BOOK REVIEW

INTERNATIONALIZATION AND THE ACADEMIC PROFESSION: COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVES

REVIEWED BY:

FRANZ NEWLAND
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

Çalıkoğlu, Alper, Jones, Glen A., & Kim, Yangson (Eds.) (2024). Internationalization and the Academic Profession: Comparative Perspectives (Vol. 24 in the Series: The Changing Academy – The Changing Academic Profession in International Comparative Perspective). Springer. Pages: 245. Price: 169.99 USD (hardcover).

In this new volume, **Çalıkoğlu** et al. provide a collection of international papers analyzing the Academic Profession in Knowledge-based Society (APIKS) project data, collected from some 32,464 faculty members from 34 countries over 2018-2020, specifically looking at issues of internationalization, through the opinions of faculty members. APIKS data provide the under-researched perspective of faculty members, in contrast to other internationalization research which more often considers student perspectives or institutional policies. The book is organized around eight key lenses on academic internationalization, with opening and closing chapters provided by the editors.

The lenses include "internationalization 'at home'" (from de Wit & Altbach, 2021[1]), relating to educating students on the international facets of disciplines (where, perhaps not surprisingly, countries with higher levels of faculty recruitment internationally also have more internationalized curricula). They also consider international funding, international research collaborations, and publication in international journals, all of which do not directly require international mobility. The impacts of university governance models on faculty perceptions of internationalization are also considered. Internationalization is often correlated with new managerialism—a move away from collegial governance towards a more hierarchical, centralized, governance in universities. By categorizing university governance models as collegial, managerial or a "collegial-efficient" hybrid of the two, the book suggests that faculty who connect their institution's governance to new managerial approaches also see growth in internationalization. The degree to which early career academics are able to engage in internationalization activities is also considered, highlighting an interesting correlation between countries with a more Napoleonic tradition of higher education (where teaching is paramount) and early career academics engaging in internationalization in *learning*, vs. countries with a more Humboldtian tradition (where the research mission drives the institution), where early career academics engage in higher levels of internationalization activities in *research*. It is nonetheless noted (again perhaps unsurprisingly) that, in general, senior academics are involved in more internationalization activity than junior academics.

1 de Wit, H., & Altbach, P. G. (2021). Internationalization in higher education: global trends and recommendations for its future. Policy Reviews in Higher Education, 5(1), 28–46.

One of the more unique lenses in the book recognizes internationalization as a mechanism of propagating the cultural influence and domination of core countries over the knowledge enterprises of the world. it considers the question of how internationally-trained PhD holders in "semi-periphery" countries see their work, compared to those in the same semi-periphery countries who haven't been internationally trained. Interestingly, the key differences in the APIKS data were that core-country-trained faculty are more likely to be critical of their institutions' internationalization efforts, and yet they appreciate the emphasis their institutions have tried to place on internationalization more strongly than their counterparts. This supports the hypothesis that faculty trained in core countries are perhaps more impatient than their colleagues for their institutions to accelerate internationalization efforts. Another lens considers whether globalization of universities is driven primarily by faculty with international experiences. It is noted that international faculty are more research-focused, mostly at the cost of teaching time but also at some cost to knowledge valorization tasks. Importantly, however, this lens highlights some of the key complexities of analyzing APIKS data, noting, for example, that international faculty more typically come from the "hard" sciences (their term) in the countries considered (with some notable exceptions such as Japan, where most hard science faculty are home-trained and have no international experience, and Canada and Russia where the level of international faculty is roughly equal across hard and soft disciplines, albeit for very different reasons). Some authors control specifically for sample sizes based on gender, academic rank, country data points and/or other variations that could influence the results, providing a valuable exemplar for addressing potential biases in such comparative analyses.

Beyond the specific lenses in each chapter, other trends are discussed in a number of chapters. Some authors refer to data showing female-identifying faculty have fewer internationalizing experiences than male-identifying colleagues, and women having a higher teaching focus than men. There are also somewhat more nuanced analyses, noting how gender and discipline do not significantly affect the tendency of faculty to collaborate with international colleagues, but that academics who identify as men or who work in the natural and medical sciences self-declared a higher percentage of publications co-authored with international colleagues, likely due to national implicit or explicit gender biases relating to preferred choices of collaborators. Some of the authors also discuss countries' desires to attract international experts, and how immigration and naturalization policies can create opportunities or barriers for broad or narrow international recruiting, etc. citing the examples of Canada, with relatively simple naturalization processes, vs. Switzerland, where naturalization is much more complex but also generally less necessary.

This illustrates one of the key challenges in the book, where, for example, using citizenship to define faculty as local or international creates unintended bias; many faculty in Canada are classified as "local" based on citizenship, but moved to Canada specifically for faculty positions and were naturalized quickly. In contrast, many Swiss faculty are classified as "international" even though they have spent most of their life in Switzerland. To overcome this, some lenses define "international" faculty as anyone who has a degree from a country other than their current country of work. Another example relates to grouping countries and national education systems. One lens considers countries as "advanced, emerging, and emerging non-European," but recognizes this as more of a continuum than a crisp classification. Another applies "centre and periphery perspectives," and yet another classifies countries according to their Napoleonic focus or Humboldtian focus. Similar challenges can arise, for example, by classifying European funding sources for institutions within European member states as "international" funding.

While every chapter makes use of the APIKS project data, the editors do critique the data itself, especially in the final, summary chapter. The methods of surveying for the APIKS project were quite different in the studied countries; some countries used simple random and strati-

fied sampling, some used purposive nonprobability sampling, and others did not use sampling at all. A variety of methods were also used for data collection. These differences resulted in quite widely varying sample sizes and response rates across each country. In addition, the editors and some authors did comment on the unique circumstances of the timing of APIKS data collection, covering the period of the COVID-19 pandemic. This event has clearly affected international mobility in a way unseen in modern history, and changed and accelerated perspectives of and possibilities for international collaboration almost unrecognizably.

On a first read, this book can seem quite unsatisfactory, since challenges with the data and its variety of contexts make comparison challenging. Despite some helpful exemplars of how to provide key contextual information for this type of comparative study, beginning with an invaluable summary of national context for each of the countries reviewed in that specific chapter, many contextual issues remain in this book, and some are covered rather obliquely. Also, the degree to which a national or organization culture may create pressure for faculty respondents to answer positively or negatively to questions related to institutional or national opportunities or priorities is not explored.

On reflection, however, this book generates many more questions than it tries to answer, providing a fertile ground for future research. It provides many excellent approaches for looking at complex comparative analyses. As an interesting exercise in how to choose and compare study countries, how to interpret and classify ambiguous data, and how to account for a wide variety of biases in sample sets, this book may be a helpful addition to the bookshelf.