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ABSTRACT

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to find out to what extent does globalization/internationalization accelerate and effect organizational change and leadership within International University Partners in individualistic versus collectivistic countries. A comparative study as such is based on ‘most similar systems design’, taking societies that are similar in respects of this particular cultural dimension, which enables us to see more clearly what differences societal aspects of a country are related to managerial values and corporate culture when becoming coterminous when institutions cross boundaries. In short, this paper aims to discuss the phenomenon of a comparative cross-cultural study as a global norm, with the implication of the effect of globalization/internationalization on the changes occurring within the International Universities.

Design/methodology/approach: The approach adopted in this paper is based on the critical review and discussion of extant literature, secondary data from GLOBE research, quantitative data from the selected Universities’ strategic plans and qualitative primary research findings, emphasizing affects on leadership and organizational working environment. This study is designed to make better understanding of these variable important aspects within universities that are continuously being influenced by global changes in a culture-specific environment. The paper is designed to discover changes within the selected International University Partners on Hofstede’s IDV cultural value dimension.

Findings: The paper illustrates how International University Partners act towards internationalization and what kind of approaches they use to adapt to this phenomenon, dependent on their cultural values and beliefs on the IDV dimension. We aim to find differences and similarities between individualistic and collectivistic cultures in their actions towards organizational change, leadership and the volume of multiculturalism within the selected Universities.

Research limitations/implications: Irrespective of the significant effect of cross-culture on business practices, our research has been challenged by some contradictions, paradoxes and conflicts that have not all been reviewed in this paper. Therefore, future research in this area is encouraged to employ more variables related to internationalization and related affects on cross-cultural leadership and organizing change and to apply the analysis on longitudinal bases in order to get results that cover larger range of international aspects and allow observing the development overtime.

Originality/value: The paper outlines the interconnectedness of globalization, whereas internationalization is changing the world of higher education. It is the first classification carried out amongst International University Partners in terms of internationalization, cross cultural establishments in higher education, organizing change and leadership styles.

Keywords: Globalization, Internationalization, Cross-cultural leadership, Organizing change, Collectivism versus Individualism, Intercultural Communication, Multiculturalism, Heterogeneity versus Homogeneity.

Paper type: Conceptual paper
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1 INTRODUCTION

Much cross-cultural comparative research has been conducted in higher education, as well as separate research on Globalization, Internationalization, Leadership and Organizing change. However, this thesis is one of the few to study higher education on Hofstede’s Individualism versus Collectivism cultural dimension, including situational variables, such as Leadership and Organizational change, specifically towards internationalization. Although research on all the above mentioned topics is very mixed, according to Morrill (2007) Leadership and Organizational and/or Institutional culture as processes of change and motivation have remained repressed themes of higher education. The neglect of these respondents to change towards internationalization within higher education give us a reason to look closely again at Globalization and its effects on the cultural environment within Universities through the lens of these processes.

The results of this thesis increases the awareness on how and to what extent International University Partners differ and are similar in their actions towards internationalization and their processes. To acknowledge these differences and similarities we have taken into consideration the cultural awareness of the interviewees which are analyzed through their leadership styles and actions undertaken towards organizational change of each University. In the thesis it is also studied if these selected Universities might want to consider a different approach towards internationalization depending on the volume of multiculturalism in their working environment. For this reason we have created an organizing change model that can not only be applied within the higher education intuitions but also in the business environment with global networks.

1.1 MOTIVE

This chapter explores motives to remarry and sources of combined arguments on the basis of literature research. Therefore, this session concentrates to explain the motive for this particular topic of interest, simplifying the choice of Internationalization of International Universities, explaining what the major challenges are of globalization on this particular topic, why Individualistic versus Collectivistic cultures; and clarifying this cross-cultural comparative study which is based on macro- meso- and micro-processes of Cultural Globalization within higher education.

1.1.1 Why Internationalization of International University Partners?

Globalization, significantly used word in everyday media and political discourse is a process, which has affected many areas of human life, one of those being education. One aspect of the globalization of education has been the creation of partnerships between Western and non Western Universities to improve the science and education (Cobern, 1998; Currie, Deangelis, Boer, Huisman and Lacotte (2003). According to Hofstede (2001) in recent years, new developments and possibilities are available in various international professional associations, institutions and international schools, partnering with other universities across -cultures and employing personnel from different nationalities. Significant for this study is Kwiek’s (2006) statement that
Universities are institutions that, in all societies, have performed certain basic functions which have resulted from the particular combination of cultural and ideological, social and economical, educational and scientific roles that have been assigned to them. Here it is important to notify that the actions towards internationalization in higher education depend on various aspects and developments of the country as well as of the institution itself.

The world trends in internationalization of higher education show that already in the 20th century scientific, technological and economic developments have stimulated the change in cultivation model of higher education (Cheng, 2005; Kishan, 2007). Furthermore, the possession of world-class universities marks a nation’s great strength in higher education, and is one of the principal marks indicating the nation’s supreme power in international competition (Kishan, 2007; Currie et al. 2003). As knowledge economy is viewed as the leading force of social progress in the 21st century, universities have become the commanding elevation of international competition in knowledge innovation and the development of human resources (Kishan, 2007). These include developments such as for instance; increase in Phd production and in exchange of international students and partnerships, but also growth of higher education responding to market forces faster than before, more commercial orientation and increase in revenue; all indicating aspects of internationalization that bring about change. These developments are confirmed by (Kishan, 2007) when he assessed that the change is noticeable in the mode of research production, increase in the importance of transferable/professional and translational skills; increase in standardization of higher education as well as global communication and creation of global networks. This evolution of internationalization within higher education establishments around the world, without doubt, will lead to further changes. This is the illustration of the basic concept behind most theories related to organizational change, which states that a problem (or first change) will lead to change (attempt to solve problem) which will lead to other problems and changes. Ergo one can assume that an increase in the number of international employees within international universities will lead to a change (adaptation to a problem/difference) which will impact the Universities on the micro-level (internally). As internationalization of higher education has become a global phenomenon, it has not only created competition between the education systems for students, either in quality or in quantity according to the education statistics in the Global Education Digest 2006 conducted by UNESCO. It has also emphasized the need for change in higher education systems to have a more international focus in the education they offer to meet the needs of the global economy (Knight, 2004; Currie et al. 2003). To find out if the selected international partner universities have implemented changes to meet the challenges of the global economy and how they have completed this, and what their strategic plans are towards internationalization in a cross-cultural context, this paper emphasizes mainly Hofstede’s research contributions for a better understanding of implications related to cultural differences.

1.1.2 What are the challenges?

When examining the media, internet and academic research on global trends and challenges in education; all indicate that the effects of globalization on education have clearly brought and are still bringing rapid developments in technology and communications. However, according to Friedman (2005) these developments in
technology and communication are also creating a reversed change on the education. In other words, these aspects have reciprocal effects on each other and are foreseeing changes within learning systems across the world as ideas, values and knowledge, changing the roles of students and academic staff, and changing homogeneous teams to heterogeneous/multicultural teams (Currie et al. 2003).

There is," wrote Wilson in 1981, as highlighted by Cobern (1998):
"a growing awareness that, for science education to be effective, it must take much more explicit account of the cultural context of the society which provides its setting, and whose needs it exists to serve"(p. 7).

With respect to non-Western cultures, this suggests that a simple transfer of Western educational practices to other cultures including ethnic minority cultures within the West will not be sufficient (Currie et al. 2003). These findings reflect on Samovar, Porter & McDaniel’s (2007) statement that the need for effective multicultural education is a fact that must be faced by the educational establishment. Nevertheless, Morrill (2007) assessed that issues related to strategy, governance, management, and leadership in higher education during a period of rapid change are continuously responding to new challenges that globalization brings about. Regardless of a student’s or faculty staffs’ native culture or co-cultural membership, the above statement indicates that the goal of multicultural education must adapt to the ever-changing cultural dynamics in order to work effectively with their international partners. Depending on the volume of the cultural dynamics within the universities as asserted by (Cheng, 2005; Samovar et al. 2007) they must seek to prepare their multicultural staff and students to become useful and functioning members of society. This is a significant challenge asserts Samovar et al. (2007) because cultural diversity in classrooms as well as in the working environment within higher education produces a group of people who have different learning styles, leadership styles as well as different goals, expectations, and communication styles.

