implementation, institutional commitment is essential (J. Taylor, 2004, p. 164).

Backed by the SNU President’s strong support for internationalisation, SNU has strengthened institutional management in support of the strategies and programs of the Office of International Affairs (OIA). It was 1997 when the SNU established an office for international affairs, the International Exchange Centre, as a division of the Office of Planning and Development. The centre was reorganised as the OIA in 2002 as an independent office, headed by a dean, to meet the increasing demands of internationalisation (K. J. Lee, 2007). The OIA is charged with developing, promoting, and assisting SNU’s international programs and strategic initiatives. It has two teams, the Team of International Affairs, and Team of International Exchange and Education each respectively under the direction of an associate dean. The OIA takes charge of inter-university partnerships, academic exchange agreements and international curricula. It also provides administrative support for the university’s international students, promotes cross-cultural events between Koreans and their international counterparts on campus and conducts protocol activities for visiting officials (Seoul National University, 2007d).
With regard to cooperation between the OIA and departments, OIA mainly takes charge of university-level international affairs, while each college takes care of its own international affairs supported by the OIA. About the relationship, the Dean of the OIA explained that the OIA provides information to colleges and approves when they make agreements with foreign institutions. 16 colleges at SNU, in other words, have charge of their own international affairs. Most of them do not have international division but the College of Engineering, one of the most active in international programs, has established its own Office of International Affairs directed by an associate dean. The office has similar responsibilities to the OIA, but its scope is limited to the realm of the College.

Heads of departments were somewhat positive about the cooperation between the OIA and colleges. A higher ratio of administrators (29%) was positive about cooperation whilst 12% were negative and 59% were neutral. Generally, academic staff agreed that the cooperation system within the limited capacities and resources of the OIA and in consideration of the characteristic of each college worked reasonably well. However, some colleges expressed difficulties with the implementation of their international activities due to the lack of an adequate administration system and insufficiently trained administrative staff at the college level (SNU 3, SNU 8, SNU 9).

**Contribution of returning scholars**

As universities increasingly emphasise the significance of internationalisation, the importance of academic staff with international and intercultural competence is on the rise. Internationalising the faculty and staff is the most critical step in internationalising the campus and this can be accomplished by hiring globally and interculturally competent people and supporting global training opportunities (Olson & Kroeger, 2001). Considering the importance of experience for international and intercultural competence, but the hitherto rarity of international scholars on campus in Korean universities, returned scholars, who had acquired degrees and work experience in their relevant fields overseas are well equipped internationalised personnel.
Among academic staff at SNU, foreign-educated returned scholars are in the majority. In 2004 the number of full-time academic staff was 1,720 of whom 95.6% held doctorates. Of those PhD holders 65.2% had acquired that degree overseas. The proportion of foreign doctorate holders in some colleges is an indication of the general internationalisation of that college: the College of Humanities (65.6%), the College of Social Sciences (93.6%), the College of Engineering (86.3%) (Sin, 2005). Only the College of Medicine has a low percentage, 3.4% of academics with a foreign doctorate. With the exception of this college, the average proportion of foreign doctorate holders at SNU was 73.9%.

Due to the long period spent acquiring their degree and working overseas, returnees at SNU have a long foreign residence. In the survey, 88% of returnees had lived overseas for more than five years, which contrasted strongly to indigenous scholars of whom only 10.7% had lived overseas for more than 5 years. Among the returnees, 56% had overseas work experience in the relevant area for an average period of 2.3 years. In contrast, 14.3% of indigenous scholar had overseas work experience.

Table 8.6 SNU returnee reasons for return

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family situation such as parents’ request or family reunion</td>
<td>19 (38.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable job offer in Korea</td>
<td>29 (58.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties of daily life in foreign country</td>
<td>2 (4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To contribute to the development of national science and knowledge</td>
<td>24 (48.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better career prospects in Korea</td>
<td>6 (12.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repayment of obligations to Korea such as scholarship or patriotism</td>
<td>6 (12.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult to find the right job overseas</td>
<td>1(2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference for living and working in Korea</td>
<td>5 (10.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Respondents were asked to select the two most important items

Participants in the survey identified the two main reasons for their return, the highest being: an acceptable job offer in Korea (58.0%) and to contribute to national science and
knowledge development (48.0%). As in other cases (HGU, KNUE and Yonsei), an acceptable job offer in Korea was the first priority but unlike other cases the second ranked one was to contribute to national science and knowledge development, rather than due to family matters. This can be presumed to be an effect of SNU’s pre-eminent status within the Korean knowledge hierarchy.

In interview, participants described composite reasons, notably the three major factors of a job offer in Korea, the intention to contribute to science and knowledge in Korea, and family matters.

Personally, I thought I might contribute to Korea. When I went abroad, I thought I would return to Korea to build our science base and teach the younger generation, my juniors. In practice, as I got an offer from SNU, coming back was easy. If I had not had an offer from SNU, I would have not come back (SNU 16).

First of all, I had to come back due to my husband and children being in Korea. They could come to live in U.S. but the major issue was parents...my parents lived in Korea... The next issue was my feeling that I ought to come back. I like living in Korea. It wasn’t a matter of choice. When I went to study abroad, I thought I would work here (Korea). Korea is more comfortable. So the return was for me rather than the contribution to my country. (Of course) I had in mind the development of Korea... I liked to pour my effort to Korea... (SNU 15).

When I first came back to KAIST, my income was a seventh of that in the U.S. After getting the offer I did not return for a year and a half. One of the reasons was the low salary being offered. All of my family opposed (the return). My wife said she would divorce me. The children preferred to live in the U.S. ...I saw lots of second generation residents who exhibited identity problems and had low self-esteem. So, I thought my children would have more self-esteem learning Korean history and culture. The other priority was to work for my country. ...there I was one of many but here I was one of few. I thought I would influence my country (SNU 10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very positive</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Very negative</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous scholars</td>
<td>1 (3.6%)</td>
<td>19 (67.9%)</td>
<td>7 (25.0%)</td>
<td>1 (3.6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28 (35.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripatetic scholars</td>
<td>11 (22.0%)</td>
<td>26 (52.0%)</td>
<td>13 (26.0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50 (64.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12 (15.4%)</td>
<td>45 (57.7%)</td>
<td>20 (25.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The peripatetic scholars' relatively long-term foreign experience should assure their international and intercultural competence. Academic staff at SNU expected them to play a positive role in university development and internationalisation. In the survey, perceptions of the returned scholars' influence on the development of SNU was mostly positive (73.1%) with only 1.3% viewing it as negative. The main reasons for this positive perception were returnees’ abilities and contributions to international collaborative research and exchange, international networks, English proficiency, and key influence on research outcomes. Of those who viewed the returnees’ influence on SNU development in a negative light, one apprehension they expressed was the potential formation of a “cartel” privileging overseas educated returnees.

Table 8.8 Returnee influence on internationalisation of SNU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very positive</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Very negative</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>2 (7.1%)</td>
<td>19 (67.9%)</td>
<td>7 (25.0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28 (35.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scholars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripatetic</td>
<td>7 (14.0%)</td>
<td>35 (70.0%)</td>
<td>8 (16.0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50 (64.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scholars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9 (11.5%)</td>
<td>54 (69.2%)</td>
<td>15 (19.2%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perceptions of the returnees’ influence on internationalisation were also largely positive: positive (80.7%), neutral (19.2%). The main reason they were perceived as having a positive influence on internationalisation was their international networks, English language competence especially for lecturing, strong motivation in internationalisation, international sensibilities, and intercultural understanding. Frequently expressed concerns over their role were the loss of their international skills and competencies on return to Korea and the common destination of the majority of their returnees, i.e. the U.S.
### Table 8.9 International activities of academic staff at SNU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Indigenous scholars</th>
<th>Peripatetic scholars</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching international students in class</td>
<td>14 (50.0%)</td>
<td>31 (62.0%)</td>
<td>45 (57.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in international conferences</td>
<td>28 (100.0%)</td>
<td>46 (92.0%)</td>
<td>74 (94.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing academic papers in international journals</td>
<td>24 (85.7%)</td>
<td>43 (86.0%)</td>
<td>67 (85.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting international research projects</td>
<td>10 (35.7%)</td>
<td>20 (40.0%)</td>
<td>30 (38.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having students conduct international research</td>
<td>7 (25.0%)</td>
<td>17 (34.0%)</td>
<td>24 (30.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving funding for international research</td>
<td>13 (46.4%)</td>
<td>38 (76.0%)</td>
<td>51 (65.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting research with foreign researchers</td>
<td>14 (50.0%)</td>
<td>27 (54.0%)</td>
<td>41 (52.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28 (35.9%)</td>
<td>50 (64.1%)</td>
<td>78 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* These proportions were based on indigenous and peripatetic scholars' activities for two years (mid 2004 - mid 2006)

The returnees' contribution to the university can be examined in the area of teaching and research. Table 8.9 compares and contrasts the international activities of peripatetic and indigenous academic staff. The data shows that generally, peripatetic scholars are more active than indigenous scholars, in all areas except for participation in international conferences. However, the difference is not statistically significant. Only for the issue of financial support received for international research is the difference statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 6.935$, df=1, $p < .01$). The reason why there is little overall difference between the level of international activities of two groups seems not to be that the returnees were inactive but because the indigenous scholars were more active than in other cases (see Chapters 5, 6, 7) of this research. SNU's leading position in Korean higher education presumably enables its scholars to be exposed to more international activities and programs. The frequency of international conferences held by SNU is exceptional among Korean universities and its high quality in research is also attractive to foreign scholars in collaborative research. The ratio of 39.3% of indigenous scholars who have more than 3 years experience overseas shows that the academic staff at SNU are exposed to far more international experience than other case universities where indigenous scholars at Yonsei (19.1%), KNUE (6.3%) and HGU (30%) had less foreign experience over the same period.
The role of peripatetic scholars in internationalisation, however, is distinctive in some areas. Despite the similarity in the frequency of encountering international students in the classroom between the two groups (Table 8.9), this was due to the fact that the international students were largely taught in Korean, which is a hindrance to attracting more international students. In 2006, when the researcher surveyed SNU, the majority of lecturers in courses in English among the Korean faculty were peripatetic scholars. In order to increase courses in English, SNU intends to hire more international faculty members but, like other Korean universities, while universities gradually employ more foreign scholars to lecture in English, peripatetic scholars are likely to be used more too.

As mentioned earlier the main difference between the international activities of the two groups is in the area of in financial support for international research. As mentioned in the previous section internationalisation is a means for SNU to become a world-class research university. Research universities are always resource intensive (Altbach, 2007). SNU requires sustained funding to maintain its state as a national “flagship” university and to join the ranks of the world top-tier universities. In these circumstances, returnees’ much more active work in collecting financial support contributes not only to their research but also to the university’s ambition to become an internationalised research university.

The returnees’ contribution to internationalisation is significant in planning strategies and implementation in which academic staff are also involved as administrators. The centre of internationalisation, the OIA, is led by returnees and strategies have been planned mainly by returnees. At the college level where the strategies are implemented in detail according to the characteristics of the department, returnees with sufficient international experience engage in reinforcement of the international profile.

With the advantages of foreign experience, returnees have been regarded as a precious resource contributing to university development. Since the 1950’s they have continued to contribute to establishing new disciplines and introduced advanced knowledge to the sprouting Korean universities. During the Japanese colonial period, there was only one
university, Gyeongseong (Seoul) Imperial University where almost all academic staff were Japanese. When the foreigners went back to their country, returnees gradually filled the vacant places introducing new knowledge, educating students and establishing academic traditions (W. S. Jeong, 1984). Academic staff mostly agree that the returnees’ contribution was indispensible in establishing the current academic state at SNU (SNU 4, 7, 14, 16, 17).

Along with the academic development at SNU, however, there is a changing perception of returnees and study abroad. Generally, while academic staff at SNU agreed on returnees’ contributions to academic development, they also indicated some shortcomings and limitations. In the past, study abroad was the only way to gain advanced knowledge, but currently there is a view that one may achieve better research outcomes at SNU laboratories whose research facilities are well equipped (SNU4). In addition, study abroad is beginning to be regarded as a way to broaden one’s outlook rather than the sole focus being the study of advanced technology (SNU7). Furthermore as the importance of returnees as importers of advanced knowledge diminishes, there is an increasing demand, even from the returnees themselves, for them to reassimilate to Korean values on return to Korean soil and to adapt their knowledge to local conditions (SNU14).

I agree that all returnees, including me, have contributed to national development. They have introduced new technology, viewpoints, and policies, which was fundamental for the advancement of Korea. But now we need more. It may be partial, but in some cases, due to the unquestioning acceptance of imports, we have often made theories, policies and the laws which were quite alien to the Korean situation. ... It is certain that foreign theories be of service to our development on the basis of dispassionate analysis of our problems. Their usefulness will differ according to disciplines. I understand in the National Science areas the textbook content is similar but in the area of Social Sciences and Humanities, for example, foreign theories are introduced without discretion. Footnotes in the textbook are foreign. It doesn’t contain data analysis about Korea. In other words, in fact, a theory is a result of verification of data collected from a country but it doesn’t have Korean raw material. I think, in this view point, we must not waste time and energy studying overseas for degree (recklessly). We need some who stay in Korea study deeply and some who go overseas studying foreign theories (SNU14).

With regard to academic diversity, returnees are regarded as the main contributor but at the same time, there is doubt over their role due to the overall tendency for foreign
experiences to be oriented toward a certain country. In a survey of universities throughout the world covering the period 1999 to 2003, SNU was the second largest recipient of U.S. PhD holders after the University of California, Berkeley (Sin, 2005). This lack of diversity is further deepened by the SNU preference for employing its own graduates. Sin (2005) criticised that even in the Social Sciences, the ratio of American doctorates was about 86.4% among returnees in 2004. In 2004 81% of all returnees at SNU held American doctorates. Academic staff have expressed some concerns about this trend even though they agreed with the tendency for the talented to gather at the centre of academic excellence in the U.S to acquire the most advanced knowledge.

Some also doubt about returnees’ international competences because they seem to re-establish strong Korean mind when they return to Korea. In the process of readjustment, returnees seem to nevertheless readapt at SNU to a Korean mind-set, which may lead to a homogeneous Korean academic atmosphere on campus in spite of the high rate of foreign doctorates.

Koreans easily assimilate to Korean culture when they return. Returnees may be accustomed (to foreign culture), but eventually, most of them become accustomed to Korean culture, and lose the acquired (foreign cultural mind-set). They become re-acquainted to the Korean system. Of course, there are some, for example, who keep an American style. But when they retain foreign things, there is a kind of conflict... With 70% of academics having studied in the U.S., in fact (SNU) should have an American atmosphere. (SNU) should be similar to American universities but it is not so... (SNU15).

Table 8.10 Difficulties in teaching and research for returnees at SNU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scarce resources and poor facilities for work and research</td>
<td>14 (28.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid administrative system</td>
<td>25 (50.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive teaching and administrative workload</td>
<td>40 (80.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited communication with international academics</td>
<td>3 (6.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid research atmosphere stemming from school ties, relations based on hometown, and the Confucian tradition.</td>
<td>10 (20.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The difficulty of dissemination of advanced knowledge to academia in a given condition</td>
<td>2 (4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment of excellent students</td>
<td>2 (4.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items
On the other hand, returnees often stumble over difficulties in the process of readjustment causing an impediment of their abilities to apply acquired knowledge and intercultural competence to research and teaching. In the survey, most academic staff selected two major difficulties regarding research and teaching on the process of re-entering Korea – excessive teaching and administrative workload (80%); and a rigid administrative system (50%).

As SNU has well equipped laboratories facilities, the difficulties caused by scarce resources and poor facilities have gradually decreased (SNU7), however, the excessive administrative burden is still one of the major difficulties. In addition, some who experienced the best research facilities abroad, working with eminent researchers from all over the world were not content with the given environment at SNU.

When I was in America, I worked with brilliant colleagues. Researchers at the research centre were eminent people. There is a difference between the best researchers in Korea and the best researchers in America, who came from all over the world. When I need support to conduct research, and in discussion, inevitably, staying in Korea is a disadvantage (SNU10).

One academic staff mentioned lack of information, lack of opportunities to attend international conferences, and a lack of academic atmosphere. With respect to the latter, for example, he argued,

Korean universities seem not be so rigorous. There is a lack of discussion between scholars...It seems to be based on ways of thinking, philosophy and (academic) traditions. In a conference, without (serious) discussion, one presents the research and participants just listen. .... In my area there is a trend that if there is a rising topic in the U.S., it takes over. Then another issue takes over and becomes in vogue. From this view point, I think we lack the capability to make our own independent research matter... (SNU 13).
Table 8.11 Difficulties of life for returnees at SNU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty of employment</td>
<td>7 (14.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readjustment to Korean life and customs</td>
<td>14 (28.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and language problems of children</td>
<td>16 (32.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate income</td>
<td>20 (40.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political and social conditions in Korea</td>
<td>16 (32.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No difficulties</td>
<td>8 (16.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items.*

Table 8.11 shows that returnees confronted certain difficulties in daily life when they returned to Korea. Some major difficulties they listed were inadequate income (40.0%), education and language problems of children (32.0%) and political and social conditions in Korea (32.0%).

In interview, academics mentioned that difficulties in daily life were modest and manageable (SNU 4, 10, 16).

Unexpectedly, daily life was not difficult. When I was abroad, Korea was at a less developed stage. I left in the mid 70's and returned in the early 80's. Within 10 years Korea had noticeably developed....I was surprised as I had memories only of the 70's. For my family it was difficult to buy a house. Beyond that, I did not have any serious difficulties (SNU 16).

With respect to difficulties in children's education, one academic expressed that it would be better for them to be global leaders because they could learn Korean culture and learn more in their difficult situation (SNU 10).

**Conclusion**

It is fascinating to observe the internationalisation of SNU, particularly as it was established adopting elements of both the Japanese and American university system, and became a prototype of the contemporary Korean university. Over its 60 year history, SNU has contributed to the Korean higher education sector by adopting an external contemporary university model and developing the Korean higher education system.
Under the effects of globalisation, SNU is undertaking internationalisation as an equal and mutual exchange of ideas and knowledge rather than a unilateral import, transforming itself from a regional Korean university to a global university. In the process of this internationalisation, returnees have contributed significantly to SNU and are being requested to undertake new roles.

The purpose of internationalisation is to equip systems and facilities for mutual exchange in teaching and research between foreign universities and the SNU. As a means of fulfilling its intentions of becoming a world-class intensive research university, internationalisation is expected to yield improvements in the quality of the university and to strengthen international research collaboration, but increased costs are considered to be a major risk to this internationalisation process. While academic staff have expressed an overall consensus of views on the necessity for internationalisation, they articulated different ideas regarding internationalisation strategies and programs, and saw major obstacle to their implementation as being the lack of policies and strategies. Regarding programs and strategies, SNU academics were active in attending international conferences, visiting and exchange programs but more is expected from exchange programs in terms of strengthened recruitment of international students and joint academic programs.