In order to meet these challenges and recognize most efficient and effective changes needed in a particular culture one needs to know first how multicultural the environment actually is and what strategy plans have been implemented towards the trends of internationalization. Therefore, this research aims to identify the type of changes made related to leadership and organizational change towards internationalization. In order to adapt to this phenomenon the research is based on a comparative study between International University Partners in collectivistic versus individualistic countries (IDV).

1.1.3 Why a cross-cultural comparative study?

Comparative research methods have long been used in cross-cultural studies to identify, analyze and explain similarities and differences across societies (Berry, Poortinga, Segall and Dasen, 1992). Whatever the methods used, research that crosses national boundaries increasingly takes account of socio-cultural settings according to Chryssochoou (2004). The benefits to be gained from this cross-national research include a deeper understanding of other cultures, particularly on the IDV cultural value dimension and International Business Universities’s (IBU) internationalization processes in these cultures. For many sociologists, as for this study the comparison provides an analytical framework for examining and explaining cultural differences and specificity. According to Berry et al. (1992) national comparisons have served
increasingly as a means of gaining a better understanding of different societies, their structures and institutions, in order to meet consistent global challenges. For the purposes of this thesis, a study is held to be cross-national and comparative. We are set out to examine particular phenomena in 9 countries with the express intention of comparing their manifestations in institutional socio-cultural setting using various instruments and secondary data to conduct this empirical research. We seek to explain similarities and differences, to generalize from them and to gain a greater awareness and deeper understanding of the cultural setting within the selected International Partner Universities.

In addition, we consider Geerzs’ (1973) argument that the changes made towards internationalization depend on cultural perceptions, but also the effect of internationalization on culture bringing about a new form of cultural transition as asserted by (Kraidy, 2005). Important to note for this study is that this cultural force indicates a change movement within institutions away from a present state towards a future state. However, the future of countries often lies within their ability to compete in a global market where industrial based economies are transforming into knowledge based industries, realizing the importance of knowledge, skills and the intellectual capacity to meet the challenges of rapid change and uncertainty (Teddlie and Reynolds, 2000; Samovar et al. 2007). These findings assist us to make better understanding of the correlation between cultural identities on Hofstedes’ (1980) IDV dimension. His later implications in 2001 indicate that there have been changes in the labor market, which have resulted in calls for more knowledge and skilled workers, and workers with deeper understandings of languages, cultures and business methods all over the world.

Changes as such reflect on connections between people within institutions as well as across borders with their partners (Scholte, 2005; Teddlie and Reynolds, 2000). In this study the purpose is to find these connections within International Partner Universities in individualistic versus collectivistic cultures. This leads us to the phenomenon of various studies from Hofstede (1984) to more recent studies by Knight (2004) and Kanungo (2006) that some people and some cultures welcome and some deplore the growth of these international institutions and have rather shown until now that there is insufficiently exploited setting of research in differences in national cultures within international schools. The reluctance of sufficient research may be explained not only by a lack of knowledge or understanding of different cultures and languages but also by insufficient awareness of the Universities’ traditions and internationalization processes operating in different national contexts. Consequently, the lack of insufficient setting of research across-cultures within international schools is for us a motive to explore the differences and similarities between individualistic and collectivistic cultures (I-C) within institutions, in particular International Business Universities.

1.1.4 What are the processes involved?

Elaborating on the secondary research findings on globalization as discussed earlier, we can say with confidence that we live in a state of global changes, in which technological, political, economic and cultural forces dynamize our society on an unprecedented scale. Everything is changing, and with institutionalized change, everything has become uncertain. Integrative endeavors in our society, particularly within the educational environment, due to lack of research on the phenomenon, we can state that Universities have an ambiguous relation to change. Have International
Universities accepted disruptive forms of change as inevitable? Or have they fiercely resisted certain changes?

Build on the ontology of evolutionary realism of institutional economy, recently proposed analytical framework by Dopfer and Potts (2008), we have developed our own framework for evolutionary internationalization within the educational environment based on changes made on the macro-meso-micro level from the perspective of socio-cultural change. The micro-level is the level of the individual (the interviewees) in the organization/institution (individual level of cultural functions). Meso is the level of the organization/institution, in this case the Universities, its structure and culture (institutional level of the cultural functions). Macro is the level of society, cultural traditions and the like (society level of cultural functions).

The motive for using the authors’ framework is to clarify the highly complex and emergent nature of existence and rapid change in higher education as mentioned earlier. For us, the central insight is that this study is particularly important on all three levels: macro- meso- and micro- level as it could provide us with a better understanding of the changes in relationship with organizational cultures within the International Business University Partners and their attitudes (strategic plans) towards internationalization. In particular on the phenomenon of organizational change and leadership styles in a cultural context. With assistance of literature written by Potts (2007) on evolutionary institutional economics, this study focuses rather on the perspective of evolution of internationalization, that one cannot directly sum macro into micro. Instead, we conceive of global influences (macro level) as a set of meso units, where the implementation of change towards internationalization opens up new directions of cultural change that precede simultaneously at all three levels.

In order not to complicate matters too much, we limit this study to two variables of change which are important for any organization or institution at the moment (House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman and Gupta, 2004): (1) organizational change and (2) leadership styles. In relation to these changes, we will conclude with some reflections on changes implemented in the selected University Partners, the ones that we think are relevant for this study. To clarify the connection between the variables and the levels of framework, we need to first ask ourselves a few critical questions concerning this phenomenon:

**Macro level:** To what extent does globalization influence change towards internationalization within societies selected on the IDV cultural dimension in general, considering the societies’ cultural norms and values on this dimension?

**Meso level:** To what extent does globalization influence and accelerate change towards internationalization within the selected Universities? *(strategic implementations and multiculturalism of the working environment)*

**Micro level:** To what extent do implemented internationalization processes and consequences influence change on the individual level? *(leaderships styles of the interviewees, Associate Deans)*
Now that we have clarified briefly the structure of this research, we would like to note that we believe that our micro-meso-macro framework in a cultural setting can greatly enhance the focus, clarity, and ultimately, power, of evolutionary internationalization within International Universities across cultures. Thus, in order for the reader to understand the obvious of the framework and how it works in this study of interest we will discuss it more in detail in the next paragraph.

**1.1.5 How does it work?**

Based on the adapted analytical framework of economic scholars Dopfer and Potts (2008) the research strategy for this comparative multi society study is concerned with institutional variables (organizational change and leadership) between societies, in which culture has great influence on actions and behavior towards internationalization (strategic plans) and the organizational working environment within Universities.

First, this paper attempts to determine the IDV cultural value dimension of the societies and macro-level laws, which are mainly focusing on differences and similarities (Hofstede, 2001). We strive to understand if any changes have occurred towards internationalization reflecting on cultural globalization factors as illustrated in figure 1.1, chapter 2.1.1. And, what the differences and similarities are between University approaches in collectivist versus individualistic cultures. According to the secondary research findings, as elaborated in the next chapter we can assume that cultural values are build into the institutional variables such as organizational culture and leadership approaches also within Universities. Consequently the cultural norms and values have also an impact on the relationships with their University partners. Therefore, it is important to know how cultures manage and what their cultural values are across boarders in order to develop effective strategies towards successful internationalization on all three levels. With this we mean developing a diverse and global perspective of the University and managing its increasing multicultural working environment. That it can be foreseen that Universities in ‘I’ versus ‘C’ cultures have different ways of dealing with change management and leadership is confirmed by Cheng’s (2005) work, indicating that different countries or areas may have different historical and contextual constraints. Therefore their progress and characteristics of education reforms may be different and move towards different influences (Cheng, 2005).

To make better understanding of the cultural context that this research contains, Cheng (2005) described it best by saying that cultural functions refer to the contribution of the education system to the cultural transmission and development at different levels of society. We use his model to make better understanding of the cultural globalization (macro-level) and how it has influenced localization (meso-level) and individualization (micro-level) of universities, which will be discussed in chapter 2.

To find out if the selected International Universities have implemented changes to serve the new global changes competently is primary in this research. Second, for Universities to work effectively towards the internationalization trends, due to continuous global forces to change, whereas Universities are enforced to implement changes we attempt to find correlation between Hofstedes’ value dimension (IDV) and decisions made. These concern implementations conducted in the working environment and leadership styles
performed within International Universities in order to be able to indicate how and why they have acted towards internationalization and where they find themselves now.

This study is not only useful to find out to what extent globalization has affected International Universities and their current state towards internationalization on global level (macro) and localization (meso level). In other words, this research is not only to uncover how these Universities pull up their intellectual resources, support, and initiatives from different parts of the world. With this we denote the volume of international visit/immersion programs, international exchange programs, international partnerships and the volume of multiculturalism within the working environment of universities. However, this study is also useful to depict the content of their strategy plans, cultural awareness and university based management, which will be discussed later in this paper.

Even though this study does not provide thorough results on micro-level it can be used as foundation for further research on internal issues on the individual level (micro) within the working environment. Following research on the problems occurring within managerial processes and functionality of the multicultural teams focusing on just one University is encouraged. Once we discover the ways of globalization and localization implications within the universities one can search to find effective and efficient ways how Universities in these particular cultures can best improve the functionality of organizational change and leadership styles towards multiculturalism and internationalization on the individual level. Further research implications we refer to are briefly discussed in section 5 Limitations and Future Research.

In short, this study aims to uncover the differences and similarities of the challenges of internationalization faced by the Universities and to explain them by use of Hofstede’s IDV cultural value dimension.

1.2 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES AND QUESTIONS

Now that the pre- understanding of the research framework has been clarified and the motive for this particular research project, the purpose of the study is formulated in the SMART method in order to provide sufficient information to formulate precise research questions. The research approach and outline will be argued further in this section. Hence, the research questions presented in this section are a result of theoretical findings through purpose formulation and context of actual research.

1.2.1 Research objectives

**Specific**: The aim of this paper is to show how globalization accelerates and increases the number of different nationalities working together in a same geographic area. This research intends to identify the type of changes made related to leadership style and multicultural working environment in order to adapt to this phenomenon, based on a cooperative study between international universities in collectivistic versus individualistic countries. In this research, we attempt to raise some differences and similarities between the cultural dimensions and relevant issues on the way International
Universities face change management towards internationalization, as consequence of globalization, if there are any at all.

**Measurable:** Data for each case is collected through two methods. Interviews with the responsible implementing change management or expertise on Internationalization processes of each International University in 4 countries scoring high on collectivism and 5 countries scoring high on individualism will constitute the main method of data collection. In total, we have conducted semi-structured interviews with 9 knowledgeable decision makers responsible for internationalization of the selected International Business University Partners, including secondary statistical data provided by the managers/University and/or available data on their websites.

**Achievable:** If we consider all the aspects important to execute this study, such as functional equivalence, instrumentation, data-collection, sampling design and data analysis as in detail explained in section Research design and methodology then it is possible to construct a compendium of generics and recommended remedies from this comparative research.

**Realistic:** While there are general methodological problems with well-established remedies, the complexities of cross-national research as such to achieve maximum result would require special attention to the issue of reliability in terms of equivalence of response and equivalence of the language. There could possibly be some errors of measurement caused by lack of equivalence of response on one cultural dimension that could affect the comparability across samples. But also possible misinterpretations of the language could jeopardize validity of the research. However, these limitations have been minimized by use of adequate instruments as explained in chapter Research Design and Methodology.

**Time-related:** Because international dimension of higher education is becoming increasingly important, complex, and confusing, where not sufficient research has been conducted, it is timely to reexamine and update some of the conceptual frameworks underpinning the notion of internationalization in light of today’s changes and challenges and the effects it has on leadership styles and organization within Higher Education.

### 1.2.2 Objectives outline

We aim to measure the relationship between society correlations, based on the mean scores of the variables for each society. With mean scores we indicate the behavior and actions undertaken by the leaders and University towards internationalization. Due to global forces to change we attempt to find correlation between Hofstede’s value dimension (IDV) and its influence on decisions made, implementations conducted in the working environment and leadership style within International Universities. As the selected Universities in individualistic countries tend to be Western and collectivistic non Western (Thomas and Inkson 2003) we aim to find correlation between them in the volume of multiculturalism within the working environment, attitude/behaviors towards the change from homogeneous teams to heterogeneous teams, leadership styles implemented and attitudes towards internationalization of the Universities. If there is a correlation and change we attempt to identify how change affects leadership style and
organizational environment within International Universities situated in collectivistic and individualistic countries. If there is correlation and no change has been implemented we aim to identify whether they should change or not. To measure these variables and to identify the critical issues that need to be considered in order to internationalize successfully we have developed an Organizing Change model, explained in detail in chapter 3.4.

If correlation and change  →  Aim: identify how change affects leadership style and organizational environment within a multinational team/international staff:
Identify differences and similarities between the collectivistic versus individualistic countries selected.

If correlation and no change  →  Aim: Identify whether they should or not

1.2.3 Research questions

The overall question of the research project can be formulated as follows:

*To what extent does globalization accelerate and effect change in the working environment and leadership style within international universities between individualistic and collectivistic cultures?*

**Sub questions**
1. In relation to the changes within the working environment caused by globalization, what are the differences and similarities in leadership styles, between individualistic and collectivistic countries?

2. How do Universities integrate globalization/internationalization within their strategic planning?

3. How has internationalization effected the degree of heterogeneity within teams in collectivistic versus individualistic countries?

4. To what extent has globalization made the leaders/decision makers in International Universities culturally aware?

2 RESEARCH FRAMEWORK

The research framework refers to accessing the collection of previously published literature on globalization and multiculturalism of education, use of theory to select the Partner Universities on the IDV dimension and models to point out a particular topic of interest of this paper. In order to clarify observations and theory this chapter provides a better understanding of actions and behaviors towards internationalization through cross-cultural psychology. However, further in chapter 3, Literature review covers all the ‘institutional variables’: intercultural communication, leaderships and organizing change towards globalization/internationalization that vary across boarders, clarifying
for the reader all that is necessary to understand the framework for this particular study. In addition, in order to analyze these variables within the selected university partners in individualistic versus collectivistic countries more information about the selected universities is also provided in section 3.

2.1 Globalization and education

As asserted by Samovar et al. (2007) globalization results can be found in an international flow of capital, goods, staff and of information and ideas. According to various empirical studies by (Currie et al. 2003; Cobern, 1998; Samovar, Porter & McDaniel, 2007) educational goals are seen to be an area of great concern in the era of globalization. It is here that universities play a crucially important role, for creating a better society as asserted by (Samovar et al. 2007). If globalization refers to the transfer, adaptation, and development of values, knowledge, technology, and behavioral norms across countries and societies as mentioned earlier one can assume that the typical phenomena and characteristics associated with globalization differs in different parts of the world. This includes the growth of global networking, international alliances and competitions, international collaboration and exchange, multi-cultural integration and the use of international standards and benchmarks as emphasized by Cheng (2005). Therefore, one can assume that these international interactions towards internationalization will vary between the selected International Partner Universities across boarders. Authors as (Cheng, 2005; Currie et al. 2003; Cobern, 1998) all point out some popular examples and evidences of globalization in education; like the internet in learning and research, international visits and projects, international exchange programs, international partnership, interactions and sharing of ideas across countries, communities, institutions and individuals. Numerous examples of such initiatives, such as the Bologna harmonization in Europe, but also Amadeus and DaVinci exchange facilitators can be found in many countries through history as discussed briefly in paragraph 3.2.1 by different authors. Just by browsing on the websites of Universities, now more and more examples of such kind of programs can also be found in Anglo countries, Western Europe, Latin America, certain Asian countries. The selected university partners are grouped and networked locally and internationally as further explained in this section. With these findings we can expect that each partner and their staff and students are mobilizing in different corners of the world to share their learning experience. Because of the global forces we can assume that all these selected International University Partners in these particular cultures have more and more common concerns and sharing whether they are situated in individualistic or in collectivistic countries as also asserted by (Currie et al. 2003; Samovar et al. 2007). Thus, whether they are aware of it or not, is another question. Also, the interactions between nations and people become boundless, multi-dimensional, multi-level, fast, and frequent as asserted by (Cheng, 2005). They have become more mutually dependent with international collaborations, exchanges, and interflows (Ohmae, 2005).