Since the late 1990's, presidents at SNU have had a strong intention for internationalisation of the university and this determination is apparent in international strategies embedded in university long-term development plans. OIA, the centre of internationalisation, fulfils strategies and programs at university level while individual colleges manage international affairs at the college level supported by OIA. Some leading departments such as the GSIS and College of Engineering attract more foreign students providing internationalised curriculum while some departments in Humanities and KIKS contribute to internationalisation of Korean Studies. International programs such as conferences, and visiting and exchange programs have been increased, as SNU has aggressively extended its international agreements during the last decade. The number of international students has increased due to its reputation however the number of foreign
academic staff has remained low partly due to the difficulties in hiring foreign academics at this national university.

Given the low ratio of foreign scholars, returnees are expected to play a positive role in university development and internationalisation. While there was not much difference between peripatetic and indigenous scholars overall in international activities, peripatetic scholars were more active in receiving financial support for international research. In addition, returnees were conspicuous in planning strategies and implementation as administrators and policy makers. On the other hand, while SNU has developed, returnees are confronting new challenges. Studying overseas no longer provides an exclusive advantage in the acquisition of advanced knowledge. Returnees are expected not merely to acquire thorough understanding of foreign theories, but also to adapt them to Korean soil.

While SNU intends to join the ranks of the world class research-intensive universities, the context of internationalisation is complicated. It should be designed and implemented to accelerate improvement of its current low international dimension whilst taking into consideration of the diverse demands of its various colleges, which include the internationalisation of Korean studies and the incorporation of Korean values into the internationalisation process. Due to its status as a national university, SNU has been slow in responding to internationalisation but due to the advantages of its distinctive position in Korea as one of the best research-intensive universities, SNU has started to regain its leading position. In the process of internationalisation, returnees have contributed from the planning of policies to implementation of strategies. When faced however with the strong homogeneous Korean academic culture, it is a challenge for them to retain their acquired international competence and continue to be engaged in vigorous international activities. In the delicate balance between the internationalisation imperative and demands for preserving national culture, returnees are expected to contribute by adapting their acquired foreign knowledge to the Korean soil and develop Korean studies and traditions to international standards.
CHAPTER NINE CROSS CASE ANALYSIS

Introduction

Cross case analysis strengthens the findings of a series of individual studies (Yin, 2003). One way of analysing such cross case findings is to aggregate them; then, according to some uniform framework, the data from the individual cases may be displayed and analysed. This chapter reintroduces the findings of the single cases in summary form, followed by a cross-case analysis. The analysis is framed by the three over-arching research questions: what are the perceptions of internationalisation in the university; how has the university implemented internationalisation; and what impact do returned scholars have on the university? The reintroduced findings are discussed through the data analysis frame (Table 4.2) which was articulated in Chapter Four.

Perceptions of internationalisation

The drive toward internationalisation of universities reflects both core ideals of the institution and the changing environment (J. Taylor, 2004). In order to meet the demand from globalising environments in the 21st century, case universities have developed vision statements and internationalisation strategies based on the aims of their university.

A vision statement reveals the university’s commitment to its core values while it reshapes its orientation in the new environment. The declaration of a desire to contribute from the local to the global human community reveals the university’s fundamental local and international dimensions and the manner it plans to fulfil its ideals. The changing global environment where universities are confronting increasingly competitive demands and university ethos regarding global society has led them to place a higher emphasis on internationalisation.

In the international knowledge system, SNU has adopted the platform of becoming a regional academic centre as a stepping stone to accomplish its ambition to become a
leading world class university. In their vision statements, HGU and SNU profess their role is to assist other institutions in developing countries, while pursuing the goal of becoming more advanced institutions themselves. This goal of developing itself and assisting other institutions expresses the fundamental value of internationalisation: cooperation, academic values and mutual benefit. The visions of the other two case universities, KNUE and Yonsei, are consistent with those of HGU and SNU. Through exchange and cooperation with advanced and developing institutions in countries near and far, case universities aim to equip their members with international competencies and advanced knowledge to contribute to the nation and the global community.

Confronting challenges from the global environment, all case universities considered internationalisation as a means to develop their universities and prepare their members for participation in the global society. Notwithstanding their similar internationalisation intentions, each university had a distinctive approach, based on its own individual university environment. HGU, a more education-centred university, focused on cultivating internationalised talent through internationalisation of the curriculum. KNUE as a more locally focussed teacher education university, focused on international exchange and collaboration. Yonsei University, with its relatively long history of intercultural contact, proclaimed its internationalisation as the means for mainstream transformation of the university into a leading university. Like Yonsei, SNU also stressed the creation of a more international environment where both local and international members enjoyed SNU’s advanced development and easy access to foreign institutions.
Figure 9.1 Rationale for internationalisation at four universities

Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items

De Wit’s (2002) categorisation of motivations for internationalisation into political, economic, academic and cultural/social rationales, reveals that universities have many different reasons to internationalise. For academic staff, internationalisation mainly means raising the quality of education, enhancing the international competence of students and lifting the academic achievement of the university. At HGU internationalisation was mostly perceived as enhancing the international competence of students whereas academics in the other three universities perceived that the most important rationale for internationalisation was raising the quality of education to a world-class level.

In line with the global trend to open up tertiary institutions to the global market, and strengthen international exchange and cooperation, the Korean government began to open up its education market since 1993 emphasising the global competitiveness of Korean universities (H. C. Lee, 2004). Korea’s leading universities can no longer expect to receive benefits just from competing with their domestic peers. As shown in the case studies (Chapter Eight and Nine), Yonsei and SNU, the best research universities in
Korea, have acknowledged the importance of internationalisation as a means to become a world-class university and this perception is widespread among academics. The desire to develop the quality of education to a world level via internationalisation is also pervasive among academics at KNUE which is a specialised teacher education institution and a leading university in the discipline of education within Korea.

In the case of HGU, the most important reason stated for internationalisation was to enhance the international competence of students. The university has framed itself as an education-oriented university from the beginning. Internationalisation has been a means to educate students to work in globalised environments. However, the other education-oriented university in this study, KNUE, only listed the item as its third priority. KNUE educates students to be teachers who work in Korean schools. It seems that the demand for international competence on the part of students from Korean schools is currently not strong as that from industry.

Table 9.1 Necessity of internationalisation at four universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very strong</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Weak</th>
<th>Very weak</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HGU</td>
<td>20 (66.7%)</td>
<td>8 (26.7%)</td>
<td>2 (6.7)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNUE</td>
<td>13 (32.5%)</td>
<td>27 (67.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yonsei</td>
<td>35 (44.3%)</td>
<td>38 (48.1%)</td>
<td>6 (7.6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNU</td>
<td>50 (64.1%)</td>
<td>26 (33.3%)</td>
<td>2 (2.6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>118 (52.0%)</td>
<td>99 (43.6%)</td>
<td>10 (4.4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>227 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regardless of different interpretations of internationalisation and different environments, most academics at the four case universities agreed on the necessity of internationalisation: KNUE (100%), SNU (97.4%), HGU (93.4%) and Yonsei (92.4%). Internationalisation can thus be said to be widely supported at the case universities. The internationalisation mission at the case universities was consistently supported by academics, with the majority of academics at HGU (66.7%) and SNU (64.1%) very strongly agreeing on its importance.
Figure 9.2 Obstacles to internationalisation at the four universities

In the process of internationalisation, universities often face barriers. Academics in the four case universities listed lack of finance and lack of policy and strategies as two major obstacles. At KNUE and Yonsei lack of finance was ranked as the most important obstacle followed by the lack of policies/strategies, whereas in SNU lack of policy/strategies was seen as the most significant factor. In the case of HGU, lack of staff for internationalisation was listed as an equally important factor.

Clearly finance is a key matter in the internationalisation of universities. To implement internationalisation, stable and continuous funds are necessary. However, Korean universities face structural financial difficulties. In the context of a decreasing national higher education student cohort, Korean universities, which rely heavily on student tuition fees, are suffering from a lack of finance. In addition, government funds are well below the level needed by universities. In 2003, Korean government funding accounted for a mere 23.2% of expenditure of institutions, compared with an average of 76.4% in OECD countries (OECD, 2006). Given perceptions of internationalisation as the key
means to become a world-class university, research-oriented universities need more support. Unfortunately funding may be a high university priority for internationalisation it receives inadequate support from the government. Even academics at SNU, one of the most successful universities in fund raising in the Korean higher education sector, ranked lack of finance as second in importance. Insufficient funds consequently result in a lack of staff for internationalisation which was ranked as the primary obstacle at HGU and third at Yonsei.

Lack of policies and strategies for internationalisation was the factor most frequently listed by respondents from SNU, and was ranked second at Yonsei and KNUE. It reflects the complex situation of Korean universities regarding implementation of internationalisation. In all of the case study universities, academics strongly agreed with the university’s emphasis on internationalisation but seemed to disagree with the detailed policies and strategies. In the early stages of internationalisation, some academics still raised fundamental questions as to the direction of internationalisation but others demanded more active strategies and implementation. Moreover, the policies and strategies seem not to match the diverse demands from various disciplines. Relatively low levels of concern for the lack of policy/strategies in HGU were distinct from those of other case study universities. HGU is a small university and it has implemented a comprehensive approach to internationalisation from the beginning of the university founded on efficient strategies.

Other difficulties such as low levels of interest by university members in KNUE, and administrative inertia or difficulties in KNUE and SNU reflect each university’s distinct culture. Students at KNUE have less interest in exchange programs. Their goal is to become domestic school teachers and their priority is to prepare for the competitive teacher appointment test. Long-term exchange programs would diminish the time available to prepare for this test. Administrative inertia or difficulties reveals a characteristic of SNU, a national university in which organisational culture is conservative and bureaucratic. The autonomy of academic and administrative staff is
restricted by their status as public servants and the public bureaucratic system lacks flexibility in personnel management.

Figure 9.3 Benefits of internationalisation at four universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>SNU</th>
<th>Yonsei</th>
<th>KNUE</th>
<th>HGU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement in quality of university</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening research cooperation</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building international network</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural awareness</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extending variety in teaching and learning</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items

Regarding the main benefits of internationalisation, academics at the four universities perceived that improvement in quality of education and strengthening of international research cooperation were most important. In the case of SNU and Yonsei, academics gave more priority to improvements in the quality of university while academics at KNUE more frequently selected the strengthening research cooperation as a priority item. In the case of HGU, the first priority was building international networks, followed only then by improvement in quality of the university.

In the two research-oriented universities, SNU and Yonsei, the ambition to achieve world-class status is pervasive among academics. Academics expect the implementation of internationalisation to yield enhanced research cooperation and ultimately
improvement in the quality of the university. Academics at KNUE have similar perceptions of the benefits of internationalisation. While KNUE mission is to educate teachers, it also has a research orientation. Through the implementation of internationalisation, KNUE academics expect to improve the research cooperation capacity, and overall quality of the university. Many academics at HGU listed as their first priority the building of international networks, followed second by improvements to the quality of the university. As an education-oriented university, academics also attached high priority to the benefits of cultural awareness, and extending variety in teaching and learning.

Figure 9.4 Risks of internationalisation at four universities

![Risk Chart]

Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items

Figure 9.4 shows how academic staff perceived the risks of internationalisation and reveals that increased costs are considered to be the major risk in all four universities. The second most frequent response factor differed across the four universities. While
academics in SNU perceived no risks to internationalisation, KNUE academics were concerned about polarisation, namely the potential for divisiveness between the less developed, less internationalised and the more highly developed, more internationalised parts of the university. For academics at HGU the threat of loss of cultural identity was rated second in importance and Yonsei academics were concerned about was increased competition.

Increased costs were undoubtedly seen as the most serious risk. Recruiting qualified academic staff and establishing infrastructure programs for internationalisation was seen as drawing budget from other sectors in a context of scarce financial resources and hence leading to imbalance in academic development. This also highlights the threat that internationalisation can pose to younger universities, depriving them of the funds to develop and grow. In this situation where internationalisation is viewed as the means to become a top-tier world class university, lack of funds can lead to the university losing top ranking amidst the limitless competition.

In addition, an international program requiring substantial funds may threaten other non-international programs. While an international program can enhance the reputation of a department, an innately non-international department may be disadvantaged. When international program are prioritised, other functions of the university can be downgraded. This may help explain the apprehensions expressed regarding polarisation between the less developed and more highly developed university departments that was the second most frequently expressed concern at KNUE.

At HGU, the potential loss of cultural identity was the second-ranked risk factor. Unlike universities in English speaking countries, for Korean universities, internationalisation means changing the campus towards a more English-friendly environment. This can lead to concerns over threats to Korean culture and identity.

"Increased competition" was considered the second major risk for academics at Yonsei. Excessive competition in the process of internationalisation often becomes burdensome
for academic staff. Korean universities tend to be urged to measure the degree of internationalisation via statistics such as the number of courses in English, and the number of publications in international journals, regardless of whether the university has relatively few international students, or is a regional institution.

The factor, no risk, was ranked second for SNU, and for other case universities it was listed third. This relatively high response rate for the item seems to indicate that academics have a growing confidence that internationalisation is an opportunity to develop their university rather than a threat.

**Implementation of internationalisation**

Institutional strategies for internationalisation define the framework and direction for overall internationalisation. Generally, internationalisation strategies include statements and directives which refer to priorities and plans. More specifically Knight (2006) states that if an institution has an integrated approach to internationalisation, the strategies contain a wide range of policies and procedures such as quality assurance, planning, funding, staffing, faculty development, admissions, research, curriculum, students support, contract and project work.

The four case-study universities developed internationalisation strategies reflecting their university philosophy, educational aims and contextual demands. The strategy at HGU, Yonsei and SNU was more integrated, expressing change across the whole university in areas of infrastructure, curriculum and international programs to develop the international competence of university members. It is expected that students will work in global environments. Internationalisation of the curriculum including courses in English and international contents, an international atmosphere for both incoming students and Korean students, and infrastructure are emphasised. By contrast, KNUE limited its strategies to exchange programs and research cooperation. Here again, KNUE was primarily responding to the regional demand for excellent teachers who will work in Korea.
Implementation of internationalisation is ultimately based on specific strategies. This section analyses the case universities’ implementation in three areas: teaching, learning and research; international programs and activities; and institutional management for internationalisation.

**Teaching, learning and research**

Teaching and learning, and research are key vehicles for university internationalisation. One of the most important aims of internationalisation is cultivating students with international competence and advanced knowledge to contribute to the nation and world society. On this measure, case universities paid key attention to teaching and learning. Among various program strategies, the current research focused on foreign language and courses containing international/international content in teaching and learning. As a measure of internationalisation, research collaboration was also surveyed.

Foreign language ability has often been considered an important indicator in the internationalisation of higher education (de Wit, 1997). With an emphasis upon creating an educational environment for internationalisation, the Korean government has implemented a policy to expand courses in English (MOEHRD, 2006d). In the case universities, the foreign language most frequently used by academic staff in teaching and research was English: HGU (93.3%), KNUE (82.5%), Yonsei (94.9%), and SNU (92.3%). The increase of courses taught in English is another general trend across the case universities with the exception of KNUE. In 2006, the percentage of courses taught in English at undergraduate schools was as follows: HGU (26%), KNUE (n.a.), Yonsei (17.5%), and SNU (5%).

In order to attract more international students and educate domestic students with a greater international competence, the case universities stressed the courses they offered in English. The universities made efforts to increase the availability of courses in English, and effective implementation of those courses. At HGU, practical English courses were
compulsory for all first year students, and a certain level of English fluency was demanded, before graduation. For new faculty, the ability to lecture in English is a hiring requirement. Academics who teach a subject in English gain additional work load credits at HGU, Yonsei and SNU. While generally Yonsei and HGU emphasise the importance of courses taught in English, SNU and KNUE have adopted a more conservative stance. Basically, KNUE experiences a relatively low demand for courses in English while academics at SNU are concerned about the quality of lectures in a foreign language. In spite of the importance of courses in English for internationalisation and an awareness of the benefits that it can confer, as universities in a non-English speaking country, many academics at the case universities expressed concern for the quality of lectures and student difficulties in understanding the courses in English.

Along with increasing the number of courses taught in English, internationalised curricula with international content and activities in teaching and learning were also emphasised. At the case universities, internationalisation approaches fell into three categories. The first category was of completely international schools providing all courses in English with fully internationalised content and activities. Examples of these are the International Law School (ILS) at HGU, Underwood International College (UIC) and Graduate School of International Studies (GSIS) at Yonsei, and the Graduate School of International Studies (GSIS) at SNU. The second category comprised specific programs in a school with full internationalised content and activities with English language lectures, as exemplified by the Global Management program at HGU’s School of Management & Economics and the Global MBA program at Yonsei’s Graduate School of Business. The final category comprised normal schools with a domestic profile. As the government and universities place a greater emphasis on internationalisation, this group has gradually increased its international content and activities, with more lectures in English.

The internationalisation of curriculum at Korean universities has been led by specialised departments such as international schools. Three of four case universities in this research established this type of school. Foreign faculty and international students tend to be
concentrated in these focussed international schools. Recently, in order to respond to internal and external demands, the case study universities have expanded internationalisation of their curriculum into areas beyond the international schools into programs mentioned in the second category above such as internationally focussed programs in Business, Law and Engineering. Increasing international/intercultural contents and activities in the curriculum boosts students' international competence. However, this trend was not evident at KNUE, a teacher-education specialised university, where students are expected to respond to the more regional demands of becoming teachers within the Korean system.

Internationalisation in research is also emphasised and measured via international collaboration and the publication of papers in international journals. Academics at the case universities have implemented research work with foreign counterparts via both established university research networks, and personal networks. All case universities have expanded formal international links to support research cooperation. Often academics' personal research networks develop into university agreements, enriching university links. While a general increase in publication in international journals was evident at all case universities, the increase at Yonsei and SNU was more marked. Their research strategies are embedded in long-term university development plans to become world-class universities. Publication in SCI-indexed journals is considered highly important in both these universities. Resourcing of research at Yonsei is characterised by concentration of resources on a few select research teams. These select research teams are fully supported to help achieve Yonsei's goal of becoming a world class institution. In the case of SNU this also included internationalisation of Korean Studies.

**International programs and activities**

As internationalisation becomes a more important dimension of university life, the range and quantity of programs and activities is growing. The key items in Korean universities’ internationalisation identified and investigated by the research were mainly international
agreements, international students and scholars, exchange programs, dual/joint degree programs and extracurricular international activities.

International agreements underpin the growth and strength of internationalisation. The number of agreements varied among case universities. In 2006, there were 50 such agreements at HGU, 21 at KNUE, 536 at Yonsei, and 102 at SNU. As these agreements are a base for faculty and student exchange, research collaboration and other cooperative programs, all four universities have increased the number of such agreements over recent years. But simple numbers do not reveal how active these international agreements are, as their activities are often exaggerated in order to enhance the reputation of the institution and moreover, different measuring criteria were evident among the universities. In spite of these defects, the numbers can indicate the importance placed by the case universities on international cooperation. While universities expand the number of their institutional agreements, they also seek a greater balance. Where previously such agreements leaned towards Western advanced countries, a recent trend is for an increase of agreements with Asian counterparts and institutions in other non Western regions.

The growing number of inbound and outbound personnel at the universities is changing the atmosphere on campus. In 2006, the number of foreign students in degree courses was 149 (4.4%) at HGU, 3 (0.1%) at KNUE, 617 (2.2%) at Yonsei, and 755 (2.5%) at SNU. In the same year, the number of foreign academics in full-time permanent positions was 12 (8.7%) at HGU, 0 at KNUE, 52 (3.5%) at Yonsei, and 8 (0.5%) at SNU. The proportion of domestic students with foreign experience via exchange or short-term visiting programs varied across the four universities. Generally, the proportion of students engaged in exchange programs was less than 0.1% in KNUE and about 1 to 2% in other case universities. The proportion of students engaged in short-term visiting programs was about 30% at HGU, whilst the proportion remained about 1% in other universities. The increasing number of international students and scholars in the case universities is gradually enhancing the international profile of the campus. In addition, domestic student participation in exchange programs and short-term visiting programs allows them to enter an enriched international and intercultural environment.
Extracurricular activities such as student clubs, international campus events and peer support groups are an important part of internationalisation strategies (Knight, 1997). Universities provide these programs to support international students and help them harmonise with domestic students. Except for KNUE, where only a few international students have enrolled in degree courses, all other universities had various activities. Yonsei and HGU's programs in particular explicitly state their all year round activities and aim to help international students socialize with local students. HGU provides the International House (I-House) where international students live with Korean students and participate in joint activities. Student Councils have also taken the initiative of promoting international activities. These Councils provide orientation, home stay and one-on-one support programs. Yonsei offers four types of support to international students: the Buddy Family & Homestay Program, Language Exchange, Buddy Program and Global Lounge. The Buddy Family & Homestay Program offers the experience of living with Korean families to international students. The Language Exchange and Buddy Program match international students and Korean students on a one to one basis, for sharing language and experiences. The Global Lounge is a multi-functional space to foster international exchange via various programs.

Dual and joint degree programs are high-level joint academic programs with foreign partners. The Korean government has promoted these programs for the purpose of introducing advanced foreign institution curricula (MOEHRD, 2006d). Among the case universities, SNU, Yonsei and HGU operated dual and joint degree programs. While HGU operated a program to support an institution in Mongolia, SNU and Yonsei operated programs with advanced institutions in Western countries.

HGU has established a Joint Degree program, Master of Business Administration (MBA), at the Institute for Finance and Economics (IFE) in Mongolia providing HGU's MBA programs. Yonsei has dual degree programs with the Washington College of Law at the American University in the U.S. and with the University of Geneva in Switzerland. Participating students graduate with Masters degrees from both universities via these
programs. SNU has dual degree programs in the Colleges of Natural Science, Engineering, and Business Administration, and also in the Graduate School of International Studies. For example, the MBA at the Graduate School of Business Administration has operated a dual degree program with Duke University in the U.S. since 2003.

Figure 9.5 Successful programs and strategies at the four universities

Overall, student/faculty exchange programs, student/faculty short-term overseas visiting programs, international conferences and courses taught in foreign languages were perceived by academic staff as programs and strategies activities that successfully implemented internationalisation. Academics at SNU listed international conferences,
short-term visiting programs and exchange programs as successful programs. Academics at Yonsei listed exchange programs and courses taught in English. Academics at KNUE listed short-term visiting programs and exchange programs. In the case of HGU, courses taught in English and recruitment of foreign students were listed as successful programs.

Case universities implement internationalisation strategies based on certain selected programs such as exchange and short-term visiting programs and conferences. Exchange and short-term visiting programs have been major programs in the internationalisation of Korean universities (MOEHRD, 1998) and the number of participants has constantly increased (K. S. Lee, 2007; MOEHRD, 2006d). Recently, as the Korean government emphasises inbound internationalisation, some universities such as HGU and Yonsei have increased the number of courses in English and successfully attracted international students. In addition, SNU’s reputation increases it has successfully held various international conferences. However, except for a few notable exceptions, other international programs and strategies such as internationalised curriculum and joint/dual degree programs have not yet been successful.
Figure 9.6 Programs and strategies needed to strengthen internationalisation at the four universities

Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items.

Figure 9.6 indicates the programs and strategies perceived by academics as necessary to strengthen the internationalisation of their university. The two most important items listed at Yonsei and KNUE were internationalised curriculum and international research collaboration. At SNU exchange programs and joint programs were ranked most important, while HGU academics ranked internationalised curriculum first.

In comparison to the overall agreement between academic staff at the four universities on a few select internationalisation programs and strategies which were viewed as successful (Figure 9.5), there were diverse opinions over which internationalisation programs and strategies were needed to strengthen respective universities. They include recruitment of
international students and student/faculty exchange programs. This reflects the diverse priorities of internationalisation strategies amongst academics. Currently implementation of internationalisation strategies is focused on a few select items, probably due to limited resources and finances. However, as demands from academics vary quite strongly, it is indeed valuable to collect opinions from all disciplines to further develop implementation of strategies in a balanced and equitable manner.

Institutional management for internationalisation

Institutional management for internationalisation is essential for the implementation of strategies and programs. To ensure a constancy of policies, de Wit (2002) emphasises a permanent organisational commitment and structure. Knight (1997) has emphasised the importance of management for internationalisation and has identified the following focus areas: governance, operations, support services and human resource development. The current research into institutional management focused mainly on the International office, cooperation between that office and other departments, and support by senior leaders.

Leadership is essential in the development of international strategy and its implementation (J. Taylor, 2004). Leaders of all four universities expressed very strong support for internationalisation. The President at HGU who has occupied the position from the inception of the university has directed the international focus. The President at Yonsei not only advocated the necessity of internationalisation but also led its implementation through strategies embedded in the university development plan and via annual evaluation of their progress. The President at SNU, too, led the impetus for internationalisation. In his 4-year presidency at the national university, he pressed for the development of internationalisation strategies and maintained a pro-internationalisation stance as a means of promoting long-term university development. The President at KNUE also had strong expectations for internationalisation. During his 4-year presidency, he has strengthened regional cooperation with institutions especially from North East Asia.
Undoubtedly, the international centres at the four universities are the core organisations for the continuing implementation of internationalisation. HGU, although under-resourced compared to SNU and Yonsei, has a well-structured organisational system for internationalisation and has the strong support of the HGU President. The key implementation systems at HGU are its Internationalisation Task Force (ITF) and the International Cooperation Centre (ICC) which are located within the HGU Office of Planning and Development. The Head of the ITF is the HGU Vice President and committee members are senior leaders of the university. While the ITF decides upon and leads plans and programmes for internationalisation, the ICC implements the international strategies. ICC is the centre for the external internationalisation of HGU, conducting international collaboration, international exchange programs and support for overseas aid associations. The University President strongly supports the ICC; however, lack of human resources restricts the scope of ICC’s support to the departments. This helps explain why heads of school view cooperation between ICC and schools as 44% positive and 10% negative.

KNUE is under-resourced, and lacks a well-structured organisational system for internationalisation despite the strong support of the KNUE President. It does not have a separate organisation in charge of internationalisation per se but is instead located within the Office of Planning & Research in a subdivision of Planning & Relations that manages international affairs. The activities of the Planning & Relations Division are limited to the area of agreements with foreign institutions and assigning follow-up to the respective faculty or other organisation. With the strong support of the KNUE University President, the Planning & Relations Division has actively extended its partnerships with foreign institutions. However, as its role is limited, it is incapable of meeting the demands from the various departments and schools. Thus more heads of school perceived the cooperation between this division and the schools as negative (37%) rather than positive (18%).

Yonsei is better resourced than KNUE and HGU. It has a small but well-structured organisational system for internationalisation and has the strong support of the Yonsei
President. Its international centre, the Division of International Education & Exchange (DIEE) centrally manages the university's international dimensions. It is in charge of international affairs such as agreements, exchange programs, international semesters, special programs and international dormitories. With the President’s strong support, the DIEE has taken the initiative to lead the collaboration for internationalisation throughout the university. Satisfaction with levels of organisational support of cooperation between departments and the DIEE however remained neutral. 17.4% of heads of department had a positive view of this cooperation whereas 69.6% felt neutral and 13% held negative views.

SNU has the best resourced internationalisation centre of the four universities. It is a well-structured organisational system for internationalisation but it suffers from some bureaucratic and administrative limitations. With strong support from the president, SNU has reinforced institutional management of internationalisation through the Office of International Affairs (OIA). The OIA has been charged with developing, promoting, and assisting SNU’s international programs and strategic initiatives. Under the control of its own Dean for International Affairs, the OIA has been tasked with managing inter-university partnerships, academic exchange agreements, international curricula, and administrative support for international students, cross-cultural events and protocol activities for visiting officials. With regard to cooperation between the OIA and departments, the OIA mainly takes charge of university-level international affairs, while each college manages its own international affairs with the support of the OIA. Heads of departments felt somewhat positive about this relationship. The ratio of administrators who felt positive (29%) about the cooperation was more than double that of those who were negative (12%).

**Contribution of returning scholars**

Paralleling the increasing importance of human resources in a knowledge-based society, the number of international students and scholars is perceived as a driving force for academic development and internationalisation of higher education. For Korean
universities, the relatively large number of Korean students studying abroad, together
with the high rate of returning Korean PhD holders, is one of the main influences on their
development and internationalisation. This section analyses findings from each case
under four headings: the characteristics of returnees, perceptions of returnees, returnees’
impact on the university, and the difficulties returnees have experienced.

The characteristics of returnees

Overall in this study, Korean scholars who obtained their highest degree overseas formed
the majority. HGU had the highest proportion of returnees with highest degree (70%). The
lowest proportion of returnees was at KNUE, but even there more than half of all
academics had acquired their highest degree overseas. The numbers at Yonsei (52%) and
SNU (65%) would be much higher if their Medical Departments, where most of the
academics are indigenous scholars, were excluded.17

As most faculty acquired their doctorates abroad, their average overseas length of stay
was relatively long. More than 80% of returnees in all selected universities had stayed
abroad more than 5 years. In the case of HGU and Yonsei academics, about 40% returnees had lived overseas for more than 10 years. Working experience in their related
research area had also intensified their knowledge. More than half of returnees at HGU
(70%), Yonsei (57%) and SNU (56%) had accumulated further experience after gaining
their degree. In case of KNUE academics, about 30% of returnees had overseas working experience. The average overseas working period for returnees following their graduation
with highest degree was about 6.5 years at HGU and 2 years at the other universities.

The high proportion of returnees among Korean scholars and their lengthy overseas
period including working experience, presents many possibilities for the selected
universities. In the context of a small proportion of full-time foreign faculty (HGU
(8.7%), KNUE (0%), Yonsei (3.5%), and SNU (0.5%) and relatively short overseas periods for indigenous scholars, such returnees can act as well-equipped internationalised

17 The proportion of returnees excepting Medical Departments would be 85% at Yonsei and 74% at SNU.
personnel. The long-term foreign experience of returnees should assure a high degree of international and intercultural competence. In addition, returnees’ research and work experience in advanced research areas can be a direct source for Korean knowledge development. Returnees from various foreign countries can also contribute to academic diversity. On the other hand, the presence of this large percentage of returnees at the university may also lead to conflict with indigenous scholars. There is a tendency for returnees from overseas leading universities to be greatly preferred when filling positions in Korean universities. A long-stay overseas may be effective for the accumulation of knowledge and international competence, but may make it difficult for returnees to readjust to Korea when they return.

Figure 9.7 Reasons for return at the four universities

![Chart showing reasons for return at the four universities.](image)

Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items

Overseas scientists often return to their home countries after acquiring a degree or gaining work experience. Decision factors underpinning their return, such as the economic, political, and academic situation of their country of study and home country, and individual strategies have been analysed according to push and pull factors (Guellec
& Cervantes, 2002). Figure 9.7 indicates two major reasons for return at the four universities. An acceptable job offer in Korea, and family situation such as parents' request or family reunion were the two most frequently selected items. For returnees at all four universities, an acceptable job offer was the most important factor accounting for the decision. The second priority for return differed amongst the various universities. While for HGU, KNUE and Yonsei academics, the family situation was the second most frequent reason selected, at SNU the contribution to national science and knowledge development was the second most frequent reason given.

Work opportunities are a major factor for peripatetic scholars. Undoubtedly, a job offer from Korea was the most important factor behind their return. During the 1970's and 80's developing Korean industries and high technology areas absorbed many overseas Korean scientists (Yoon, 1992). The expanding tertiary education sector welcomed returnees for their advanced knowledge and foreign language fluency. From the 1990's onwards, however, not all of them received a full-time job offer from a university. Many started their career with part-time positions at a modest university, or a research job at a research centre. Many recently returned scholars without work experience overseas after their highest degree acquisition started their career from an insecure part-time position.

While academics seek a place to fulfil their academic ambitions, they also consider many other factors. As Song (1991) has explained, Korean returnees from the U.S. were deeply concerned with family matters, a priority that is rooted in Confucian values such as the responsibility of the first son in a family, responsibility for their elderly parents, or family reunion. The response regarding family matters was highest at KNUE (58%). On the other hand, returnees' patriotic desire to contribute to national development was another major factor. During the national development period from 1970's to 1980's, the Korean government sent many elite students overseas at governmental expense. They returned to Korea in spite of its inferior research environment. This patriotic reason was most explicit stated at SNU (48%).
Perceptions of returnees

Table 9.2 Perceptions of returnees’ impact on university development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very positive</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Very negative</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HGU</td>
<td>8 (26.7%)</td>
<td>18 (60.0%)</td>
<td>4 (13.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNUE</td>
<td>8 (20.0%)</td>
<td>25 (62.5%)</td>
<td>6 (15.0%)</td>
<td>1 (2.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yonsei</td>
<td>24 (30.4%)</td>
<td>41 (51.9%)</td>
<td>14 (16.5%)</td>
<td>1 (1.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNU</td>
<td>12 (15.4%)</td>
<td>45 (57.7%)</td>
<td>20 (25.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Returnees are expected to play an important role in the university, due to their international and intercultural experience. While the returnees themselves have more positive perceptions of their contributions, academics in general at all four universities had positive views of the returnees’ contribution to university development and internationalisation. In the area of the returnees’ influence on university development, the majority of academics had positive perceptions: HGU (86.7%), KNUE (82.5%), Yonsei (82.3%) and SNU (73.1%).

As academics in the four universities recognised, returnees have contributed significantly to the development of university. They have brought advanced knowledge, methodologies, and systems, which have contributed to the development of contemporary Korean higher education. In spite of this general recognition of the returnees’ role in university development, however, there a rising concern over their role evident at the four case study universities. As the quality of Korean university has developed, the returnees’ key role in the adoption of advanced knowledge is gradually decreasing. In addition, the simple transplant of foreign knowledge into Korean soil is no longer welcomed, as there is increasing desire to be an academic centre in the global knowledge system and to develop deep knowledge that reflects the Korean environments. This perception was more explicitly stated at Yonsei and SNU.
Table 9.3 Returnee’s influence on internationalisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very positive</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Very negative</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HGU</td>
<td>10 (33.3%)</td>
<td>18 (60.0%)</td>
<td>4 (6.7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNUE</td>
<td>3 (7.5%)</td>
<td>30 (75.0%)</td>
<td>7 (17.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yonsei</td>
<td>22 (27.8%)</td>
<td>45 (57.0%)</td>
<td>12 (15.2%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNU</td>
<td>9 (11.5%)</td>
<td>54 (69.2%)</td>
<td>15 (19.2%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>78 (100.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of internationalisation, academics had high expectation of the role of returnees. The percentage of those who were either very positive or positive was 93.3% at HGU, 82.5% at KNUE, 84.8% at Yonsei and 80.7% at SNU. At HGU and Yonsei where internationalisation was more pervasive throughout the university, more academics had a very positive perception: HGU (33.3%) and Yonsei (27.8%). On the contrary, at KNUE, where internationalisation was implemented in more limited areas, the proportion that was “very positive” was lower (7.5%). In general, where more areas were involved in internationalisation, there was a more positive perception of the returnees’ role.

*Contribution of returnees*

Due to their academic development during recent decades, Korean universities can no longer be classed as under-developed in terms of their teaching and research environment but given the universities’ continued desire to strengthen international networks, the returnees’ role is still important. In the teaching and research areas, with vigorous international activities, returnees have a key role to play in internationalisation.
Table 9.4 International activities of academic staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>HGU</th>
<th></th>
<th>KNUE</th>
<th></th>
<th>Yonsei</th>
<th></th>
<th>SNU</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching international students in class</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in international conferences</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing academic papers in international journals</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting international research projects</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having students conduct international research</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving funding for international research</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting research with foreign researchers</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The numbers above are percentages indicating the proportion of indigenous (I) and peripatetic (P) scholars engaged in various international activities for two years (mid 2004 - mid 2006)

In each case study the contribution of returnees to their home university was examined in the following categories: teaching activities, conference attendance, publications, conducting international research projects, supervising students' international research projects, receiving financial support and conducting research collaboration with overseas scholars. Table 9.4 compares the activities of indigenous and peripatetic scholars in these seven areas across all four case study universities over the same two-year period (mid 2004 - mid 2006). Generally, peripatetic scholars were more active. However, the difference between two groups varied across the four universities.

For the item, "teaching international students in class," peripatetic scholars were more active at HGU, Yonsei and SNU. In the area of "participating in international conferences" and "publishing papers in international journals," peripatetic scholars' were more active at KNUE and Yonsei. In the area of "conducting international research projects," "having students conducting international research," and "receiving financial support for international research," peripatetic scholars were more active, except at HGU. Regarding the item of "conducting research with foreign researchers," peripatetic scholars were more active in all case universities.
When analysed by disciplines following Biglan’s classification, returnees in the Hard-Pure domain were most active in “participating in international conferences,” “publishing a paper in an international journal,” “having students conducting international research,” and “conducting research with foreign researchers.” Returnees in the Soft-Pure domain were most active in “teaching international students in class,” “performing international research projects,” and “receiving financial support for international research” (see Appendix Table K.1).

By gender, international activities between male and female groups were generally similar except with regard to the items “teaching international students in class” and “conducting research with foreign researchers.” While male returnees were more active in teaching international students, female returnees were more active in conducting research with foreign researchers. The differences, however, were not statistically significant (see Appendix Table K.2).

While generally, peripatetic scholars were found to be active in various international activities, their contribution varied across items and universities. It seems that their involvement is deeply rooted in the particular circumstances of the university. For example, for the item “teaching international students in class,” (with the exception of KNUE where few international students are enrolled), at all the other universities, about half the academics indicated experience in teaching international students. While peripatetic scholars were more active, the difference between indigenous and peripatetic scholars was most obvious at HGU. It seems that the high proportion of courses taught in English (26%) at HGU allows more peripatetic scholars to be involved in courses in English where more international students are expected to attend. However, at the other two universities, Yonsei and SNU, where many international students attend courses taught in Korean, there is a higher possibility that indigenous scholars will of encounter international students in the courses the academics teach in Korean.