Further, Cheng (2005) acknowledges the need for development of a new set of courses on various globalization (macro) levels necessary and important in the new education. To discuss the cultural phenomena of globalization and University implications towards internationalization we use Chengs’ new paradigm for re-engineering education and implications of Triplization for Education as described in table 1.1 here below and discussed in the following paragraph. Important to note is that we do not focus on all the
conceptions and characteristics nor the implications, but consider only the ones significant for the interest of this study.

Table 1.1 Chengs’ Implications for Triplization of Education (Cheng, 2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Triplization</th>
<th>Conceptions and Characteristics</th>
<th>Implications for Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Globalization** | Transfer, adaptation, and development of values, knowledge, technology and behavioral norms across countries and societies in different parts of the world:  
  - Global Networking  
  - Technological, Economic, Social, Political, Cultural, and Learning Globalization  
  - Global Growth of Internet  
  - International Alliances and Competitions  
  - International Collaboration & Exchange  
  - Global Village  
  - Multi-cultural Integration  
  - International Standards and Benchmarks | To maximize the education relevance to global development and pool up best intellectual resources, support, and initiatives from different parts of the world for learning, teaching and schooling: e.g.  
  - Web-based Learning  
  - International Visit/Immersion Program  
  - International Exchange Program  
  - Learning from Internet  
  - International Partnership in Teaching and Learning at group, class, and individual levels  
  - Interactions and Sharing through Video-Conferencing across Countries, Communities, Institutions, and Individuals  
  - Curriculum Content on Technological, Economic, Social, Political, Cultural, and Learning Globalizations |}

| **Localization** | Transfer, adaptation, and development of related values, knowledge, technology, and behavioral norms from/to the local contexts:  
  - Local Networking  
  - Technological, Economic, Social, Political, Cultural, and Learning Localization  
  - Decentralization to the Local Site Level  
  - Indigenous Culture  
  - Community Needs and Expectations  
  - Local Involvement, Collaboration and Support  
  - Local Relevance and Legitimacy  
  - Community-based Needs and Characteristics  
  - Social Norms and Ethics | To maximize the education relevance to local developments and bring in community support and resources, local partnership, and collaboration in learning, teaching and schooling: e.g.  
  - Community Involvement  
  - Public-Institutional Collaboration  
  - Institutional-based Management & Accountability/School-based Management  
  - Inter-institutional Collaboration  
  - Community-related Curriculum  
  - Curriculum Content on Technological, Economic, Social, Political, Cultural, and Learning Localizations |}

| **Individualization** | Transfer, adaptation, and development of related external values, knowledge, technology, and behavioral norms to meet individual needs and characteristics:  
  - Individualized Services  
  - Development of Human Potential in Technological, Economic, Social, Political, Cultural and Learning Aspects  
  - Human Initiative and Creativity  
  - Self-actualization  
  - Self-managing and Self-governing  
  - Special Needs | To maximize motivation, human initiative, and creativity in learning, teaching and schooling: e.g.  
  - Individualized Educational Programs  
  - Individualized Learning Targets, Methods, and Progress Schedules  
  - Self lifelong Learning, Self Actualizing, and Self Initiative  
  - Self Managing Students and Teachers  
  - Meeting Special Needs  
  - Development of Contextualized Multiple Intelligences |}
2.1.1 Cultural Globalization of Education

Cheng (2005) explains as illustrated in figure 1.1 a new paradigm for re-engineering education, creating a triplization model for Education, including Globalization, Localization and Individualization. We use his model to explain the Cultural Globalization as illustrated in the figure to clarify the cultural values of collectivistic versus individualistic cultures and their impacts on actions towards internationalization processes. To make better understanding of universities’ working environments we discuss also briefly the social level because of the increase in growing global consciousness (House et al. 2004; Chryssochoou, 2004). This is important because various authors as indicated in the previous sections have assessed that education needs to prepare students and staff for the increasing multicultural working environment creating international harmony, social co-operation, global human relationships, and work towards the elimination of national, regional, racial, and gender biases at the international level (Cheng, 2005; Samovar et al. 2007).

That this research is concerned with the global influences it clearly shows that its’ initiative focus is on the macro level. With this we imply as explained earlier that globalization has influence on the whole society and that their cultural norms and values on Hofstede’s cultural IDV dimension have influence on the changes implemented towards internationalization. The macro-approach assists the study to depict holistic national strategies implemented on the meso level (localization of Universities) that are based on the volume of cultural diversity within the Universities, behaviors translated in strategic plans and decisions made towards internationalization also on the individual level (micro).

*Figure 1.1 Globalization, Localization and Individualization of Education (Cheng, 2005)*
The implications of localization (meso-level) to reform education are used to maximize the education relevance to local development and bring in community support and resources, local partnerships, and collaborations in learning, teaching, and schooling according to (Cheng, 2005). Some examples by the author as illustrated in Table 1.1 for the practice of localization include community involvement in education; public-institutional collaboration; the assurance of institutional accountability, but significant for this study are mainly the implementation of institutional autonomy, school-based management and community-based prospectus/curriculum and inter-institutional collaborations towards many aspects of internationalization, which will also be discussed later in this chapter.

Although this thesis does not go in detail on the Individualization level (micro), it is important to clarify that individualization refers to the transfer, adaptation, and development of related external values, knowledge, technology, and behavioral norms to meet the individual needs and characteristics (Cheng, 2005). The importance of individualization to human development and performance is based on the concerns and theories of human motivation and needs (Chryssochoou, 2004; Schiffman, Kanuk, and Das, 2006). As motivation is influenced by cultural values and beliefs as asserted by (Schiffman et al. 2006) this research contains only information on the individuals interviewed for this study to illuminate the importance of cultural values. This information conducted includes the interviewee’s cultural background and views and practices of leadership styles and organizing change. As mentioned earlier this study does not consider many aspects on the individual level, but rather touches upon them in certain areas for the interest of this study and provides useful results for further research on this particular level.

Not to confuse the triplization model with the cultural functions of it, which rather refer to the contribution of the education system and to the cultural transmission and development at different levels of society, Cheng (2005) explains that the cultural functions include three levels: individual, institutional and society level. In distinction, triplization model is concerned with all the functions of education institution on global level and their influences on localization and individualization as revealed in Figure 1.1. Not withstanding, to limit the complexity of the research area, the main framework of macro-meso-micro levels have the main focus on the cultural functions, which are explained here below.

At the individual level of cultural functions, the education institution helps students and academic staff develop creativity and aesthetic awareness, and to become familiar with the dominant values underpinning their society (Cheng, 2005). This we will find out through leadership styles performed by the interviewees. At an institutional level, education institutions act as agents for systematic cultural transmission, cultural integration among their multiple and diverse public (working environment), and cultural revival (partnerships across cultures). This we will find out through statistical data on international staff recruitment, international exchange students and partners involved. Thus, through strategic objectives towards internationalization for the future. At the community and society levels, education institutions often serve as a cultural unit carrying the explicit norms and expectations of the local community (Cheng, 2005). This we will elaborate by using secondary research findings on the IDV cultural dimension and the correlations with the findings of this study.
If the Universities have not already started with a new education reform to pursue they might want to consider all three levels in order to respond effectively to the challenges of globalization as previously mentioned in chapter 1.1.2. According to Cheng (2005) all three levels for achieving future effectiveness are important, for which the emphasis should rest on the relevance of education to the new functions of education institutions and the new paradigm of learning in the new millennium as asserted by Cheng (2005). We believe that secondary research shows that multiculturalism is the new millennium of education that emphasizes the need for effective multicultural education as a fact that must be faced by the education establishment, as also confirmed by Samovar et al. (2007). Therefore, the following section underpins the basis of the challenges faced by multicultural education.