Given their active international involvement, returnees have a key role to play in internationalisation. Their international networks played an important role in extending
university international networks in all case study universities. Faculty exchange, which originated via returnees’ personal networks, has developed to the stage of formal academic agreements with foreign universities at HGU. At KNUE, returnees’ international networks have also contributed to the institution’s international networking. Their host countries and institutions are considered prime targets for international cooperation agreements. In addition, returnees are a precious resource for international cooperation in their institution.

Returnees’ international/intercultural competence is also pivotal to the development of international strategies and implementation. At HGU, returnees planned the initial internationalisation strategies. At two other case universities, SNU and Yonsei, they were also deeply involved in the international committee, which directs the orientation of internationalisation.

Their foreign experience and foreign language fluency in research and teaching are also practical and useful skills in the administrative arena. In all four universities, the directors of international offices were returnees. They are key decision makers in resolving matters of institutional strategies and programmes.

**Difficulties for returnees**

Peripatetic scholars, who sustain a more international profile, can be a driving force for the internationalisation and development of their university. However, their contribution can be impeded during their process of readjustment. Returnees often confront difficulties stemming from conflict between their acquired academic cultures and the Korean and from less supportive working conditions such as weakness of infrastructure and fragile relationships with colleagues (Meyer, 2001).
Figure 9.8 Difficulties in teaching and research for returnees

![Bar chart showing difficulties in teaching and research](image)

**Note.** Respondents were asked to select the two most important items, (%)

Figure 9.8 shows the major difficulties in teaching and research experienced by returnees at the four universities. The most frequently mentioned difficulties in teaching and research was “excessive teaching and administrative workload” followed by “rigid administrative system.” Returnees at Yonsei listed “scarce resources and poor facilities” as the second most important factor rather than “rigid administrative system.” KNUE, returnees expressed an equal frustration with first and the second items.

Lack of facilities presented more serious difficulties for early returnees. As Korean universities have developed, this impediment has slowly ameliorated. However, excessive teaching and administrative workload pose the main challenges for all disciplines and age groups. By disciplines following Biglan’s classification, while returnees in the Hard & Pure domain expressed “scarce resources and poor facilities” as their most serious difficulties alongside “excessive teaching and administrative workload,” those from other disciplines listed “rigid administrative system” as the second largest challenge (see Appendix Figure K.1). By age groups, “rigid administrative system” which was the third most frequently mentioned response for returnees in their
sixties and above, but was the second most frequently cited by returnees in their fifties and below (see Appendix Figure K.2). It is presumed that while difficulties caused by lack of facilities have been reduced as Korean universities have developed, difficulties caused by excessive workloads, and rigid administrative systems have continued. In interviews, academics linked those difficulties to the academic atmosphere in Korea.

Figure 9.9 Difficulties of life for returnees at the four universities

Regarding major difficulties faced in daily life, returnees principally responded that “education and language problems of the children” and “inadequate income” were the key issues. In terms of frequency by university, children’s education (50%) and inadequate income (50%) were the most frequently expressed issues at HGU, inadequate income (46%) and uncertainty of employment (42%) at KNUE, children’s education (45%) and readjustment to Korea (31%) at Yonsei, and inadequate income (40%), children’s education (32%) and political/social conditions in Korea (32%) at SNU.

Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items, (%)
Among the various difficulties of daily life at universities, the two most frequent and commonly experienced difficulties were children’s education and language problems, and inadequate income. Returnees who had lived overseas longer had more difficulties in readjustment and children’s education. The proportion of returnees who had lived more than 10 years overseas by university was HGU (40%), Yonsei (40%), SNU (32%) and KNUE (17%). The problems their children faced in readjusting to education in Korea, and the returnees’ income level were the most commonly cited responses at HGU and Yonsei. Just like returnee academics themselves, their children also confront problems in such an unfamiliar environment. Goodman (2003) investigating Japanese returnee children, reports that educational, linguistic and cultural problems were perceived as the most common challenges. For Korean returnees, too, it is hard for children of returnees to leave an education environment with which they have become well acquainted. When their children face difficulties in readjusting to the Korean education environment as part of the overall process of readjustment, this adds an extra burden to the difficulties experienced by the returned family.

Inadequate income is both a practical and emotional issue. Early stage returnees in 1970’s and 1980’s resumed their work in Korea with less income than they would have received if they had stayed in the U.S.. Despite reasonable income levels compared to other Koreans, they considered the opportunity cost, which they could earn or save if they would stayed in Korea. For recent returnees, unstable job conditions and lower income is a reality. When they do not have a stable job, returnees experienced difficulties trying to live on their income from a series of part-time lecturing jobs at various universities. Their income just meets their living costs, and they feel miserable.

Male and female returnees ranked the difficulties of readjusting to life in Korea differently. While male returnees most frequently listed “inadequate income” (45%), and “education and language problem of children” (44%), female returnees listed “readjustment to Korean life and customs” (37%), and “uncertainty of employment” (22%) (see Appendix Figure K.3). The item, uncertainty of employment, reveals the difficult condition experienced by returnees, and in particular by women. Newly returned
returnees often start their career as part-time lecturers in a short-term contract position. Uncertainty of employment was the least frequently listed response by male returnees but was the second most frequently expressed response for female returnees. While the data from cross tabulation of a multiple choice question limits wider inferences about the implications across Korean universities, interviews support this result. As identified in previous research by Min and Sco (1998) about difficulties experienced by female academics, female returnees also had difficulties in securing full-time jobs at university. On the other hand, the item “readjustment to Korean life and customs” which was the most frequent response for female returnees may well relate to difficulties they experience when they re-enter Korean society with its persistently masculine-centred Confucian values, after a period of relative freedom in the U.S.

Conclusion

The cross-case analysis reviews the findings from each case study in terms of perceptions and implementation of internationalisation and the contribution of returnees at HGU, KNUE, Yonsei, and SNU. The similarities and differences between the case study universities based on the university atmosphere are due to differing internal and external demands, educational aims and academic cultures.

Confronting a global environment in the 21st century, case universities consider internationalisation to be a means to develop universities and prepare students for a global society. This approach largely accords with academics’ perception of the rationale for internationalisation. The main obstacles to internationalisation for most universities are lack of finance and lack of policy/strategies. While academics see improvements in quality of university and strengthening research cooperation as the main benefits of internationalisation, their prime concerns are increased cost.

Given their different educational aims, disciplinary profiles and academic cultures of the different case study universities, the internationalisation process has emphasised diverse features. In the case of HGU, the international dimension has been strongly reinforced by
the university's overall educational policies. Internationalisation is viewed as a means
to change the whole university in the areas of infrastructure, curriculum and
administration. The international dimension of KNUE, on the other hand, has been
strongly affected by its more locally-embedded academic culture and aims of education.
It is focused on teacher education with an emphasis on international research
collaboration and exchange programs. Yonsei has highlighted its internationalisation
process in the form of a comprehensive strategy. A characteristic of Yonsei's
internationalisation strategies is that it is a part of well-organised university development
plan, “Yonsei Vision 2020.” This institutional vision directs the overall institutional aim
and strategies toward creating a world-class university. Finally, SNU has implemented its
internationalisation strategies within its overall long-term development plans. While it
has emphasised mutual exchange, it seeks a way to internationalise Korean Studies and
knowledge. Like Yonsei, active implementation of internationalisation strategies is
oriented fundamentally at the improvement of the quality of the university to a world
level.

When examining returnee perceptions of the importance of internationalisation at Korean
universities, it is clear that they are viewed as contributing positively to stimulating
academic development and in general supporting and extending the internationalisation
process. Through having spent relatively long periods overseas, returnees have acquired
international competence and advanced knowledge. When Korean universities were still
at a basic stage of development, returning scholars who had studied in advanced countries
contributed to national development by transferring new technology and science. Their
contribution was vital for the development of Korean universities. Even now, at this more
advanced stage of Korean university development, the role of returnees remains critical.
Both as teaching staff and researchers, peripatetic scholars are more active in
international activities. Their vigorous international activities seem to be attributable to
their international competence and experience such as understanding of other cultures,
foreign language ability and personal networks. Their contribution is not limited to
teaching and research areas. They also play a key role in the extension of the institution’s
international network. In the management of internationalisation, they also tend to have a
greater role than indigenous scholars do. However, returnees have experienced difficulties during the process of readjustment in Korea and these difficulties have impeded their greater contribution to university development.
CHAPTER TEN  INTERNATIONALISATION OF KOREAN HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE IMPACT OF RETURNING SCHOLARS

Introduction

This chapter investigates internationalisation, and in particular the contribution and experience of returnees at four Korean universities. As the background to this research, globalisation and its impact on higher education, mainly on international dimensions and academic mobility, are explored. In this context, the research analyses internationalisation at the four universities, with regard to perceptions, implementation, and the returnees' perceived contributions. Finally, recommendations based on the findings of this research into Korean higher education are put forward for institution-based strategic approaches to internationalisation and more systemic deployment of returnees' contributions.

Globalisation and higher education

Globalisation has often been used as a framework to discern causes, effects and future directions for universities in an era of unprecedented transformation (Altbach, 2004a; King, 2004b; Marginson, 1999; Slaughter, 1998). In Chapter One, the research scrutinised the globalisation phenomenon and its impact on higher education according to economic, political and cultural dimensions. This phenomenon, which has often been described as a force to link and drive the whole world towards a more unitary entity, constantly interacts with nations' individual circumstances, notably their economic, political and cultural dimensions.

Given this changing global environment, universities are facing major transformations especially in funding, management and the key functions of teaching, learning, and research. Given the insufficient levels of government funding in the era of mass higher education, universities are being pressured to seek other resources (Greenaway &
Haynes, 2003). This trend is likely to be aggravated by the global economic crisis that began in 2008. It has commonly resulted in university-industry strategic alliances following demands from industries, performance-based resource allocation policies from governments, and operating university for-profit businesses (Liefner, 2003; Lingard & Rizvi, 1998). At the same time, an entrepreneurial ethos such as high flexibility, quality of product and responsiveness to client demands, is pushing universities toward new types of organisation and management styles (Sotirakou, 2004). Universities emphasise efficiency and effectiveness in institutional governance, employing varied managerial techniques such as total quality management (TQM), peer-review and staff appraisal (Welch, 1998, 2005a). In addition, there are substantial changes in teaching and learning, and research. The incorporation of information-technology into the teaching and learning process is widening accessibility to higher education and is sometimes argued to yield a more effective and cost-cutting learning environment. With regard to research, closer linkages between universities and industries, and performance-based funding systems have brought about higher productivity and responsiveness, increasing government influence and at times a corresponding weakness in the Pure Sciences.

Meanwhile, globalisation is also stimulating and reshaping the international dimensions of higher education. Developing ICT and, until recently, cheaper international travel, enhances student mobility and can stimulate international academic cooperation. In the current global era because international competencies are required for employees, whether they are engaged in international or domestic industries, various stakeholders, including governments, the business sector and students are demanding that universities internationalise education. In addition, there is a trend for globalisation to add new and arguably contradictory values to the traditional international value system. Therefore, internationalisation of higher education consists of not only its internationalisation values of traditional academic principles, cooperation and mutual benefits but is also strongly impacted by the new globalisation values of competition, commercialisation and a concentration on one-sided economic benefits.
There are myriad factors shaping universities response to internationalisation such as culture, history, and the economic and political situation. Accordingly, a university’s international strategies vary across different institutions, regions and cultures. These differences are often based on varied academic, cultural, economic and political rationales (Knight, 1994). Universities may develop internationalisation strategies to help ensure the high quality of research and education. As a cultural centre, universities preserve national culture and contribute to the improvement of intercultural understanding among its members (staff and students). In addition, universities are nationally rooted, and must also respond to demands for national development. Ever-growing demands in the economic sector often result in the expansion of international programs beyond national boundaries. It is within the context of this complex and at times contradictory set of imperatives that universities develop international strategies and programs.

Changing perceptions toward mobilising personnel, and their impact on higher education provided the base for the discussion of academic mobility of higher education in Chapter Two. With regard to mobility, imbalanced flows (the so called brain-drain) aroused profound concern among sending countries. However, brain circulation and knowledge diaspora approaches, which imply long-term mutual benefits for both sending and receiving countries, provide a different view of international mobility of the highly skilled. Such individuals bring expertise, skills, and economic resources, and forge strong human networks, whether they permanently return to their home country or stay in the host country (Welch, 2005a; Zweig, 1997). In spite of an emerging perspective emphasising the mutual benefits, however, nations remain eager to attract more high-skilled talent. In other words, while national governments establish international knowledge networks, especially via their highly skilled personnel overseas, at the same time, they also try to retain and regain the highly skilled (Fullilove & Flutter, 2004; Hugo, 2004).

With regard to international dimensions, academic mobility is an essential characteristic of higher education, where intellectual inquiry and academic curiosity cannot be limited
by national boundaries. In the global knowledge system (Altbach, 1998, 2004b), knowledge is accumulated, developed and disseminated beyond national boundaries, via peripatetic scholars in the context of the convergence and divergence of academic traditions. Thus, for example, institutions in the periphery develop under the strong influence of academic centres, as well as having their academic diversity enriched by returned scholars with varied academic and cultural backgrounds. At the same time, such institutions must respond to their regional context and help preserve local culture and identity.

Academic mobility stimulates the international dimensions of higher education. In order to attract more international students and provide more opportunities for domestic students, universities expand their international dimensions. More scholars now frequently visit foreign institutions for teaching and research purposes, which consequently provide international experiences for them and their students. In other words, increasing international academic mobility in a globalised world, works as a catalyst for internationalisation.

**Internationalisation of Korean universities**

With the widening and intensifying of international aspects at universities, internationalisation policies at the national level are deeply influencing the development of the higher education system (van der Wende, 2001). Since 1995, when the Korean government acknowledged such changes and prepared for an open education market under the GATS, internationalisation of Korean higher education entered into a new phase. Whereas previous internationalisation policies at the national level had mainly focused on the international mobility of personnel and research cooperation, policies from the middle of the 90’s showed more comprehensive approaches, including quality management, cultivation of globally competent human resources and the maintenance of Korean cultural identity. Two main emphases in the internationalisation of Korean higher education were the reinforcement of the global competitiveness of Korean higher education and opening up of its education market (MOEHRD, 2006d). In other words, at
the national level, internationalisation was a means to reinforce the global competitiveness of Korean higher education in a globalised context.

At the institutional level, the meaning and direction of internationalisation reflects changing environments, national policies, and core institutional ideals. While regional and national demands are still critical to most universities' internationalisation agendas, the impact of increasing competitive and economic agenda in the changing global environment demands that universities expand their internationalisation horizons to meet globalisation values. Korean universities often connect their ethos and educational goals to internationalisation strategies, proclaiming their contribution to the nation and world society via cooperation with overseas institutions and the cultivation of talent with international competence. Beneath this fundamental educational value there exists a strong desire to raise the quality of education to a world-class level in order to enhance their competitiveness in a globalised world. In short, the meaning of internationalisation for Korean universities is both to improve the quality of institutions, and to cultivate internationalised talent.

Internationalisation in Korean higher education brings high expectations as to its benefits but it also raises concerns. For a long time, academic exchange and cooperation with advanced foreign institutions has been a significant means of developing Korean higher education. Generally, internationalisation in Korean higher education is expected to bring improvements to the quality of universities and their research cooperation. Those benefits have been realised via expanding international agreements and sending academics to advanced institutions overseas. However, from the middle of the 90's in a more globalising context, universities have been challenged to implement a new type of internationalisation, not only to fulfil of academic values and cooperation, but also to prepare for the borderless competition for survival. The accelerated clash of internationalisation and globalisation values within the Korean government has often raised conflict among academics (K. S. Lee, 2007). In addition, high expectations of internationalisation differ, with demands from departments varying. In this circumstance, universities have expanded internationalisation to new areas, but such aspirations
consequently demand huge amount of funds, well-prepared personnel and sophisticated strategies. While Korean universities implement internationalisation programs to reap the benefits of improvement of quality and research cooperation, they confront difficult tasks in securing of finance and developing detailed internationalisation strategies.

As internationalisation is understood as a means to develop universities, internationalisation strategies in Korean universities tend to be embedded in the university’s long-term development plan. The strategies, which reflect the university’s philosophy, educational aim and demands, often have an integrative form, expressing the transformation of the university through curriculum, research, manifold education programs and administration.

Some explicit features in teaching and learning consist of increasing courses in English and internationalised curriculum. As internationalisation of curriculum and education via foreign languages, especially English, builds students’ international competence, preparing them for future careers in a global market, some Korean universities are aggressively expanding teaching in English in specific disciplines. While disciplines such as Business Administration and International Studies lead this change, internationalisation of curriculum with lectures in English has gradually expanded to other disciplines. As these trends are consistent with the Korean government’s internationalisation strategies to attract more international students and create a more international environment on campus (MOEHRD, 2007a), they are likely to grow further. However, like the case of Japanese internationalisation of higher education (Tsuneyoshi, 2005), increasing lectures in English raises dilemmas in a Korean language environment campus, such as the lack of English fluency by domestic students, and cultural issues.

Internationalisation of research in Korean higher education has intensified via extending global research networks. The increasing number of international agreements forms part of the background to research collaboration. Academic staff and research students exchange with overseas peers, and conduct collaborative work through trans-national
networks. Besides formal agreements, informal personal contacts are also helpful to the collaboration, something of particular pertinence in the Korean context, given the widespread practice of gaining one’s higher degree abroad. On the other hand, with the acknowledgement of the importance of the quality of research within a university internationalisation, the publication of articles in international journals especially for SCI-indexed journals is increasingly emphasised. The importance of the publication in international journals and presentation of research papers at international conferences may act as an incentive to academics to involve themselves in international realms, but it may also lead to the diminished appeal of domestic conferences and journals.

With regard to other international activities and programs, the number of agreements, exchange programs, and international students enrolling are highlighted as figures revealing the general level of internationalisation in a university. The increase of international agreements in diverse regions expands opportunities for involvement in exchange and other collaborative programs. However, as exchange programs are implemented on the basis of reciprocity but the number of outgoing domestic students always significantly exceeds that of incoming international students, universities are implementing various short-term visiting programs to meet demand. In the case-study universities, exchange programs, short-term visiting programs, international conferences, and courses taught in English were generally listed as successful programs but academics’ demands for programs that required strengthening were not just restricted to these few items, but varied across international dimensions.

As internationalisation consists of several dimensions, universities often approach it with an institutional commitment which embraces effective leadership, a central organisational unit for implementation, and cooperation across all faculties. The president of a university may exert strong leadership to develop and implement systems and integrate strategies. Given such strong support from the president, a centralised organisational unit may lead institutional change. This structure is apparent in leading Korean universities that are strongly implementing internationalisation. An international centre develops overall planning, coordinates among organisations, and helps implement programs. While
it enables fast and effective implementation of strategies across all organisations, it often fails to give sufficient support to every department and may be inadequate in coordinating strategies and surveying academic opinions.