2.1.2 Multiculturalism and education

If globalization has influence on the economic, cultural, and political dominance of multinational corporations and institutions, the blurring of nation-state boundaries and the internationalization of trade according to Knight, (2004) and Verluyten, (2001) one can assume that there is growth of multiculturalism within organizations as well as within International Universities. Therefore, it is impossible to ignore the global needs to change neither within Universities. It is clear that globalization cannot be avoided by institutions of higher education and that they need to respond proactively and reflect on the impacts of globalization. Universities providing a high quality education for the globalised world, despite its focus on internationalization and cross-cultural communication, are still based on an individualistic model of teaching highlighting that educational systems and processes involved vary between cultures as observed by (Samovar et al. 2007; Cheng, 2005). Moreover, according to Verluyten (2001) multiculturalism is economically neither always more efficient, nor less efficient, as he quoted:

“That depends on the process involved, and it may vary depending on the different stages in the process also” (p.56).

Similarly, the author points out that multicultural teams (or culturally heterogeneous teams) tend to be the most or least effective, whereas the homogeneous teams tend to be average. If performance is influenced by multiculturalism of a team within a company while this is an emergent development, one can assume that there is need for change within institutions along various lines of process involved (Thomas et al. 2003; Verluyten, 2001; Kanungo, 2006). As Verluyten (2001) quoted: ‘Multicultural teams have the potential to become the most effective and productive teams in an organization’ (p 55).

Or as stated by Adler (1990) in (Riggio, Murphy and Pirozzolo, 2001):

“Evidence suggests that multicultural groups in practice can be either highly effective or ineffective depending on whether diversity is successfully managed” (p 197).

Also Verluyten (2001) mentioned that when well managed, diversity becomes a productive resource to the team, however when ignored, diversity causes process problems that diminish the team’s productivity. In order to conduct the further research on performance of multicultural teams as suggested earlier and explained in the following part, studies show that heterogeneous teams seem to be performing better
then homogeneous teams as highlighted by Verluyten (2001). However before preceding further research it is important to first establish how multicultural the working environment is within the selected universities in order to then draw a parallel with the following specificities: the leadership style and organizational change (strategic objectives) towards internationalization.

In order for International Universities to face challenges of multicultural education as suggested by Cobern (1998) education cannot become equally sustainable as a means of westernizing the world. But on the contrary, as asserted by Samovar et al. (2007) effective multicultural education is a fact that must be faced by the educational establishment, treating each unique culture and society with due respect, realizing that global education is not only learning about the West. It is also important to study different cultures of the world, using different approaches, ways of teaching and different media (Samovar et al. 2007). Significant to notify is the author’s connotation that multiculturalism affects the educational process because it affects the cultural dynamics of the working environment as well as the classroom as mentioned in the first chapter. Moreover, education statistics in the Global Education Digest 2006, as illustrated in appendix 8, have shown that the internationalization of education, particularly higher education, is a growing phenomenon, showing increase in recruitment of international staff, teachers and allocation for more students from around the world. These developments and statistics will also be discussed in the analysis of the selected Universities.

At the individual level, culture may be one of a number of factors affecting capabilities on the job, and allowing each person to contribute their best, combined with others with different strengths offers the best prospects for maximum achievement according to (House et al., 2004). These consequences of multiculturalism show clearly that it affects individual and the institutional level of higher education, which are all greatly influenced by globalization of the whole society.

Research on diversity in groups has found great potential for enhanced creativity and performance in diverse groups, because different perspectives are combined according to Triandis (2002) in (House et al., 2004). However, according to various studies, this potential may not be realized if effective communication and cooperation cannot simultaneously be preserved. This brings us to the obvious of earlier mentioned melting pot within the Westerner countries, where the extent to which Universities will implement change towards internationalization in its various facets, will vary from many non-Western countries. However, due to globalization and great economic development in for example China (House et al., 2004; Warner, 2003; Global Education Digest, 2006) we can assume to find increase in partnerships between Western and non-Western Universities, which might also indicate increase in heterogeneity within the Universities in certain non-Western Universities.

2.2 Observations

In the context of this comparative study, internationalization of universities may include, for example, developing joint educational projects, postgraduate levels, student exchange and staff exchange, curriculum matters and administrative cooperation (Currie et al. 2003) This focus on internationalization reflects on the volume of international students on campus, student exchanges, collaboration agreements with overseas partners.
and hiring of international staff according to the statistics of Global Education Digest 2006. These amendments have also been observed personally in the three Universities selected for this study, including Jönköping International Business School in Sweden, Haskayne Business School in Calgary, Canada and Gadjah Mada University in Jogjakarta, Indonesia. Consequently, different studies refer to the main objectives of globalization and internationalization in higher education. One can also find different impacts of globalization in cross-cultural management which will be discussed in chapter 3.2.2 and to make better understanding about University systems, the background of the selected Universities on internationalization are discussed further in section Research design and Methodology. However, before we touch upon the theoretic background of the cultures and Universities selected, primary to understand for this study is the importance of defining a nation as being part of our everyday discourse throughout the media, the things we learn at our education, how we communicate with people from other cultures, our views, beliefs and perceptions as highlighted by Chryssochoou (2004) which will be discussed briefly in the next paragraph.

2.3 Cross-cultural psychology

As asserted by Samovar et al. (2007) culture is inseparably linked to education whereas people raised in diverse cultures are educated in accordance with the perceived needs of their own cultures. Chryssochoou (2004) also depicts the importance of some theorists that define nation as objective criteria for example by common culture, language, religion, territory. Nonetheless, the author describes the subjective criteria for example mutual recognition of belonging to the same national community. As mentioned earlier and illustrated in figure 1.1 globalization involves rapid social change that is occurring simultaneously across a number of dimensions – in the world economy, in politics, in communications, in the physical environment and in culture – and each of these transformations interact with one another (Samovar et al. 2007; Hopper, 2007; Cheng 2005). The degree of modernity, such as in economic developments (GNP, life expectancy) and in political, educational and social development (education level, public health care and social security), according to Hofstede (1980) can also determine cultural values, and in particular individualism. Either way the functions of the nation-state, including cultural values are progressively being challenged due to globalization (Chryssochoou, 2004). If we simply look at the history of the European model of the homogeneity and civic allegiance had already been challenged, including US, Australia, and Canada, which were founded by people from different European countries who emigrated and prospered. Studies have also shown that even in some parts of Europe multiculturalism has consistently increased. (Chryssochoou, 2004; House et al. 2004) In other words, these countries have become a melting pot of different cultures living and working together in the same geographical area. Similarly, these historical engagements designate that we can assume that individualistic countries selected for this study already indicate to consist of a nation that is rather more heterogeneous then in collectivistic countries. This thought leads us to another thought that the extent to which these nations mentioned above share certain aspects in the way they perceive the relationships between different cultures we can assume to be dependent on the development of multiculturalism of the nations. If a multicultural nation is defined as a system of beliefs and behaviors that recognizes and respects the presence of all diverse groups in an organization or society, as asserted by Samovar, Porter and McDaniel (2007) then the nation must acknowledge and value their socio-cultural differences, and
encourage and enable their continued contribution within an inclusive cultural context which empowers all within the organization or society (Samovar et al. 2007)

However, the authors, but also studies by Morris and Allen (1993) point out that cross-cultural partnerships, marked by the participants’ varying values, ideals, beliefs, and behaviors, offer a rich medium for discord. For example as the authors quoted:

“Collectivistic cultures have an aversion to open, direct conflict, which is seen as a threat to the harmony and stability of the relationship between group members, whereas individualistic cultures in contrast value assertiveness and consider dissent and disagreement as a natural and valued par of life” (Samovar et al. 2007, p 176).