On the whole, Korean universities have implemented internationalisation strategies within the framework of Korean government policies designed to transform universities in the context of globalisation. In spite of differences among institutions, this underlying tone has led to two common senses of internationalisation of Korean universities. Firstly, internationalisation is closely linked to education reforms. Internationalisation of HEIs reveals much that has gone beyond the specific development of international dimensions of universities. Education reforms have been aimed at developing universities’ global competitiveness, which has been exemplified in the national internationalisation policies, university internationalisation strategies embedded in long-term institutional development plans, and academics’ perceptions of internationalisation rationales.

Secondly, internationalisation has been significantly infused with globalisation values. As internationalisation of Korean universities has aligned itself with government education reforms in the context of globalisation, globalisation values have deeply permeated internationalisation and affected related strategies. Internationalisation strategies were implemented on the base of cooperation, mutual benefits and academics values to strengthen collaboration with institutions and scholars across national boundaries. At the same time, however, institutions also pursued reform strategies on the base of competition and entrepreneurial values. This direction of internationalisation has led to university transformation that goes beyond mere strengthening of international dimensions, but has also generated conflicts caused by clashing value systems.

The impact of returning scholars in Korean universities

As an essential factor of academic development in the history of higher education, the increasing number of mobilising academics in a globalised world has played a major part in the internationalisation of higher education (Enders, 2004; Jöns, 2007; Welch, 1997).
Whether they concentrate mainly on leading universities in an academic centre of the international knowledge system or return to their home countries, they bring change and new knowledge to an institution (Mahroum, 2000). With regard to academic mobility, my research focused particularly on returning scholars and their impact on Korean universities.

Since the foundation of contemporary Korean universities, returnees who had mainly studied in the U.S. and other advanced countries have contributed to academic development (J. G. Lee, 1992). When Korean universities lacked capable scholars to teach and do research work, those returnees formed an important base. Now that Korean universities have developed, large numbers of university graduates still go abroad for further study and, after acquiring their PhD, return to Korea seeking job opportunities in the higher education sector. While the return rate of doctoral recipients from American universities has begun to decrease, it is presumed that still the rate is relatively high among Asian countries (Finn, 2005). In Finn’s (2007) continuing research, doctorate recipients stay rate in U.S. shows about 90% for Indians and Chinese but less than half for Koreans in 2005. U.S. National Science Foundation figures for doctorate recipients intending to stay in U.S. also show about 90% for Indians and Chinese but about 60% for Koreans during from years 1994 to 2005 (National Science Board, 2008). As research collaboration is becoming more and more important, there is a continuing demand for returnees in Korean universities. With the increasing importance of internationalisation, they are regarded as valuable human resources.

Given the low proportion of foreign faculty in Korean higher education, the relatively high proportion of returnees is a key source of academic diversity, institutional development and internationalisation. Overall, among the total full-time tenured academic staff, the proportion of foreign academic staff was a mere 3.6%, while the proportion of returnees with a foreign doctorate was 33.6% in 2006 (MOEHRD, 2007c). While securing prominent foreign academics has proved difficult, owing to cultural differences, low income and less-well-equipped research facilities, the Korean background of returnees has been a bonus, in terms of their return and re-adjustment to
Korean society. Their principal reasons for willingly returning to Korea were an offer of work in Korea, requests from family and making a contribution to the national science and knowledge development. During their long-term foreign residence, which involved gaining a degree and work experience, they developed greater capacities and capabilities as researchers and teachers in a foreign language, and also advanced knowledge, research methodology, networks, an academic attitude and international competence. For these reasons, returnees are expected to play an important role in university development and internationalisation.

Returnees' international activities were seen to be dynamic in teaching, research and administration. In the area of teaching and supervising their foreign language ability, especially in English, enables them to give more lectures in English which is becoming essential in Korean university internationalisation. In addition, they tend to supervise students who are involved more in international research projects. In the area of research, except for participating in international conferences, they are generally more active than indigenous scholars in publishing academic papers in international journals, conducting international research projects, receiving financial support for international research, and conducting research with overseas researchers. In the area of administration, returnees contribute to internationalisation through participating in strategy development and implementation. Overall, the international experience of returnees is very useful and effective in internationalising teaching, research, and administration.

On the other hand, some difficulties hinder returnees' effective contribution in Korean higher education. Returnees often confront difficulties based on differences in academic culture and working conditions (notably excess teaching and administrative workloads), and a rigid administrative system. Returnees who worked in more open and independent research environments experience difficulties in once again operating in a hierarchical and more group-centred atmosphere. In addition, returnees encounter difficulties in negotiating their dual identity as both foreign and Korean educated. Without continuing efforts to preserve their acquired international identity, they can lose their unique strong points during readjustment to Korean society. More seriously, they often encounter peer
criticism for their supposed lack of understanding of Korean society revealed in inappropriate their research in the Korean context and thoughtless importation of foreign knowledge and research methodologies. These are matters deserving ongoing consideration by returnees, who have a responsibility to engage in knowledge naturalisation rather then simply adopting foreign knowledge and implanting it in the Korean academic soil.

Reflections on Korean higher education

From the insights gained as a result of this investigation it is possible to offer a number of recommendations for Korean higher education, especially with a view to better implementation of internationalisation, and broadening the contribution of returning scholars.

1. Institution-based strategic approach for internationalisation

In the changing environment of a globalised world, individual institutions are confronting specific challenges and opportunities with respect to international dimensions (Knight, 2004). Because of the different underpinnings of universities such as institutional culture, ideals, priorities, resources and demands, institutional approaches toward internationalisation differ. Therefore, it is essential that a strategic approach reflects the underpinning values of its university (while also contributing to their transformation). Universities should analyse values, opportunities, priorities and surrounding factors. In addition, universities need to involve all their members, in order to secure their cooperation and include them all when they develop strategies. Emphasising the importance of the engagement of all members, including faculty members, students and administrators, in the process of internationalisation, Choi (2003) asserts that greater involvement of the members of the university is central to the success of internationalisation. The various reflections of university staff sought by the university concerning the internationalisation strategy at HGU, and SWOT analysis in the case of both HGU and Yonsei, are a good example of how university members can be involved
Internationalisation strategies and goals should be closely linked to the ideals of the university and its long-term development plans. In a globally changing environment, Korean universities are re-establishing long-term university development plans in which internationalisation strategies are embedded. These strategies need to specify goals within the long-term development plan, that are articulated through detailed plans, clear goals, resources and an implementation timetable. Implementation of internationalisation strategies is an ongoing process. Therefore, it is necessary that a university identify both short and long-term strategy goals in which short-term outcomes are fed in to long-term goals. In this way, internationalisation is not limited only to overcoming current challenges but ultimately allows a university to fulfil its longer-term ideals and aims.

Internationalisation should not be a marginal process but a mainstream approach to systematic university reforms to teaching, learning, research, and institutional management. In the case-study universities internationalisation has expanded deepened their engagement and activities in these areas. In spite of this general trend, however, expansion and intensification should be based on the particular needs of a university. One example is KNUE, in which localised demands paralleled increasing international demands. KNUE’s internationalisation strategies, which have focused on short-term visiting programs and research collaboration, resulted from KNUE lacking large numbers of international students on campus and only small numbers of domestic students going abroad. In such a context internationalisation strategies should be applied to specialised areas so that limited resources can be best utilised and university development can be balanced between local and international demands. Like the four case-study universities, it seems reasonable for other Korean universities to implement strategies based on exchange/visiting programs, research cooperation, hosting international conferences and lectures in English, in the first stage. However, as also shown in the case studies, these activities can be expanded in various ways. Strengthening of joint academic programs and the internationalisation of the curriculum should be the first priority because these
areas are closely linked to teaching and learning where both domestic and international students can improve their international competence in Korean campuses. Some successful departments in case universities were revealed as strong in these areas.

Effective leadership and institutional management is vital for the effective implementation of internationalisation strategies (Biddle, 2002; de Wit, 2002; J. Taylor, 2004). As discussed in Chapter Nine, a leader's strong support for internationalisation and the international centre were at the core of institution-based internationalisation in the case-study universities. The leaders' strong vision were reflected in the development of strategies and implementation. The international centre led various programs and supported other departments. However, the support system and cooperation with teaching departments require strengthening. More appropriate financial support and resource allocation will ensure broad participation and effective implementation at the department level. Universities should also consider reward and promotion policies, support for international students, and training for staff members.

2. Broadening the scope of returnee's contribution to the university

State support and cooperation is also vital. The government should intensify contribution to Korean universities via policies for attracting and networking overseas Korean academics. Most are self-funded and therefore decide for themselves whether they plan to return or stay after acquiring their degree. Currently, only a few Korean students study overseas on government scholarships and, whereas previously they had to return to Korea on completion of their degree, now they are free to return at will. The already huge number of researchers who have been educated in domestic universities and Korean researchers who willingly return from overseas means the government may not acknowledge the need for a coordinated policy to recruit more overseas Korean scholars. However, in a knowledge-based society, countries compete to gain the highly skilled regardless of their nationality (Thorn & Holm-Nielsen, 2008) and, although Korean scholars in the past have tended to return home, there is already a concern at the decreasing return rate of Korean PhDs from America (S. Kim, 2006). Therefore, a
strengthened and coordinated policy approach to attracting overseas Korean academics to Korea is needed.

Networking among the knowledge diaspora is one means of stimulating the return and also utilising the overseas Korean scholars. The government could provide more opportunities to overseas scholars and students to join research projects conducted by various government institutions. For example, overseas scholars could be involved in collaborative research with domestic scholars and overseas students could work on data collection and analysis as research assistants. This would enable overseas Korean scholars to maintain an interest in the Korean situation. One research finding indicates that one of the major reasons for return is job opportunity in Korea. If knowledge diaspora networks are utilised to provide information on available job opportunities, then this could help stimulate return rates.

At the institutional level, there is a need to improve the research and teaching environment. As discussed in Chapter Nine, two of the most serious difficulties in the area of teaching and research were excess teaching and administrative workloads, and a rigid administrative system. These difficulties are closely linked to the traditionally hierarchical and bureaucratic nature of Korean universities (similar to other East Asian countries). Universities should consider individual research conditions more and attempt to reduce excesses wherever possible.

At the level of the individual, the research findings show the importance of job experience overseas, continuing communication with foreign counterparts, networks, and knowledge naturalisation. Returnees with work experiences have better opportunities to secure a position. More importantly when they develop new knowledge, they can draw upon their deeper understanding and experience of their host countries, in order to minimise any side effects when introducing a new theory and methodology. Secondly, returnees should preserve their international competence by maintaining continuous exchange with international academia. The longer they stay in Korea they are more likely to lose some of their international competence. Continuous involvement in various
international activities is a means for returnees to preserve their international competence. Thirdly, international research networks are an essential asset for returnees. The networks they establish are not only a base for their own research but also sources for the expansion of international dimensions in their university. Finally, returnees should consider their valuable position as actors of knowledge neutralisation rather than simple importers. In spite of the returnees’ contribution to Korean higher education, they are often criticised by their peers as thoughtless importers lacking a deep understanding of both their host country and Korea. Research collaboration with other domestic Korean scholars would thus also be useful in their early stages of return.

**Recommendations for future research**

The findings from this study suggest the need for further studies. First, further research into the internationalisation process of case-study universities is needed. As an urgent task, internationalisation is bringing rapid change to Korean universities. During the course of this research, many changes occurred in the four case-study universities. In recent years, internationalisation strategies have been developed, as have also huge organisational changes that centre on internationalisation. Two leading research oriented universities, SNU and Yonsei developed internationalisation strategies to enhance their research capability. In spite of such limitations such as a regional location and smaller size, HGU has maintained its leading position in internationalisation among Korean universities, using institutional strategies to transform itself into an advanced university. Study of KNUE reveals how a more regionally located university develops internationalisation strategies in a specialised area, education in this context. Further research can yield an even deeper understanding of internationalisation at the institutional level.

Second, further research is needed on how the implementation of internationalisation strategies influences students. The current research focused on returnees’ contribution to internationalisation, with no focus on the effects of internationalisation on students. However, the student factor is important in the internationalisation process. As revealed
in this research, one of the main rationales of internationalisation is raising students’ international competence. Therefore, research into the extent to which varied international programs and activities foster international competence, would further contribute to our understanding of internationalisation in Korean universities. For example, many Korean universities emphasise lectures in English, expecting not only proficiency in English but also an overall change of atmosphere towards that of an international campus. However, some surveys show that English language teaching does not necessarily meet student needs, nor bring about change to the university. Further study of how universities implement internationalisation of the curriculum and bring change to students, and how students respond to and perceive that, would be useful.

Third, more comparative studies on the internationalisation of higher education would be useful. Internationalisation of HEI’s is a global trend. It presents particular challenges and opportunities for institutions in Asian countries. Universities in Asian countries have been at the periphery in the global knowledge system but have rapidly developed. In the process of internationalisation they are confronting similar issues regarding English, preservation of national culture, recruitment of international students and specific emphases of national governments. As these research findings reveal, internationalisation among institutions exhibits similarities and differences based on national culture, institutional culture and other elements of the environment. Therefore, comparative research into institutions in East Asian countries such as China, Japan, and Taiwan would provide a comparative picture of the internationalisation processes within institutions, from a regional perspective.

Fourth, further research into the specific contributions and experiences of various academic members, with respect to internationalisation, is recommended. In terms of academic personnel and their background, more and more are becoming international - indigenous scholars, returning scholars, and foreign scholars. As Korean universities emphasise internationalisation, the changing environment presents diverse challenges to academic staff in different groups. While indigenous scholars may often resent the general atmosphere of preference for returnees, returnees themselves often experience
difficulties in the research environment. Indigenous scholars have much to offer internationalisation from their deep understanding of the local culture, values and knowledge. They have expertise not only in Korean Studies but can also develop their Korean-focused research to an international level informed by their rich Korean perspective. The case of foreign scholars may well be even more complicated. They may experience difficulties in general but also a degree of prejudice within the Korean academic culture. Further research into foreign scholars, especially their experiences, academic accomplishments, and contribution to Korean universities, would add to our understanding of internationalisation. In addition, information on how universities support each group within the overall internationalisation process, and to what extent these different groups contribute to the development and internationalisation of university would be useful.

Fifth, research on the Korean knowledge diaspora and the contribution of these scholars to Korean universities would extend our understanding of international mobility among Korean academics. Currently, huge numbers of Korean students study abroad and there is also a similar trend of Korean scholars going abroad as visiting scholars. This group who may once have been dismissed or disdained as a brain drain by some, is now being increasingly recognised as a potential resource - talent who can develop international knowledge networks in their host countries and who are potential returnees. How they maintain their relationship with Korean universities and to what extent they contribute to knowledge development in Korea would be a valuable interesting topic for further research.

Finally, research could usefully extend its horizon to research internationalisation at other education levels. Internationalisation is not only present in universities but is rapidly spreading to schools. From primary to high schools, the curriculum increasingly contains international content as a part of international education. Currently, more and more international high schools are being founded in Korea. The extent to which the curriculum contains international content and activities and how it influences students, as well as issues of parent motivation, would widen our understanding of
internationalisation. In addition, as more younger Korean students return, there is also an increase of such students below tertiary level. Further research in this area would usefully complement our understanding of the challenges and opportunities that are presented by internationalisation.

**Closing remarks**

My research on internationalisation of Korean higher education considered a distinctive feature: returning scholars. For Korean universities, internationalisation does not just mean increased international activities but it should be part of a systemic approach with a desire to develop the quality of university to world-class level. In this circumstance, returning scholars are considered valuable because of their mix of international competence and Korean background. It is recommended that implementation of internationalisation strategies should be based on university circumstances. With regard to returnees, what is needed is a coordinated national approach to harness elite overseas Korean scholars to serve national priorities, development of better working conditions at the institution level and preservation of international competence at the individual level.

As a case study, the research is limited in applicability to other Korean universities. However, with an in-depth and multi-faceted investigation of individual case universities and cross analysis of findings from the four case universities, it was possible to identify the differences and similarities between universities and develop reflections on internationalisation and the returnees’ contribution to Korean higher education. It is expected that these research findings will prove to be a valuable resource for future research on Korean higher education and comparative research into case studies from other countries.
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Appendix A. Ethic approval

The University of Sydney

NSW 2006 Australia

14 February 2006

Associate Professor A Welch
School of Policy and Practice
Faculty of Education and Social Work
Education Building – A35
The University of Sydney

Dear Professor Welch

Title: Returning scholars in Korean higher education: A case study of internationalisation of higher education

Ref No.: 02-2005/2/7879 – new number

The Executive Committee considered your request to modify the above protocol. The Executive Committee found that there were no ethical objections to the modifications and therefore recommends approval to proceed.

The following modifications were approved:

• New proposed completion date – 31 August 2007. Please refer to the above NEW Reference Number.
• Renewal of the project to 28 February 2007.
• Change in student degree status to PhD.
• Amendments to the Participant Information Statement and Consent Form.

Conditions of Approval Applicable to all Projects

In order to comply with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Research Involving Humans, and in line with the Human Research Ethics Committee requirements the Chief Investigator’s responsibility is to ensure that:

(1) Modifications to the protocol cannot proceed until such approval is obtained in writing. (Refer to the website www.usyd.edu.au/ethics/human under ‘Forms and Guides’ for a Modification Form).
(2) The confidentiality and anonymity of all research subjects is maintained at all times, except as required by law.

(3) All research subjects are provided with a Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form, unless otherwise agreed by the Committee.

(4) The Participant Information Sheet and Consent Form are to be on University of Sydney letterhead and include the full title of the research project and telephone contacts for the researchers, unless otherwise agreed by the Committee.

(5) The following statement must appear on the bottom of the Participant Information Sheet. *Any person with concerns or complaints about the conduct of a research study can contact the Manager, Ethics Administration, University of Sydney, on (02) 9351 4811.*

(6) The standard University policy concerning storage of data and tapes should be followed. While temporary storage of data or tapes at the researcher's home or an off-campus site is acceptable during the active transcription phase of the project, permanent storage should be at a secure, University controlled site for a minimum of seven years.

(7) A progress report should be provided by the end of each year. Failure to do so will lead to withdrawal of the approval of the research protocol and re-application to the Committee must occur before recommencing.

(8) A report and a copy of any published material should be provided at the completion of the Project.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Associate Professor J D Watson
Chairman
Human Research Ethics Committee

Encl. Participant Information Statement
Participant Consent Form

Cc: Mr Sang Un Namgung, 76/7 Broome Street, Waterloo NSW 2017
Appendix B. Research approval from case universities

Handong Global University
Hagihae, Pohang, Kyungbuk, KOREA 791-708
Tel. 054-260-1273  Fax. 054-260-1049
www.handong.edu

Letter of Acceptance

December 6, 2005

Dear Mr. Sang-Un Namgang

We are pleased to inform you that Handong Global University has granted approval for your research on
"Returning scholars in Korean higher education: A case study of internationalization of higher education" at
Handong University, Gyeong-buk, South Korea. You are warmly welcome to conduct the study in our university
as we believe that the research will contribute to internationalization of Korean higher education.