It is clear that cultural values are manifested in everyday life, and as Ting-Toomey (1999) notes Collective and Individualistic value tendencies are manifested interaction with family, school, and workplace. For example if we look at the directness and indirectness of people across cultures, the use and meaning of the word ‘yes’ can be used in direct and indirect ways and could create linguistic difficulties of interpreting what is said when one from a collectivistic culture is interacting with one from the individualistic culture according to (Samovar et al. 2007; Warner, 2003). Both authors give an example of interaction between North Americans and East Asians, such as the Chinese. Warner (2003) points out that in East Asian countries, such as Thailand, Taiwan and Indonesia direct confrontations, criticism of others and explicitly denying requests are generally avoided and telling someone ‘no’ is an art form that requires considerable use of non-verbal communication and careful inflections of the voice while avoiding saying ‘no’. Therefore, the use of ‘yes’ we can imply that in collectivistic cultures has a different meaning then in individualistic cultures, which might lead to misunderstandings, but also to bias information when interpreting the research data. That every culture includes individualistic and collective goals to some extent according Samovar et. al. (2007) is also confirmed by Chryssochoou (2004). The entire behavior described above on how one behaves in social environment indicates that people across cultures have different perspectives which reflect on cultural psychology of different nations.

According to Chryssochoou (2004) there are two types of multiculturalism that can be distinguished in collective multiculturalism, where treatment of the heritage culture of groups is equal and respectful and on the opposite side individual multiculturalism, where treatment of each individual as the carrier of a unique culture is equal and respectful. If we assume Hofstede’s study on the value dimension (I-C) to be an accurate study, one can assume that in individualistic countries we would find rather individual multiculturalism within the organizations/institutions and in collectivistic countries we would rather find collective multiculturalism. This theoretic background is important for this study in order to clarify implemented changes, decisions made and leadership styles in the extreme opposite cultures on the IDV dimension. Furthermore important to mention is Thomas and Inkson’s (2003) argument that high individualist cultures (HIC) are concerned about themselves, preferring activities to be conducted privately, and expecting decisions to be made by the individual according to his or her judgment and the anticipated rewards, whereas people in collectivist cultures view themselves as members of groups and collectives, prefer group activities, and expect decisions to be made on a consensus or consultative basis, where the effects of the decision on everyone are taken into account. This argument & the above notified theory
indicate that we can expect clear differences in leadership styles within the selected Universities between the ‘I’ culture and ‘C’ culture.

2.4 Country Selection on IDV dimension scores

According to Adler (1984) in House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, and Gupta, (2004) in order to translate the abstract and fuzzy cultural differences into different levels of more specific theory derived societal variables cultures need to be selected on a theoretical basis. Based on the authors’ argument, the active consideration of theory in research design reduces the changes of making gratuitous specification errors in the basic constructs. For this reason we have chosen to select cultures on Hofstede’s theoretical foundation of cultural dimensions. Because out of 53 countries and regions studied by Hofstede, the United States (91) scored the highest (most individualistic) on the individualism/collectivism dimension, following by Australia (90), United Kingdom (89), and Canada (80), we have chosen to conduct interviews with partner Universities of JIBS in Sweden (71), in these individualistic countries. On the other side of the cultural dimension we have chosen for countries scoring high on collectivism where JIBS has conducted partner universities; including Colombia (13), Indonesia (14), Republic of China, Taiwan (17) and Thailand (20). To clarify where the countries in the IDV dimension stand, they are illustrated here below in Table 1.2, based on Hofstede’s scale attached as appendix 1. Countries selected for this research are rather primarily selected because Jönköping Business School (JIBS) has partnership with the Universities and second according to the Hofstede’s cultural dimensions scoring the highest on collectivism. Furthermore, because Sweden is the founding country of this research, scoring slightly higher on individualism with a social/collective twist to it, we will include JIBS in our comparative research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collectivistic</th>
<th>Individualistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2 Country selection on Hofstede’s IDV cultural dimension

3 LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review of this thesis is basically divided into four main research topics; Globalization and Internationalization, Intercultural communication, Organizational change and Leadership across- cultures. The first research area provides a thorough clarification of the differences between globalization and internationalization, but also the relations between the two phenomena. The second topic explains the importance of communication across- cultures in the working environment and the concept of Hofstede’s IDV cultural dimension, and then concentrated on different aspects of the cultural dimension. The third and fourth topics relate to behavioral attitudes towards change, including different leadership styles and organizational change in relation to
Although the literature mentioned above is not described in detail, the Literature Review is of definite essence for this study to get the reader acquainted with the various theories that are related to the subject area in order to understand our choice of research framework and the discussion of the results. But, before we go any deeper into the literature review we refer first to the most significant definitions used throughout the thesis and their interpretations.

### 3.1 TERMINOLOGIES AND INTERPRETATIONS

In order to avoid confusion and enable better understanding for the reader, it is important to clarify some terminology and abbreviations used in the thesis and explained in this next part.

**IBU**: abbreviation for International Business University

**IDV**: in reference to Hofstede’s research which measures the degree of individualism

**PDI**: In reference to Hofstede’s research which measures the degree of power distance, where HPD standing for Higher Power Distance and LPD standing for lower power distance.

**I-C**: abbreviation for Individualism versus Collectivism


**Abbreviations for Universities**: UofC: University of Calgary, UofM: University of Manchester, VU: Victoria University, JU: Jönköping University, GMU: Gadjah Mada University, CU: Chulalongkorn University, NSYSU: National Sun Yat-Sen University, FCSU: Fresno California State University, and EAFIT.

**International Schools or Universities or Faculties**: Because the term University in some countries refers to a Faculty or a School and in some a Faculty is part of a University, and others even have Schools that are part of a Faculty. In order to minimize the confusion on these terms we have chosen to use these terms in the same meaning as: higher education institutions having partnerships with similar institutions abroad. However, the structure of each selected University for this study is explained in the Research design and also in the analysis. Nevertheless, all the interviewees are however a decision maker on internationalization of a Business/Economics Faculty/School and not the whole University.

**Institutions**: Terminology referring to universities.

**Tertiary education**: Expression which is interchangeable with higher education, and refers to the service provided by universities which are also called institutions (Global Education Digest, 2006).
**Organizational level and institutional level:** The expression Organizational level is often used in the context of research on the structure of private organizations, which are more common in the framework of cross-cultural research. However, literature shows that even if there are some differences in the way public institutions are structured, there are also some similarities between the two. Therefore even if in most cases when referring to the analysis of the structure of universities the term institutional level will be used, it can also be designated using organizational level.

**Culture and Organizational culture:** It is important to make a difference between the two. The use of the word Culture alone refers to behaviors and values related to the national origin, or location, where Organizational Culture is used to describe behaviors and values within a professional environment. Of course both terms will be further defined in our research. This is of course our interpretation and choice, meaning that there could be some exceptions to the use of this terminology in other authors work quoted in this paper

**Institutional variables:** refers to the factors within the structure of universities which are being investigated to see in what manner they are affected by Globalization and more specifically the increase of cultural diversity which in this case are leadership and Organizing.

**Leader/Manager/Decision-maker:** According to Yukl (2005) there is an ongoing debate about whether leader and managers should be differentiated or not. Indeed it is debatable whether manager are always leaders, however this research does not intend to answer this question, and uses each term interchangeably when referring to the person who has authority.

**Cross-cultural:** implies more than one national culture.

**Globalization and Internationalization:** Both terms will be addressed separately later on in this paper, however most literature agrees to say that Globalization is a vast word which is used in many contexts and is therefore entitled to have several meanings. However this paper will show that even if they are two separate phenomena Globalization can hardly be taken apart for internationalization since internationalization describes one of the processes for Globalization.