Please feel free to contact us for further arrangement of time and venue for conducting interviews,
questionnaire survey and document analysis.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

[Position]

Date: December 6, 2005.
Letter of Permission

29 November, 2004

Dear Mr. Sang-Un Namgung

This is to advise that we give permission for research on "Returning Scholars in Korean Higher Education: A Case Study of Internationalization of Higher Education" at Korea National University of Education, Chungbuk, South Korea.

We are aware of the procedures involved in this project. We hope that this study will contribute to internationalization of higher education in a Korean context.

Thank you.

Yours Faithfully

[Signature]

Kim

Head of the Faculty Body
Korea National University of Education
Letter of Permission

December 15, 2004

Dear Mr. Sang-Un Namgung

This is to advise that we give permission for research on "returning scholars in Korean higher education: a case study of internationalization of higher education" at Yonsei University, Seoul, South Korea.

We are aware of the procedures involved in this project. We hope that this study will contribute to internationalization of higher education in a Korean context.

Thank you.

Yours faithfully

Jung-Hoon Lee, D.Phil.
Dean
The Division of International Education and Exchange
Letter of Permission

12, January, 2006

Dear Mr. Sang-Un Namgung

We are pleased to inform you that we give permission for your research on "Returning scholars in Korean higher education: A case study of internationalisation of higher education" at Seoul National University, Seoul, South Korea. You are warmly welcome to conduct the study in our university as we believe that the research will contribute to internationalisation of Korean higher education.

Please feel free to contact us for further arrangement of time and venue for conducting interviews, questionnaire survey and document analysis.

Yours sincerely,

[Redacted]

Changku Byun Ph.D.
Dean
Office of Academic Affairs
Seoul National University
PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

Research Project

Title: Returning scholars in Korean higher education: A case study of internationalisation of higher education.

(1) What is the study about?

The current research investigates the internationalisation of higher education in Korea. The study also examine the returning scholars’ impact on the internationalisation of Korean higher education dealing with the delicate matters, brain drain and diaspora, as well as investigating the effect of global knowledge transfer and mobility of academics in higher education.

(2) Who is carrying out the study?

The study is being conducted by Sang-Un Namgung to form the basis for the degree of a Doctor of Philosophy in Education at The University of Sydney under the supervision of Associated Professor Anthony Welch and Senior Lecturer Mike Horsley.

(3) What does the study involve?

The study will involve the use of semi-structured interviews and questionnaires in order to explore the decision factors for return, contribution and difficulties of returning scholars, and the internationalisation situation for each chosen university. Mainly senior officers and academic staff working at universities will be chosen as questionnaire respondents or interviewees. Digital voice recorder will be used to record these interviews.

(4) How much time will the study take?
Completing the questionnaire will take about a half hour and the semi-structured interviews approximately one hour.

(5) Can I withdraw from the study?

Being in this study is completely voluntary. Also, all participants will have the opportunity to withdraw or amend any information during or at the end of the questionnaire and interviews.

(6) Will anyone else know the results?

All aspects of the study, including results, will be strictly confidential and only the researcher will have access to information given by participants, except as required by Law. The confidentiality of the data will be ensured as all information will be kept in a locked filing cabinet and the identity of the participants will also be kept confidential, as pseudonyms will be used. All the materials gathered from the study will be kept in locked filing cabinet for a minimum of seven years after the study has been conducted. It will be disposed of by erasing the material stored on the digital recorder and the files. Also, a report of the study may be submitted for publication, but individual participants will not be identifiable in such a report.

(7) Will the study benefit me?

It is hoped that this study will be beneficial for all participants, by allowing them to reflect on their own concept of internationalisation.

(8) Can I tell other people about the study?

Yes, the study can be discussed amongst your peers and other relevant individuals.

(9) What if I require further information?

When you have read this information, Sang-Un Namgung will discuss it with you further and answer any questions you may have. If you would like to know more at any stage, please feel free to contact Anthony Welch, Associate Professor, +61 2 9351 3175 and / or Mr. Mike Horsley, Senior Lecturer, +61 2 9351 4246 or myself at +61 2 9036 5300 (Australia) or +82 62 671 7321 (Korea).

(10) What if I have a complaint or concerns?

Any person with concerns or complaints about the conduct of a research study can contact the Manager, Ethics Administration, University of Sydney on +61 2 9351 4811

This information sheet is for you to keep
참가자 안내서

연구 계획

주제: 한국의 고등교육과 귀환 학자: 고등교육의 국제화 사례 연구

(1) 무엇에 관한 연구인가?

이 연구는 대한민국의 고등교육의 국제화를 조사한다. 이 연구는 또한 귀환
학자의 한국 대학의 국제화에 대한 영향을 다룬다. 영향을 미치는 요인들에
대해 연구하여 두뇌 교육, 해외학습, 귀환(다이어스포라) 등에
에 대한 연구를 한다.

(2) 누가 이 연구를 수행하는가?

이 연구는 남궁상윤의 시드니 대학 교육학 박사 학위를 위하여 수행되며, 동
대학의 부교수인 Anthony Welch 와 선임 강사인 Mike Horsley 의 지도하에
이뤄진다.

(3) 이 연구에 어떠한 것들이 포함되는가?

이 연구는 반 구조화된 면담과 질문지 조사를 포함하는데, 이것들은 귀환
결정요소, 귀환 학자의 경험, 그리고 각각의 학생의 성장 및 평가에
요소를 포함하는 조사를 수행한다. 주로 대학 행정자와 학교가 질문지와 면담 조사의
대상자로 선정된다. 면담 녹음을 위하여 녹음기와 묘사가 사용된다.

(4) 이 연구에 얼마나 많은 시간이 소요되는가?

질문지를 작성하는 데는 반 시간, 반 구조화된 면담을 수행하는 데는 대략 한
시간이 소요된다.
(5) 나는 도중에 참여를 중단할 수 있는가?

이 연구는 철저히 자발적인 참여로 이루어져며, 모든 참가자들은 질문지 작성이나 면담 수행 도중 또는 끝나고 나서 연구 참가 원칙이나 정보의 변경을 요구할 수 있다.

(6) 누군가가 결과를 알 수 있는가?

연구의 제 측면과 연구 결과는 엄격하게 비밀이 보장되며, 법에 규정된 경우를 제외하고는 오직 연구자만이 참가자들로부터 얻은 정보에 접근할 수 있다. 자료는 잠금 장치가 있는 서류함에 보관됨으로써 그 기밀성이 유지될 것이고, 익명을 유지함으로써 참가자의 신원 또한 비밀에 부쳐질 것이다. 연구 과정에 모아진 자료들은 연구가 수행된 이래 최소 7 년간 잠금 장치가 있는 서류함에 보관될 것이다. 디지털 저장장치나 컴퓨터 파일에 저장된 자료는 지위질 것이다. 또한 연구 결과는 출판될 수도 있는데, 이때 참가자들의 신원은 밝혀지지 않을 것이다.

(7) 이 연구는 나에게 도움이 되는가?

이 연구가 자신이 가지고 있는 국제화에 대한 개념을 고찰해 볼 수 있도록 함으로써 모든 참가자들에게 도움이 되기를 희망한다.

(8) 나는 다른 사람에게 이 연구에 대하여 말할 수 있는가?

가능하다. 이 연구에 대하여 당신의 동료나 다른 관련자와 논의해 볼 수 있을 것이다.

(9) 추가적인 정보를 얻으려면 어떻게 할 수 있는가?

이 안내서를 읽을 때, 연구자가 좀 더 심도 있게 안내서의 내용을 논의할 것이고, 질문에 답할 것이다. 만약 더 알고 싶은 내용이 있으면, 연구 참여의 어떤 단계에 있든지 언제 조교수인 Anthony Welch (+61 2 9351 3175), 선임 강사인 Mike Horsley (+61 2 9351 4246) 또는 본 연구자 [+61 2 9036 5300 (호주) or +82 62 671 7321 (한국)]와 연락을 취할 수 있다.

(10) 불편이나 염려사항이 있으면 어떻게 할 수 있는가?

누군가가 이 연구와 관련하여 염려나 불편 사항이 있으면 시드니 대학 윤리위원회 담당자 (+61 2 9351 4811)와 연락을 취할 수 있다.

이 안내서는 보관용으로 드리는 것입니다.
Appendix E. Participant consent form, English Version

The University of Sydney
Faculty of Education and Social Work
College of Humanities and Social Sciences
NSW, AUSTRALIA, 2006.

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

I, ..................................................................... , give consent to my participation in the research project titled, “Returning scholars in Korean higher education: A case study of internationalisation of higher education,” conducted by Sang Un Namgung, for the degree of a Doctor of Philosophy in Education at the University of Sydney.

In giving my consent I acknowledge that:

1. The procedures required for the project and the time involved have been explained to me, and any questions I have about the project have been answered to my satisfaction.

2. I have read the Participant Information Sheet and have been given the opportunity to discuss the information and my involvement in the project with the researcher/s.

3. I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time, without affecting my relationship with the researcher(s) now or in the future.

4. I understand that my involvement is strictly confidential and no information about me will be used in any way that reveals my identity.

Signed: ........................................................................................................................................

Name: .........................................................................................................................................

Date: ...........................................................................................................................................
Appendix F. Participant consent form, Korean Version

나,.............................., 은(는) 남궁상윤이 시드니 대학의 교육학 박사 학위를 위하여 수행하는 “한국 고등교육과 관련 학자: 고등교육의 국제화 사례 연구”에 참여할 것을 동의합니다.

동의하는 것과 관련하여 본인은 아래 사항들을 인지하고 있습니다.

1. 연구에 요구되는 질문서와 소요 시간에 대하여 설명을 들었으며, 연구와 관련된 본인의 질문에 만족스러운 답변을 들었습니다.

2. 본인은 참가자 안내서를 숙지하였으며, 연구 관련 정보와 본인의 연구 참여에 관하여 연구자와 논의할 기회가 주어졌습니다.

3. 본인은 현재 또는 미래의 연구자와의 관계에 아무런 손상 없이 연구에서의 참여를 중단 할 수 있음을 인지하고 있습니다.

4. 본인은 본인의 연구 참여가 철저히 비밀에 부쳐지며, 앞으로 이용될 본인에 관한 어떠한 정보에서도 본인임이 드러나지 않을 것을 인지하고 있습니다.

서 명:........................................................................................................................................

이 림:........................................................................................................................................

날짜:........................................................................................................................................
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Interview protocols

Section 1
Questions for ministry officials concerned with internationalisation in universities

1. What are the current Korean governmental policies to improve internationalisation of higher education?
   - Globalisation and internationalisation of higher education
   - Brain Korea 21
   - Opening of education market

2. What is the meaning of internationalisation of Korean universities
   - Political, economical, academical and cultural aspects
   - Main points of internationalisation of Korean universities

3. Currently to what extent are Korean universities internationalised?
   - Current state of internationalisation
   - Obstacles of internationalisation
   - Benefits of internationalisation
   - Risks of internationalisation

4. What is the governmental role for internationalisation and what do you expect to universities to do for internationalisation?
   - Governmental role
   - Universities’ role

5. What is the governmental policy for returning scholars
- Policies for utilisation of returning scholars
- Opinion on contribution of returning scholars for universities

6. What is the governmental policy for overseas Korean scholars?
- Opinion on international movement of student/staff
- Policies to encourage overseas Korean scholars to return to Korea
- International networking for overseas Korean scholars

Section 2
Questions for internationalisation directors and administrators in universities

1. What are your perceptions of internationalisation?
   - Reasons for university's internationalisation
   - Benefits of internationalisation
   - Risks of internationalisation
   - Obstacles for internationalisation

2. Currently to what extent is your university internationalised?
   - Academic programs (curriculum, programs, student/faculty mobility, etc.)
   - Research collaboration (conferences and seminars, research agreements, etc.)
   - Extra-curricular activities (intercultural campus events, student activities, etc.)
   - External relations (commercial activities, offshore alumni, etc.)

3. How does your university manage internationalisation?
   - Planning (goals and strategies for internationalisation, recognition of international dimension in other policy documents etc.)
   - Operation (appropriate organisational structure, supporting systems, human resource development etc.)
   - Assessment (benchmarking, assessment, feedback etc.)

4. How does your office for internationalisation operate?
   - Background of establishment (governmental policy, university policy)
- Location within the university
- Title of the administrator and his/her competence
- Support from the university president
- Relationship with other departments

5. How have returned scholars contribute to your university?
   - Academic development
   - Internationalisation

6. What are difficulties of returned scholars and how does your university support them?
   - Difficulties of returning scholars
   - Support from university

7. How does your university cooperate with overseas Korean scholars?
   - Collaborative research, information exchange, financial support etc.

Section 3
Questions for academic staff

1. What are your perceptions of internationalisation?
   - Globalisation and internationalisation
   - Reasons for university’s internationalisation
   - Benefits of internationalisation
   - Risks of internationalisation
   - Obstacles for internationalisation

2. Currently to what extent is your university internationalised?
   - Main internationalisation programs and strategies
   - Successful programs and strategies
   - Unsuccessful programs and strategies
   - Current state of internationalisation
3. How do you estimate returnees’ contribution for your university?
   - Knowledge development
   - Internationalisation

4. How can we best utilise overseas Korean scholars?
   - International scientific networking
   - Return or diaspora

* Item 5 is only for returnees

5. How was your resettlement process?
   - Main factors for your return
   - Difficulties in your daily life
   - Difficulties in your academic life
Appendix H. Interview protocols, Korean Version

면담지 문항

면담지 1
대상: 대학 국제화 관련 담당 행정부 관계자

1. 고등교육의 국제화를 이루기 위한 최근 한국 정부의 정책은 무엇입니까?
   - 대학의 국제화, 세계화
   - 두뇌 한국 21
   - 교육시장 개방

2. 국제화는 우리 나라 대학에 어떤 의미가 있습니까?
   - 정치적, 경제적, 학문적, 문화적 측면
   - 국제화의 주안점

3. 한국 대학은 국제화 정도는 어떠하다고 생각하십니까?
   - 국제화 정도
   - 국제화의 저해 요소
   - 국제화로 인한 이점
   - 국제화의 위험 요소

4. 국제화를 위한 정부의 역할과 대학에 기대하는 점은 무엇입니까?
   - 정부의 역할
   - 대학이 노력해야 할 점
5. 해외에서 공부하고 돌아온 학자들에 대한 정부의 정책은 어떠습니까?
   - 귀환 학자의 활용 정책
   - 대한민국과 대학에 대한 귀환학자의 기여에 대한 견해

6. 해외 거주 한국 고급 인력과 관련된 정부의 정책은 무엇입니까?
   - 학생, 학자의 해외 이동에 대한 정부의 견해
   - 해외 학자, 학자의 귀환을 촉진하기 위한 정책
   - 학자들의 연결망 구축(한민족 과학자 네트워크 등)

답변 2
대상: 대학의 국제화 관련 책임자 및 행정가

1. 대학의 국제화를 어떻게 인식하고 계십니까?
   - 대학의 국제화 원인
   - 국제화의 이점
   - 국제화의 위험 요소
   - 국제화의 절제 요소

2. 국제화 실태는 어떠습니까?
   - 국제화 프로그램(교육과정, 프로그램, 교수/학생 이동 등)
   - 연구 협력(학술회의, 국제 연구 협약, 등)
   - 교육과정 이외 활동(대학 내 다문화 행사, 학생 활동 등)
   - 외적 협력(산업적 측면, 해외 동문회 등)

3. 국제화를 위한 대학의 행정적 측면은 어떠습니까?
   - 계획(국제화 목표 및 전략, 각종 계획에 반영 등)
   - 운영(적합한 조직 구조, 지원 시스템, 인적 자원 개발 등)
   - 평가(벤치마킹, 평가, 피드백 등)
4. 국제화 전담 기구의 설치 및 운영은 어떻게 되고 있습니까?
- 설치된 배경(국가 정책, 大学 정책)
- 大学 내의 조직상 위치
- 전담 기구의 장의 직위와 권한
- 국제화 전담 기구의 의사결정에 따른 大学 본부나 最高 결정권자의 지원
- 다른 大学, 학과와의 연계

5. 귀환 학자들은 大学에 어떻게 기여하고 있는가?
- 大学의 학문 발전
- 大学의 国際화

6. 귀환 학자들의 어려움과 지원 상황은 어떠한가?
- 귀환 학자들이 겪는 어려움
- 학교 차원의 지원

7. 귀교는 해외 한인 학자들과 어떻게 협력을 이루어지고 있습니까?
- 공동 연구, 정보 교환, 재정 지원, 기타.

면담지 3
대상: 大学 教授

1. 大学의 国際화에 대한 教授님의 견해는 무엇입니까?
- 세계화와 国際화
- 大学의 国際화 원인
- 国際화의 필요성
- 国際화의 저해 요소
- 国際화로 인한 이점
- 국제화의 위험 요소

2. 대학의 국제화 실태는 어떠한가?
   - 주요 국제화 프로그램과 전략
   - 성공적인 프로그램과 전략
   - 성공적이지 못한 프로그램과 전략
   - 대학의 국제화 정도

3. 대학의 발전에 대한 귀환 학자의 기여에 대하여 어떻게 생각하십니까?
   - 대학의 학문적 발전
   - 대학의 국제화

4. 해외 한인 학자를 어떻게 활용하는 것이 좋다고 생각하십니까?
   - 과학자 네트워크
   - 귀국 또는 해외 정착 (다이아스포라)

* 5 번 항목은 귀환학생에만 해당 됨

5. 귀환과 우리나라에 재정착 과정은 어떠하였습니까?
   - 귀환 주요 요소
   - 생활상의 어려움
   - 학문상의 어려움
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Questionnaire form for academic staff

Dear academic staff,

I appreciate your participation in this research. The purpose of the questionnaire is to investigate internationalisation of Korean higher education. It includes questions about perceptions of internationalisation, status of internationalisation, role of returning scholars in higher education and the concerns of returnees.

Your personal information will be treated as strictly confidential and your responses will only be used for the purpose of this research.

Your help is deeply appreciated.

May 2006

Namgung, Sang Un (E-mail: s.namgung@edfac.usyd.edu.au)
The University of Sydney, Dept. of Education and Social Work

※ For each question please tick (✓) the item which best reflects your situation and opinion unless otherwise instructed.

1. How do you estimate the necessity of internationalisation in your university and department?
   Using the scale below please indicate its necessity in your opinion
   ① Very strong  ② Strong  ③ Neither strong nor weak  ④ Weak  ⑤ Very weak

   (1) __ University
   (2) __ Department
2. What are the most important rationales for internationalization for your university? Choose the two most important items.

- 1. To increase the international and intercultural understanding of university members
- 2. To improve the quality of education to a world class level
- 3. Our society and private sector demand graduates who have a strong knowledge and skill base in intercultural relations and communications
- 4. It is good for the preservation and promotion of national culture
- 5. It is good for the international reputation of the university which means additional benefits of increased revenue and student numbers.
- 6. It contributes to the strength of national identity and development
- 7. For the academic achievement of the university via cooperation with institutions in other countries and cultures
- Other (please specify): ____________________________________________

3. What are the main obstacles of internationalization for your university? Choose the two most important items.

- 1. Lack of government support
- 2. Lack of policies and strategies to promote internationalisation
- 3. Lack of finance within the university
- 4. Administrative inertia or difficulties
- 5. Lack of facilities
- 6. Lack of reliable and comprehensive information
- 7. Lack of staff for internationalisation
- 8. Insufficiently trained or qualified staff to guide the process
- 9. Low level of interest by university members
- 10. Difficulties in recruiting international students/staff
- Other (please specify): ____________________________________________
4. What are the most important benefits of internationalization for your university? Choose the two most important items.

_① Improvement in quality of education_  
_② Building international networks_  
_③ Strengthening of international cooperation of research_  
_④ Recruitment of international students_  
_⑤ Benefit of teaching and learning (choice, variety etc.)_  
_⑥ Cultural awareness_  
_⑦ Access to advanced knowledge_  
_⑧ Other (please specify): ____________________ _

5. What are the main risks of internationalisation for your university? Choose the two most important items.

_① Loss of cultural identity_  
_② Brain drain_  
_③ Increased costs_  
_④ Increased competition_  
_⑤ Constriction of teaching and research activities_  
_⑥ Polarisation_  
_⑦ Other (please specify): ____________________ _

6. International programs and strategies in universities are as below. Which items are successful and which items are needed to strengthen in the future in your university. Choose two items respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>① Student/faculty exchange programs</th>
<th>② Recruitment of international students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>③ Courses taught in foreign languages</td>
<td>④ Internationalised curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⑤ International conferences</td>
<td>⑥ Recognition of credits from overseas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⑦ International research collaboration</td>
<td>⑧ Joint/dual degree programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⑨ Joint academic programs with international partners</td>
<td>⑩ Area and international centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⑪ Distance education abroad</td>
<td>⑫ Alumni development programmes abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⑬ Student clubs and associations for international activities</td>
<td>⑭ International and intercultural campus events</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Student/faculty short-term overseas visiting programs
4 Recognition of an international dimension in mission statement and other policy documents
5 Students support services for international students studying on campus
6 Appropriate financial support and resource allocation systems
7 Reward and promotion policies to reinforce faculty and staff contribution to internationalisation
8 Other (please specify): __________________________________________________________

(1) Choose two most successful items in your university: ( ), ( )
(2) Choose two items which are needed to strengthen in the future: ( ), ( )

7. How do you estimate the current status of internationalisation of your university and department? Using the scale below show your estimation respectively.
   ① Very strong  ② Strong  ③ Neither strong nor weak  ④ Weak  ⑤ Very weak
(1) ___ University
    (2) ___ Department

8. Do you have overseas experience?
(1) ___ ① Yes    ___ ② No
(2) If yes, for what purpose? Please check all the appropriate items
   ___ ① Data collection    ___ ② Study abroad for degree
   ___ ③ Visiting scholarship ___ ④ Conferences or seminars abroad
   ___ ⑤ Work abroad        ___ ⑥ Vacation
   ___ ⑦ Other (please specify):

(2) How long have you stayed abroad?
   ___ ① Less than 1 year  ___ ② 1-2 years  ___ ③ 3-4 years
   ___ ④ 5-9 years  ___ ⑤ More than 10 years
9. What is your intention if yes, of migration to a foreign country?
  __① I don’t have any intention to migrate
  __② I have some interest to migrate to a foreign country
  __③ If I have a better offer, I will migrate to a foreign country
  __④ I would like to migrate to a foreign country, but at the present I have no specific plan
  __⑤ I would like to migrate to a foreign country, and I have a specific plan

10. How do you gain international knowledge and communicate internationally? Choose the three most important items.
  __① International conferences   __② Visiting overseas   __③ Individual contact
  __④ The Internet               __⑤ Journals/Books     __⑥ Collaboration of research
  __⑦ Mass media                __⑧ Other (please specify):

11. In the past two years have you
(1) taught international students in your class?
  __① Yes (frequency: )   __② No
(2) attended an international conference?
  __① Yes (frequency: )   __② No
(3) submitted academic papers to an international journal or organisation?
  __① Yes (frequency: )   __② No
(4) done international research projects?
  __① Yes (frequency: )   __② No
(5) had students conducting international research?
  __① Yes (frequency: )   __② No
(6) received internal/external financial support for your international research?
  __① Yes (frequency: )   __② No
(7) had international colleagues (including overseas Korean scholars) in your research programs?
  __① Yes [Number of foreign scholars ( ), Number of overseas Korean scholars ( )]   __② No
12. How often do you use a foreign language in your work (research/teaching)?
   (1) _① Very often _② Often _③ Neither often nor rare _④ Rare _⑤ Very rare
   (2) If yes, which one is the most frequently used language? (please specify): _____________

13. How significant are the international dimensions (e.g., international issues in curriculum, international data collection, international research, collaboration with foreign institutions, overseas training) of your courses?
   _① A very _② Quite a lot _③ Neutral _④ A little _⑤ Very little

14. What do you think of the academic/administrative influence of returning scholars comparing that of the same level of domestic scholars in your university?
   (1) _① Much more powerful
       _② More powerful
       _③ Similar
       _④ Less powerful
       _⑤ Much less powerful
   (2) Please describe your reasons briefly
       ____________________________________________________________________

15. What do you think of the influence of returning scholars for the development of your university?
   (1) _① Very positive
       _② Positive
       _③ Neither Positive nor negative
       _④ Negative
       _⑤ Very negative
   (2) Please describe your reasons briefly
       ____________________________________________________________________
16. What do you think of the influence of returning scholars for the internationalisation of your university?
(1) _① Very positive
   _② Positive
   _③ Neither Positive nor negative
   _④ Negative
   _⑤ Very negative
(2) Please describe your reasons briefly
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

17. With regard to the development of internationalisation, which characteristics need to be considered in the following areas?
(1) Characteristics of Korean society:
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

(2) Characteristics of your university:
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

(3) Characteristics of your department:
________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

* Questions 18-24 are for personal profile
18. What is your gender?
   _① Male
   _② Female

19. What is your age?
   _① Twenties
   _② Thirties
   _③ Forties
   _④ Fifties
   _⑤ Sixties and above

20. What is your title and position?
   (1) Title
      _① Professor
      _② Associate Professor
      _③ Assistant Professor
      _④ Instructor
   (2) Position (please specify): __________________________________________
21. What is your field of study?
   _①_Humanities & Social Sciences _②_Natural Sciences _③_Engineering
   _④_Fine Arts & Physical Education _⑤_Health Sciences
   _⑥_Others (Please specify): ________________________________

22. What is your highest degree and where did you acquire the degree?
   (1) _①_Doctorate _②_Masters _③_Bachelor _④_Other (please specify): ______
   (2) _①_From a domestic university/institution (※ This is the end of the questions. Thank you for completing this questionnaire)
   _②_From an overseas university/institution (please specify the nation): __________ (※ Go to question 23)

※ Questions 23-24 are only for returning scholars

23. What is your returning type?
   (1) Overseas career (Check all the appropriate items)
      _①_Primary education _②_Secondary education _③_Undergraduate _④_Masters
      _⑤_Doctorate _⑥_Worlding experience in your field (Period: years)
   (2) Since your return home, how long have you been in Korea?
      _①_Less than 1 year _②_1-2 years _③_3-4 years _④_5-9 years _⑤_More than 10 years
   (3) Since your return home, all in all, how long have you spent overseas visiting period?
      _①_Less than 1 year _②_1-2 years _③_3-4 years _④_More than 5 years

24. What was the most important reason of your return? Choose the two most important items.
   _①_My family situation (parents’ request, family reunion etc.)
   _②_There was an acceptable job offer in Korea
   _③_There were difficulties of daily life overseas (The difference of language and culture etc.)
   _④_I intended to contribute to the national science and knowledge
   _⑤_My career would be more successful in Korea
   _⑥_I want to repay my obligation to Korea (scholarship, patriotism etc.)
   _⑦_It was hard to find an appropriate job overseas
   _⑧_Other (please specify): ________________________________
25. Did you receive incentives from your university or Korean government which influenced your decision to return?

(1) Yes  No

(2) If yes, please describe briefly ________________________________

26. How useful has your foreign experiences been for your work as an academic?

(1) Very useful
   Useful
   Somewhat useful
   Not too useful
   Not at all useful

(2) If the experience is useful, what are the two most useful items?

   ① Acquired foreign language  ② Acquired advanced knowledge
   ③ Acquired new research method  ④ Increased opportunities
   ⑤ Established line of personal contact  ⑥ Other (please specify):

27. How often are you in contact with scholars or institutions in the foreign country where you lived?

(1) Very often  Often  Neither often nor rarely  Rarely  Very rarely

(2) If you have the contacts, how do you keep in touch with them? Check all the appropriate items

   ① Editing a book with them
   ② Conducting a collaborative research project with them
   ③ Presenting an academic paper to the institution or journal in the foreign country
   ④ Providing lecture or distance education to the institution in the foreign country
   ⑤ Working with a company in the foreign country
   ⑥ Other (please specify):
28. What kinds of difficulties in daily life did you face on return to Korea? Choose the two most important items.
   ① Uncertainty of employment
   ② Readjustment to Korean life and customs
   ③ Education and language problems of children
   ④ Inadequate income
   ⑤ Political and social conditions in Korea
   ⑥ Other (please specify): ____________________

29. What kinds of difficulties regarding research and teaching did you face on return to Korea? Choose the two most important items.
   ① Scarce resources and poor facilities for work and research
   ② Rigid administrative system
   ③ Excessive teaching and administrative workload
   ④ Limited international academic communication
   ⑤ Rigid research atmosphere stemming from school ties, relations based on hometown, and the Confucian tradition
   ⑥ The difficulty of dissemination of advanced knowledge to academia under certain conditions
   ⑦ Other (please specify): ____________________

30. How successful do you think is your return? Use the scale below to indicate what you think.
   ① Very successful
   ② Successful
   ③ Neither successful nor unsuccessful
   ④ Unsuccessful
   ⑤ Very unsuccessful
   (1) Regarding your university life
   (2) Regarding your personal daily life

Thank you for completing this questionnaire
Dear administrator

I appreciate your participation in this research

The purpose of the questionnaire is to investigate internationalisation of Korean higher education. It includes questions about the perceptions of internationalisation, status of internationalisation, role of returning scholars in higher education and the concerns about returnees.

Your personal information will be treated as strictly confidential and your response will only be used for the purpose of this research.

Your help is deeply appreciated

May 2006

Namgung, Sang Un (E-mail: s.namgung@edfac.usyd.edu.au)
The University of Sydney, Dept. of Education and Social Work

※ For each question please tick (√) the item which best reflects your situation and opinion unless otherwise instructed.

1. Since last year have you had international students, including ethnic Korean students residing overseas enrolled in or visiting your department?
   (1) __①Yes __②No

   (2) If yes, check all appropriate items
      ___①Degree courses [Undergraduate ( ), Masters ( ), Doctorate ( ), Post-doc ( )]
      ___②Certificate courses ___③Exchange programs
      ___④Short-term visiting program ___⑤Other (please specify): ____________________
2. Since last year have you had students participated in exchange programs in your department?
(1) _①Yes _②No
(2) If yes, check all appropriate items
① Degree courses [Undergraduate ( ), Masters ( ), Doctorate ( ), Post-doc( )]
② Certificate courses
③ Exchange programs
④ Short-term visiting program: ⑤ Other (please specify):

3. Since last year have you had domestic scholars participating in exchange/visiting/sabbatical programs in your department?
(1) _①Yes _②No
(2) If yes, which countries have they visited? Specify countries and numbers of scholars (e.g.: U.S. 1, U.K. 2)

4. Since last year have you had foreign scholars visited your department via exchange programs?
(1) _①Yes _②No
(2) If yes, what is their nationality? Specify all nations and scholars number. (e.g.: U.S. 1, UK 2)

5. Have you had foreign scholars employed in your department?
(1) _①Yes _②No
(2) If yes, what are their nationalities? Specify all nations and scholars number. (e.g.: U.S. 1, UK 2)

6. Has your department had international agreements with foreign institutions?
_①Yes _②No

7. Since last year have you had joint courses/research programs in your department?
(1) _①Yes _②No
(2) If yes, please specify programs
8. How do you estimate the cooperation between your university’s international organisation and your department regarding internationalisation?

(1) Very cooperative
(2) Cooperative
(3) Neither cooperative nor uncooperative
(4) Uncooperative
(5) Very uncooperative

9. Since last year have you had international activities/events in your department?

(1) Yes (2) No

If yes, please specify

10. Does your department have recruitment, reward and promotion policies to reinforce faculty contribution to internationalisation?

(1) Yes (2) No

11. Since last year has your department had internal financial support for international education/research/events?

(1) Yes (2) No

12. Since last year has your department had external financial support for international education/research/events?

(1) Yes (2) No

If yes, where has the financial support come from? Check all appropriate items.

(1) Government and public institutions (2) Domestic enterprises
(3) Foreign enterprises (4) Foreign University/institutions
(5) Foreign governments (fund) (6) International organisations
(7) Other (please specify): ___________________________
13. Does your department have courses requiring international visit components or credits from the foreign institutions?
(1) __①Yes  __②No
(2) If yes, what is the proportion of students participating per year?
 _①50% or more  _②30-49%  _③10-29%  _④5-9%  _⑤Less than 5%

14. Does your department have any courses taught in a foreign language?
(1) __①Yes  __②No
(2) If yes, which languages are used? Specify all languages:
(3) If yes, what is the proportion of courses taught in a foreign language in the entire courses in your department?:
(3) If yes, who teaches the course? Check all appropriate items.
 _①Foreigner  _②Korean (Domestic scholar)  _③Korean (Retuned scholar)

15. Which factors do you think are needed to improve the internationalisation of your department?

16. What is your gender?
 _①Male  _②Female

17. What is your age?
 _①Twenties  _②Thirties  _③Forties  _④Fifties  _⑤Sixties and above

18. What is your highest degree?
(1) __①Doctorate  __②Masters  __③Bachelor  __④Other (please specify):
(2) __①From a domestic university/institution
 _②From an overseas university/institution (please specify the country):
19. What is your title and position?

(1) Title: ① Professor ② Associate Professor ③ Assistant Professor ④ Lecturer

(2) Position (please specify): ________________________________

20. What is your field of study?

① Humanities and social sciences ② Natural sciences ③ Engineering

④ Arts ⑤ Health sciences ⑥ Other (Please specify): 

Thank you for completing this questionnaire
Appendix J. Questionnaire Forms, Korean Version

질문지 (교수용)

안녕하십니까?

교수님의 귀한 시간을 활용하여 설문조사에 참여하여 주신데 대하여 깊이 감사드립니다.

이 질문지는 우리나라 대학의 국제화 현상을 알아보기 위하여 작성되었습니다. 질문지는 대학의 국제화 실태, 국제화에 대한 견해, 학자들의 대학 국제화에 대한 기여를 알아보기 위한 문항들이 포함되어 있습니다.

교수님의 인적사항은 절대로 공개되지 않으며, 응답하신 내용은 연구 목적 이외에는 사용되지 않습니다.

도움을 주셔서 감사합니다.

2006년 5월
남궁상윤 (전자우편: s.namung@edfac.usyd.edu.au)
시드니대학교 교육학 박사과정

※ 자시문에 따라 해당 번호에 표시(✔) 또는 자유 응답해 주십시오.

1. 귀교는 국제화가 어느 정도 필요하다고 생각하십니까? 아래의 항목을 이용하여 대학전체 및 교수님의 학부/학과/전공에 있어서 국제화의 필요성 정도를 각각 번호로 나타내 주십시오.
   ① 매우 높음 ② 높음 ③ 보통 ④ 낮음 ⑤ 매우 낮음
   
(1) __대학 전체
(2) __학부/학과/전공
2. 귀 대학이 국제화 되어야 하는 이유는 무엇이라고 생각하십니까? 가장 중요한 2개 항목을 선택하여 주십시오.

①타국, 타문화에 대한 이해가 대학 구성원에 요구되기 때문에
②교육의 질을 세계적 수준으로 향상시키기 위하여
③사회와 기업이 국제적 지식을 갖춘 인력을 요구하기 때문에
④우리 고유의 문화를 지키고 발전시키는데 도움이 되기 때문에
⑤대학의 위상 강화와 재정, 입학생 증가의 부가적 혜택을 위하여
⑥국가의 정체성 유지와 국가의 발전에 기여하기 위하여
⑦타국, 타문화권과의 교류 및 협력의 확대로 대학 본연의 학문적 성취 촉진
⑧기타 (기술해 주십시오):

3. 귀교에 있어서 국제화의 저해 요소는 무엇입니까? 가장 중요한 2개 항목을 선택하여 주십시오.

①정부의 지원 부족 ②국제화를 위한 정책 및 전략의 부족
③대학의 예산 부족 ④관료적 태성이나 행정적 어려움
⑤시설 미비 ⑥신뢰롭고 종합적인 정보의 부족
⑦국제화에 필요한 인력 부족 ⑧담당자의 자질 부족 (외국어 능력 등)
⑨대학 구성원들의 관심 부족 ⑩국제 학생/학자 유치의 어려움
⑪기타 (기술해 주십시오):

4. 귀교에 있어서 국제화가 가져오는 이점은 무엇입니까? 가장 중요한 2개 항목을 선택하여 주십시오.

①대학의 전반적인 수준 향상 ②국제적 협력 망 구축
③국제 연구 협력 강화 ④외국인 학생 유치
⑤교수/학습 장의 이결(다양성, 선택권 등) ⑥다문화 이해
⑦선진 학문 도입 ⑧기타:
5. 귀교에 있어서 국제화로 인한 위협 부담은 무엇인가? 가장 중요한 2개 항목을 선택하여 주십시오.

_①문화적 정체성 상실 _②두뇌 유출
_③비용의 증가 _④경제의 심화
_⑤교육 및 연구 활동 위축 _⑥양극화 심화
_⑦기타 (기술해 주십시오):

6. 대학에서 시행하고 있는 국제화 프로그램 및 전략에는 다음과 같은 것들이 있습니다.
귀교에서 시행되고 있는 항목 중 현재 가장 잘 시행되고 있는 것 두 가지, 앞으로 강화시켜야 할 것 두 가지를 골라 주십시오.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>①교환학생/교수 프로그램</th>
<th>②외국학생유치</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>③외국어로 하는 강의</td>
<td>④국제화된 교육과정</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⑤국제학술회의 개최</td>
<td>⑥외국취득 학점 인정</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⑦국제 공동 연구</td>
<td>⑧공동/복수 학위 프로그램</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⑨외국 대학과 공동 프로그램 운영</td>
<td>⑩지역학, 국제학 센터 운영</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⑪해외 원격 교육</td>
<td>⑫해외 동문 모임 구축</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⑬국제 활동을 위한 학생 모임</td>
<td>⑭국제문화 교류를 위한 대학 행사</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⑮교수/학생 단기 해외 연수</td>
<td>⑯국제화를 명시한 교육목표 및 계획</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⑰대학내 외국인 학생에 지원 활동</td>
<td>⑱결합한 자원/제정 지원 및 분배 시스템</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⑲국제화에 기여하는 교수/직원에 대한 보상</td>
<td>⑳기타: ____________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) 가장 활발히 시행되는 것 두 가지: ( ), ( )
(2) 앞으로 강화해야 할 것 두 가지: ( ), ( )

7. 귀교의 국제화 상대는 어느 정도라고 생각하십니까? 아래의 척도를 이용하여 대학 전체 및 교수님의 학부/학과/전공의 국제화 정도를 나타내 주십시오.