**Cultural Globalization:** implies globalization of cultures meeting each other all over the world.

**Homogeneous/Heterogeneous culture:** A homogeneous culture is a nation/organization existing of people in majority of one culture (Thomas and Inkson, 2003; Verluyten, 2001). On the opposite is a heterogeneous culture, which can be referred as a melting pot of cultures living or working in the same geographical area.

**Countries & Cultures:**
If people within a society form a nation as an objective criteria for example by common culture, language, religion, territory according to Chrysochoou (2004) they also represent a nation of one particular country by living on a territory with borders. Even though these nations consist of diversity within them and different perspectives of
people belonging to sub-cultures within that particular country (territory) they still share certain norms & values necessary to be a member of that society. Therefore, culture and country represent an equivalent meaning throughout the report. Thus, further explanation about sub-cultures is described in section Delimitations of Literature Review.

3.2 GLOBALIZATION AND INTERNATIONALIZATION

To clarify, one has to understand that this study does not have the pretention nor the ambition to discuss all of the outcomes of globalization nor does it intend to give an opinion on the phenomenon, as expressed by Blazejewski and Dorow (2005), it only wishes to point out how globalization incorporates internationalization, which is one of the main explanations for the increase of heterogeneity within the higher educational systems. However one has to see globalization and internationalization as two distinctive phenomena which are however tightly interconnected.

A broad and literal definition for Globalization is the process of growing from a national scale to a worldwide scale, which inevitably will bring together single national societies into one large worldwide society. In other words as Cavanagh and Mander (2004) illustrate in the book *Alternatives to Economic Globalization*, Globalization will lead to a worldwide homogenous set of values, tastes and lifestyle. As Friedman (2005) argues Globalization leads to geopolitical changes and also an evolution in demographics. Nonetheless, Globalization cannot be considered as structured as it encompasses many different variables and is somewhat a natural phenomenon related to a worldwide spread of capitalism. This implies that before reaching homogeneity (if ever), because that would not be taking into account all the anti-globalization movements which want to protect the diversity of cultures and values) the world will have to go through different steps. Indeed to understand Globalization’s tools and thus one has to look at how globalization and internationalization are interconnected. Sassen (2007) defines globalization as the sum “of an enormous variety of micro-processes that begin to denationalize what had been constructed as national - whether policies, capital, political subjectivities, urban spaces, temporal frames, or any other of a variety of dynamics and domains“.

Each of these micro-processes is oftentimes resulting from internationalization processes, which is also the case for higher-educational systems. Wikipedia’s (2008) definition for internationalization is an increase of involvement in international markets, and both Friedman (2005) and Cavanagh and Mander (2004), consider that internationalization can be considered as the cooperation between at least two nations, however it should not favor a certain culture over another. A good example would be the European Union where several countries cooperate through agreements on many levels however they do not in theory favor one nation over the other. To sum up and relate both phenomena to culture, globalization intends to narrow the diversity between several countries by replacing separate existing cultures with a single and “new” one which will be common to all. Nonetheless whether this is a voluntary or involuntary process is not the question here. On the other hand, Internationalization simply intends to tighten and increase collaboration between countries throughout the world however doing so respecting and dealing with their own separate cultures.
In respect to the difference made between Globalization and Internationalization, this paper will identify how Universities adapt to globalization. Indeed as mentioned previously, and confirmed in the book Globalizing practices and University responses, Globalization has a significant impact on the higher education systems throughout the world, as explicitly clarified in chapter 2.1. However given the definition for internationalization we will see that the adaptations made are oftentimes internationalization processes.

3.2.1 Impacts of globalization on higher education

As mentioned above by Sassen (2007) and thoroughly explained by Friedman (2005) in the World is flat, Globalization inevitably will affect the higher educational systems throughout the globe. Several reasons can explain why Globalization will necessarily impact Universities. For instance according to him Globalization was partly made possible through the development of Internet which widened and fastened the speed of communication between countries. However the internet also widened the information made available around the world, and therefore enlarged the access to knowledge. This means that the knowledge created on a national base is now made available on a global scale. On the other hand knowledge has not been internationalized alone. Indeed the access to international knowledge has also been largely facilitated by universities themselves. As shown in the book Globalizing practices and University responses, Universities started developing international exchange programs, for both staff and students, which can be seen as a mean for internationalization, however it is limited to programs which do not aim to build revenue on these exchanges. These programs have been developed over several decades and are responsible for an increase in heterogeneity among staff and students.

Yet, as pointed out by Currie et al. (2003), the period where universities used to cooperate by means of internationalization has now shifted along with capitalism to competition. Indeed, universities do not only wish for exchange students and staff, they now wish to develop the number of international students. This means that they now focus on quality and attractiveness for international students and staff. As explained by Currie et al. (2003) such a shift in behavior is highly correlated with the role of the nation-state. As mentioned above the shift took place along with capitalist behaviors among different nations which are highly responsible for globalization. Indeed as mentioned by Cavanagh and Mander (2004) globalization is characterized through the coordination and competition that exists between different nations around the world. As a result, higher-education being defined on a nationwide scale became part of the competition, meaning a market place was set for higher educational systems where they are asked to act in their government’s interest.

A good example of this increase in competition is the Bologna process in Europe (Currie et al. 2003). Indeed such processes have focused in harmonizing higher educational systems in Europe, which is a good example of an effect of globalization since it aims to keep only one educational system in Europe and set the rule for the European market-place. Grand notions of students moving freely from Bologna to Paris to Oxford suggest that from its earliest times the University transcended national or, to be more precise, territorial frontiers (Currie et al. 2003). Moreover the Bologna process
facilitates mobility of students and staff, but forces competition among universities from the same area, not to mention also, the competition with other Universities across the world. This competition defined international strategies within Universities, which implemented scholarship programs to facilitate access for International students, and invested in different research programs to attract international staff. This implies that a new variable has to be taken into account which is the financial strategies which vary a lot from one University to the other depending if it is publicly or privately owned.

Even if as mentioned the financial capabilities of Universities play an important role, this paper will mainly focus on globalization and internationalization being facilitators for the mobility of international student and staff, which leads to an increase of heterogeneity among students and staff. Indeed as stated in the introduction, one of the aims of this paper is to analyze the impact of a raise of heterogeneity on the type of management implemented in higher-educational establishments. Moreover, this study focuses on the current mobility of students and staff moving freely from Europe to Asia, South America, Australia, UK and US.

3.2.2 Impacts of globalization in cross-cultural management

Many authors among whom the most famous are Hofstede and Trompenaars have identified several dimensions to cultures, which stand for key characteristics which allowed them to set up norms to classify different cultures. Important to notify is that differences in cultures can affect the appropriateness and effectiveness of the practices that make up a management control system (Thomas and Inkson, 2003). As indicated by Moran and Harris (2007), modern managers need to be aware of these differences, since Globalization forces them to work globally. Nevertheless, according to them working globally means working across borders, which as Friedman (2005) points out is a requirement and almost natural given that the “world is flat”. Nevertheless as Blazejewski and Dorow (2005) point out, Globalization also implies that the labor market in our home countries is also evolving, becoming more complex due to the increased mobility of employees, meaning that firms have to deal with an increasingly international personnel. Yet again it can be argued whether it is Globalization or more Internationalism which is responsible for the internationalization of the workforce; according to Friedman (2005) outsourcing and other borderless cooperation phenomena are all part of what globalization stands for, but then again as pointed out earlier Cavanagh and Mander (2004) define such cooperation processes as the essence of internationalism. Given this distinction, we will still attribute the internationalization of the work labor to Globalization assuming that it is interconnected to internationalization and can therefore be assimilated.