①매우 높음 ②높음 ③보통 ④낮음 ⑤매우 낮음

(1) _대학 전체
(2) _학부/학과/전공
8. 교수님께서는 외국 체류 경험이 있으신가?

(1) ①있습니다   ②없습니다
(2) 있다면 목적은 무엇이었습니까? 해당되는 것에 모두 표시해 주십시오.
  ①차량수집   ②학회 참석을 위한 유학   ③교환/방문 교수
  ④국제 세미나/학회 참가   ⑤해외 근무   ⑥휴가
  ⑦기타 (기술해 주십시오):
(3) 있다면 총 체류 기간은 얼마나 되신니까?
  ①1년 미만   ②1-2년   ③3-4년   ④5-9년   ⑤10년 이상

9. 교수 또는 연구를 위하여 외국에 나가 정착하실 의향이 있으신가?

  ① 전혀 없음
  ② 관심이 있음
  ③ 여건이 마련된다면 해외 이주 의향 있음
  ④ 의향은 있으나 구체적인 계획은 없음
  ⑤ 해외로 이주할 것이며 구체적인 계획 있음

10. 교수님께서는 주로 무엇을 통하여 국제 교류 및 정보 수집을 하십니까? 중요한 항목을 3 가지만 선택하여 주십시오.

  ① 국제도서관의   ② 해외 방문   ③ 외국인과의 개별 접촉
  ④ 인터넷   ⑤ 외국 저널/도서   ⑥ 국제 공동 연구/저술
  ⑦ 대중매체   ⑧ 기타 (기술해 주십시오):

11. 최근 2년 동안 교수님의 국외 활동에 관한 질문입니다.

(1) 수업시간에 외국인 학생과 가르치신 적이 있으신가?
  ①있습니다(인원 수: )   ②없습니다
(2) 국제도서관의에 참가 및 논문 발표를 하신 적이 있으신가?
  ①있습니다(횟수: )   ②없습니다
(3) 논문을 국제학술지나 국제기관을 통해 출판하신 적이 있으신가?
  ①있습니다(횟수: )   ②없습니다
(4) 국제학술 프로젝트를 수행하신 적이 있으십니까?
_①있다 (횟수: ) _②없다
(5) 지도 학생 중 국제 연구에 참여한 학생이 있습니까?
_①있다 (인원 수: ) _②없다
(6) 국제 학술 활동을 위하여 교내/외로부터 재정 지원을 받은 적이 있으십니까?
_①있다 (횟수: ) _②없다
(7) 수행하신 연구 프로젝트에 외국인 학자(교포 학자 포함)가 포함되었습니다か?
_①있다 (외국학자( )명, 교포학자( )명) _②없다

12. 교수/연구 활동과 관련된 외국어 사용 정도는 어떻게습니까?
(1) _①매우 높음 _②높음 _③보통 _④낮음 _⑤매우 낮음
(2) 만약 사용된다면 가장 많이 사용되는 외국어는 무엇입니까?:

13. 담당하고 계시는 교과의 강의에 국어적 측면 (예, 교육과정에 국어 문제 및 내용 포함, 국어 자료 수집, 국제 연구 진행, 외국 기관과의 연계, 해외 훈련 등)이 차지하는 비중은 어느 정도 입니까?
_①매우 높음 _②높음 _③보통 _④낮음 _⑤매우낮음

14. 전반적으로 볼 때 “해외 학위 취득 학자”의 학과 내에서의 학문적/행정적 영향력을 통치급의 “국내 학위 취득 학자”와 비교할 때 어느 정도라고 생각하십니까?
(1) _①일정 크다 _②조금 크다 _③비슷하다 _④조금 작다 _⑤일정 작다
(2) 그렇게 생각하시는 이유가 있습니까?

15. “해외의 학위 취득 학자”가 귀교의 발전에 어떠한 영향을 끼쳤다고 생각하십니까?
(1) _①매우 긍정적 _②긍정적 _③보통 _④부정적 _⑤매우 부정적
(2) 그렇게 생각하시는 이유는 무엇입니까?
16. “해외 학위 취득 학자”가 귀교의 국제화에 어떠한 영향을 미친다고 생각하십니까?
(1) _① 매우 긍정적 _② 긍정적 _③ 보통 _④ 부정적 _⑤ 매우 부정적
(2) 그렇게 생각하시는 이유는 무엇입니까?

17. 국제화와 관련하여 고려하여야 할 한국사회, 귀 대학, 귀 학부/학과/전공의 특징이 있다면 기술해 주십시오.
(1) 한국사회의 특징:

(2) 대학교의 특징:

(3) 학부/학과/전공의 특징:

18. 성별
_① 남 _② 여

19. 연령
_① 20대 _② 30대 _③ 40대 _④ 50대 _⑤ 60대 이상

20. 직급 및 직책
(1) 직급 _① 교수 _② 부교수 _③ 조교수 _④ 전임강사 _⑤ 기타:
(2) 직책 (보직): ______________________

21. 계열
_① 인문사회과학계열 _② 자연과학계열 _③ 공학계열
_④ 예체능계열 _⑤ 의학계열 _⑥ 기타: ______
22. 취득한 최상위 학위의 취득지
(1) __1학사학위 __2석사학위 __3학사학위 __4기타: ________
(2) __1국내대학 (※ 문항의 끝입니다. 응답해 주셔서 감사합니다.)
__2국내대학 (국가명): ________ (※ 23 번 문항으로 가실시오)

※ 여기서부터는 “해외 학위 취득 학자”에만 해당됩니다.

23. 교수님의 귀환 유령은 어디에 해당됩니까?
(1) 외국에서의 학력 및 근무 경력 (해당되는 곳에 모두 √ 표 하세요)
__1초등학교 __2중등학교 __3대학 학사과정 __4대학 석사과정
__5대학 박사과정 __6관련 분야에서 근무 경력 (기간: 년)
(2) 귀환 후 본국 생활 기간은 얼마나입니까?
__11년 미만 __21-2년 __33-4년 __45-9년 __510년 이상
(3) 귀환 후 본국 생활 중 외국 방문 기간은 얼마나입니까?
__11년 미만 __21-2년 __33-4년 __45년 이상

24. 귀환 결정의 가장 중요한 요인은 무엇이었습니까? 가장 중요한 2개 항목을 선택하여 주십시오.
__1가족 상황 (부모님의 요청, 가족의 재회 등)으로 인해
__2국내에서 일할 수 있는 기회가 생겨서
__3외국 생활의 어려움 (언어, 문화 장벽 등)으로 인해
__4국가의 학문 발전에 기여하기 위하여
__5국내에서 일하는 것이 연구 경력에 더 좋을 것 같아서
__6국가에 대한 의무 (장학금 등)로 인해
__7외국에서 기대하던 조건의 직장을 구하기 어려워서
__8기타 (기출해 주십시오):________________________________________

25. 귀국 결정에 영향을 미친 국가나 대학으로부터 받았던 인센티브가 있습니까?
(1) __1있다 ________ __2없다
(2) 있었다면 무엇이었는지 간략하게 기술해 주십시오.
26. 외국에서의 경험 (학습/연구/교수)이 한국에서 교수로서의 직무 수행에 어느 정도 도움이 되었다고 생각하십니까?
(1) _① 매우 많이 _② 많이 _③ 보통 _④ 조금 _⑤ 매우 조금
(2) 도움이 되었다면 어떠한 측면에서 가장 큰 도움이 되었습니다가? 가장 중요한 2개 항목을 선택하여 주십시오.
_① 외국어 습득 _② 새로운 학문 습득
_③ 새로운 연구 방법 습득 _④ 기회 확대 (취업, 연구 용역, 승진 등)
_⑤ 국내외 인맥 형성 _⑥ 기타 (기술후 주십시오):

27. 귀환 이후에 외국의 방문지 기관 및 인사들과 어느 정도로 연락하고 계십니까?
(1) _① 매우 자주 _② 자주 _③ 종간 _④ 드물게 _⑤ 매우 드물게
(2) 관계를 유지하고 있다면 관계 유지는 어떠한 방법으로 이루어지고 있습니까? 해당되는 항목을 모두 선택하여 주십시오.
_① 방문지 카자와 공동 저술 _② 방문지 기관 및 기관과 공동 연구 수행
_③ 방문지 기관, 학술지에 논문 기고 _④ 방문지 기관에 강의, 세미나, 원격교육 제공
_⑤ 방문지의 회사와 관련된 업무 수행 _⑥ 기타:

28. 귀국 후 한국 사회 제적용 과정에서 봉착했던 일상생활상의 어려움은 무엇입니까?
가장 중요한 2개 항목을 선택하여 주십시오.
_① 신분 불안 (교용) _② 사회 제적용 상의 어려움
_③ 자녀의 교육 및 언어 문제 _④ 경제적인 어려움
_⑤ 한국의 정치 및 사회 상황
_⑥ 기타 (기술해 주십시오):

29. 귀국 후 한국 대학에의 제적용 과정에서 봉착했던 학문 (교수/연구) 상의 어려움은 무엇입니까? 가장 중요한 2개 항목을 선택하여 주십시오.
_① 부족한 자원 및 막후된 연구 시설 _② 경제적 활동 구조
_③ 과도한 강의 및 업무 부담 _④ 학문의 국제적 교류 제약
_⑤ 학연, 지연이나 유교적 전통으로 인한 경제적 연구 환경
_⑥ 선진 학문 도입이 어려운 학계의 여건
_⑦ 기타 (기술해 주십시오):
30. 교수님의 귀하한 것에 대하여 어느 정도 반목하십니까? 아래의 적도를 이용하여
학문적 측면과 일상생활의 측면에서의 만족도를 각각 번호로 나타내 주십시오.

① 매우 만족  ② 만족  ③ 보통  ④ 불만족  ⑤ 매우 불만족

(1) 학문적인 측면
(2) 일상 생활의 측면

끝까지 응답해 주셔서 대단히 감사합니다.
질문지 (행정가용)

안녕하십니까?

귀한 시간을 참가하여 설문조사에 참여하여 주신데 대하여 감사드립니다.

이 질문지는 우리나라 대학의 국제화 현상을 알아보기 위하여 작성되었습니다. 질문지는 대학의 국제화 실태, 국제화에 대한 전개, 학자들의 대학 국제화에 대한 기여를 알아보기 위한 문항들이 포함되어 있습니다.

교수님의 인적사항은 절대 공개되지 않으며, 응답하신 내용은 연구 목적 이외에는 사용되지 않습니다.

도움을 주셔서 감사합니다.

2006년 5월

남중성운 (전자우편: s.namgung@edfac.usyd.edu.au)
시드니대학교 교육학 박사과정

※ 지시문에 따라 해당 번호에 표시(○) 또는 자유 응답해 주십시오.

1. 지난 학년도 이래 귀 학부/학과/전공에 외국인 학생 (교포 학생 포함)이 등록하거나 공식 방문한 적이 있습니까?

(1) ①있다    ②없다
(2) 있다면 해당되는 항목에 모두 표시해 주십시오.
   ①학위 과정 [학사( ), 석사( ), 박사( ), 박사 후( )]
   ②학위 외 수료 과정 (Certificate)  ③교환학생
   ④단기 연수 프로그램  ⑤기타:


2. 지난 학년도 이래 귀 학부/학과/전공에 외국 대학과의 교류 프로그램 (인턴십, 현장실습, 연구 수행 등)의 일환으로 외국에 나간 학생 (개인적인 유학 제외)이 있습니까?
   (1) __①있다          __②없다
   (2) 있다면 어떤 과정에 있는지 해당되는 항목에 모두 표시해 주십시오.
       _①학위 과정 [학사( ), 석사( ), 박사( ), 박사 후( )]
       _②학위 외 수료 과정 (Certificate)   _③교환학생
       _④단기 연수 프로그램                _⑤기타 :

3. 지난 학년도 이래 귀 학부/학과/전공에 교환/ 방문/ 연수 프로그램 등으로 해외에 나간 교수가 있습니까?
   (1) __①있다          __②없다
   (2) 있다면 어느 나라를 방문하였습니까? 해당되는 국가명과 방문 학교 수를 모두 적어 주십시오. (예: 미국 1, 영국 2)

4. 지난 학년도 이래 귀 학부/학과/전공에 외국 대학과의 국제 교류의 일환으로 초빙된 방문 학자가 있습니까?
   (1) __①있다          __②없다
   (2) 있다면 어느 나라의 학자입니다? 해당되는 국가명과 방문 학자 수를 모두 적어 주십시오. (예: 미국 1, 영국 2)

5. 귀 학부/학과/전공에 고용된 외국인 학자가 있습니까?
   (1) __①있다          __②없다
   (2) 있다면 어느 나라의 학자입니까? 해당되는 국가명과 학자 수를 모두 적어 주십시오. (예: 미국 1, 영국 2)
6. 귀 학부/학과/전공에서 외국대학과 맺은 국제 협약이 있습니까?
   _①있습니다 _②없다

7. 지난 학년도 이래 귀 학부/학과/전공에서 외국 대학과 공동으로 진행하는 교육과정/연구 프로그램이 있습니까?
   (1) _①있습니다 _②없다
   (2) 있다면 무엇인지 구체적으로 적어 주십시오.

8. 귀 학부/학과/전공과 국제화 전담 부서와의 국제화 협조체제는 어떻게 이루어지고 있습니까?
   _①매우 협조적 _②협조적 _③보통 _④비협조적 _⑤매우 비협조적

9. 지난 학년도 이래 귀 학부/학과/전공에서 진행하거나 지원한 국제 행사/활동이 있습니까?
   (1) _①있습니다 _②없다
   (2) 있다면 무엇입니까?

10. 귀 학부/학과/전공에서는 국제화와 관련된 임직, 능력이 교수의 채용, 승진, 정년보장, 인센티브 부여 등의 준거로 활용됩니까?
    _①활용 된다 _②활용되지 않는다

11. 지난 학년도 이래 귀 학부/학과/전공에서는 국제 교육/연구/행사와 관련하여 대학 내에서 재정 지원을 받은 적이 있습니까?
    _①있습니다 _②없다
12. 지난 학년도 이래 귀 학부/학과/전문에서의 국제 교육/연구/행사와 관련하여 대학 외부로부터 재정 지원을 받은 적이 있습니까?
(1) ①있다  ②없다
(2) 있다면 어디에서 지원을 받았습니까? 모든 항목에 표시해 주십시오.
   ①정부 및 공공기관  ②우리나라 기업  ③외국 기업
   ④외국 대학/연구기관  ⑤외국 정부(기금)  ⑥국제기구
   ⑦기타 (기술후 주십시오):

13. 귀 학부/학과/전문의 교과목 중 외국으로의 현장 연구나 외국 대학에서의 학점 이수를 요구하는 것이 있습니까?
(1) ①있다  ②없다
(2) 있다면 학부/학과/전문의 전체 학생 중 참여하는 학생의 비율은 어느 정도 입니까?
   ①50% 이상  ②30-49%  ③10-29%  ④5-9%  ⑤5% 미만

14. 귀 학부/학과/전문에는 외국어로 진행되는 강좌가 있습니까?
(1) ①있다  ②없다
(2) 있다면 어떤 언어가 사용됩니까? 모두 기록해 주십시오:__________________________
(3) 있다면 학부/학과/전문의 전체 강좌 중 차지하는 비율은 어떻게 됩니까?:_____%
(4) 있다면 누가 강의를 담당하고 있습니까? 해당되는 항목에 모두 표 해 주십시오.
   ①외국인  ②내국인(국내 학위 취득 학자)  ③내국인(해외 학위 취득 학자)

15. 국제화를 촉진시키기 위하여 귀 학부/학과/전문에서 노력해야 할 점이 있다면 기술해 주십시오.

16. 성별
   ①남  ②여
17. 연령
   ①20대  ②30대  ③40대  ④50대  ⑤60대 이상

18. 취득한 최상위 학위와 취득 국가
   (1) ①박사학위  ②석사학위  ③학사학위  ④기타: ________
   (2) ①국내 대학  ②외국 대학(국가명을 써 주십시오): ________

20. 직급 및 직책
   (1) 직급 ①교수  ②부교수  ③조교수  ④전문강사  ⑤기타:
   (2) 직책 (보직): ______________________

21. 계열
   ①인문사회과학계열  ②자연과학계열  ③공학계열
   ④예체능계열  ⑤의학계열  ⑥기타: ________

   끝까지 응답해 주셔서 대단히 감사합니다.
## Appendix K Tables and Figures

### Tables K.1 International activities of returnees by disciplines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Hard &amp; Pure total</th>
<th>Hard &amp; Applied total</th>
<th>Soft &amp; Pure total</th>
<th>Soft &amp; Applied total</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching international students in class</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.593**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in international conferences</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9.965*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing academic papers in international journals</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14.860**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting international research projects</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having students conduct international research</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving funding for international research</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting research with foreign researchers</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.663</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. These proportions were based on returnees’ activities for two years (mid 2004 - mid 2006)*

### Tables K.2 International activities of returnees by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching international students in class</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in international conferences</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing academic papers in international journals</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting international research projects</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having students conduct international research</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving funding for international research</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting research with foreign researchers</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. These proportions were based on returnees’ activities for two years (mid 2004 - mid 2006)*
Figure K.1 Difficulties in teaching and research for returnees by disciplines

Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items, (%)

Figure K.2 Difficulties in teaching and research for returnees by age groups

Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items, (%)

---

**Figure K.1 Difficulties in teaching and research for returnees by disciplines**

- Excess teaching and administrative workload: 90.3%
- Rigid administrative system: 70.6%
- Scarce resources and poor facilities for work and research: 70.6%
- Rigid research atmosphere stemming from the Confucian tradition or kinship: 32.3%

**Note.** Respondents were asked to select the two most important items, (%)

**Figure K.2 Difficulties in teaching and research for returnees by age groups**

- Excess teaching and administrative workload: 73.9%
- Rigid administrative system: 47.8%
- Scarce resources and poor facilities for work and research: 40.0%
- Rigid research atmosphere stemming from the Confucian tradition or kinship: 30.4%

**Note.** Respondents were asked to select the two most important items, (%)
Figure K.3 Difficulties of life for returnees by gender

Note. Respondents were asked to select the two most important items, (%)
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