This taken into account one can say that the business world is going increasingly global and as Doug Ivestor points out (former CEO of Coca Cola) “as economic borders come down, cultural barriers go up presenting new challenges and opportunities in business”. (Javidan and House, 2002) One of the answers to these new challenges is cross-cultural leadership. Goethals and Burns (2004) define cross-cultural leadership as:

“the ability of an individual (the leader) to intentionally and unequally influence and motivate members of a culturally different group toward the achievement of a valued outcome by appealing to the shared knowledge and meaning systems of that culturally different group” (p.301).
This definition is based on the definitions of culture and leadership, and focuses on the differences that might exist within the selected Universities in Individualistic and Collectivistic countries, which are thoroughly explained in chapter 3.5: Leadership in Cross-cultural Studies.

3.3 INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION

From the research background it is clear that the world’s economy is becoming more global every year, where a vast number of Universities will feel a growing need to work tightly with other Universities abroad. According to Verluyten (2001) institutions are becoming more and more involved in internationalization, and feel a growing need for intercultural awareness and skills. In sum, this growing need might lead to contacts leading to negotiations, leading to contracts, welcoming foreign faculty staff members and students on their visits, market their services internationally and adapt them to foreign markets, consider funding a partner from another country and search for funding across boarders, integrating migrant workers and minorities better into their workforce. As asserted by Verluyten (2001) in all these cases, businesspeople need to become aware of how people from other countries and cultures think, react and communicate. To understand the cultural aspects, it is essential for this study to first define culture and its influence on implications within the working environment and towards internationalization.

3.3.1 Culture

In early studies by Kroeber and Kluckhohn many definitions of culture have been collected according to Verluyten (2001) indicating that the meaning of „Culture“ is difficult to define because it is a broad term and has many different levels to it. As culture is now widely treated as a multidimensional concept and construct according to (Hofstede, 2001; Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, 2004) the importance of defining culture for this study is to understand its impact on psychological processes, structures, and behavior. This research focuses on the national culture level as well as the institutional/organizational level. It is because of this focus that the following definition of national culture will be used for this study as it is based on Hofstede’s findings, the founder of national culture research and the core of this study.

A useful definition of Culture by Geert Hofstede is defined as: “the interactive aggregate of common characteristics, consisting of shared mental programs that influence individuals’ and human group’s response to its environment” (Hofstede, 2001, p. 21)

Furthermore, as highlighted by Hofstede (2001) Kluckhohn (1951) quoted: “Culture consists in patterned ways of thinking, feeling and reacting, acquired and transmitted mainly by symbols, constituting the distinctive achievements of human groups, including their embodiments in artifacts; the essential core of culture consists of traditional (i.e. historically derived and selected) ideas and especially their attached values” (Hofstede, 2001, p.21).

Thomas and Inkson (2003) also highlight that culture is a way of life affecting the way they think, feel and react and it often determines their actions and attitudes. It is based
Culture, in the sense of collective mental programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one human group from another, includes systems of values shared among people which have not only a powerful influence on behavior but important to notify is that culture can also be learned and might differ from each other not just in their details, but also in their pervasiveness (Thomas and Inkson, 2003; Samovar, Porter & McDaniel, 2007). Consequently, if culture can be learned, it means that it is possible that individuals from one culture can adopt cultural traits and values from another. This statement is verified by Thomas et al. (2003) when they assessed that the experience of for instance migrants, who deliberately and often successfully move from one culture setting to another or in other words from one territory to another, suggests that it is quite possible for individuals to lose aspects of their old cultures and to learn new ones particular to their new environment. This statement leads us to the point of decision-making and strategic change where cultural dimensions of identity as briefly explained in the next chapter can play an influential role in decisions that are made towards internationalization and the leadership styles executed within the Universities. From the above mentioned definitions it is clear that culture is rather an organized system of values, beliefs, attitudes and meanings that are related to each other and to the environmental context then a random influencing factor. It is therefore interesting to explore this idea in the cultural context of how decision making processes are conducted within the educational environment (the selected Universities) across-cultures. For example, in “tight” cultures such as for example in China, cultures have uniformity and agreement towards correct behavior and are often based on homogeneous populations or dominance of particular religious and or political beliefs. On the other side, countries such as the US with diverse populations have relatively “loose” cultures, where a greater diversity is tolerated and individual development of freedom of thought and action is encouraged (Thomas and Inkson, 2003). These findings reflect on Chryssochou (2004) terminations that nations are often formed because of cultural similarities among different population groups, and when people make comparisons to evaluate themselves they choose others that are more or less similar to them. This is an example of a sub-culture creation within another culture. However, Thomas et al. (2003) also points out that overtime people reinforce their adherence to a national culture by means of shared institutions, legal and educational systems, and mass media, which again reflect on culture, in the sense of collective mental programming of the mind which differentiates the members of one human/collective group, in this case one nation with an individual system of education from another as highlighted earlier (Thomas et al. 2003; Samovar et al. 2007).

National cultures in this sense are particularly important because of the concept of national dominion and the need to conduct business projects, network affairs within national, legal, and political frameworks (Thomas et al. 2003) which consequently lead to internationalization in its various aspects. These aspects are performing different influences on the national cultures across the globe, depending on the tolerance, openness or positive appreciation of the nation towards other cultures (Verluyten, 2001; Chryssochou, 2004). In Webster’s dictionary (2008) to tolerate may mean to ‘recognize and respect’ (in cultural context: others’ beliefs, practices, etc.) without
sharing them (Verluyten, 2001). The same word argues Verluyten according to dictionary also means ‘to bear’, to put up with someone or something not especially liked. Unlike tolerance, being open to what is new or unknown entails that one will look at features from other cultures with sympathy and understanding, and be willing to share in the practices that go with them whenever possible and appropriate (Verluyten, 2001). And last, positive appreciation speaks almost for its self that one actually starts to like the outlandish way of thinking and certain practices that they adopt themselves (Verluyten, 2001). These research findings reflect also on Chryssochoous’ argument on nation’s regulations, which are based on nation’s perceptions if other culture within another should publicly conform to the cultural norms. Should they conform to the cultural norms of the country as established by the majority, but in private they can follow their own cultural norms? Or is the nation encouraged to keep their own ways of thinking in the private sphere and contribute toward building a common way of seeing the world – a new culture (multi cultural values and beliefs) in the public sphere? To designate the change process due to cultural diversity Thomas and Inkson (2003) marked it best when they compared cultural diversity with biodiversity. Here they indicated that cultural diversity offers a wider range of viewpoints on how to deal with different challenges, just as biodiversity allows the ecosystem to deal with major changes.

Just as we summarize this paragraph an important way to describe both the similarities and differences among cultures is by their underlying values, fundamentally shared beliefs about how things should be or how one should behave (Verluyten, 2001). On the organizational level (localization level), culture within institutions/organizations will be discussed further in this report in paragraph 3.4.2. In short, these findings lead us towards explanation of cross-cultural misunderstandings which are based on Hofstede’s dimensions of value variation between cultures according to Thomas et al. (2003) and which are interpreted further in detail in this chapter.

### 3.3.2 Effects of national culture on the organizational culture

As mentioned earlier organizational culture and national culture play a big role in terms of tolerance to change and therefore it is important to take into account when implementing change. However pointing out what organizational culture exactly is; is not such an easy task.

Indeed Organizational culture cannot only be looked upon Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952) description, who define it as the predominant values and behaviors of its members, which are acquired through a common history and experience. As a matter of fact one also has to bear in mind what Hofstede (2001) pointed out and also many other authors that organizational culture is influenced by national culture. No one will dispute the fact that while some nation states are culturally fairly homogeneous, most of them are composed of variety of subcultures as mentioned in section: Research Framework. Yet, as mentioned by Verluyten (2004) there are good reasons to think that the level of the nation state is in many cases of prime importance in shaping the culturally defined features of the individual who has lived for a longer period of time within its borders, and there also is empirical evidence to corroborate this statement. The overall political system, the administrative, legal and judiciary systems (social systems), the economic system and educational system, all exert its massive influence upon its citizens (Verluyten, 2004; Hofstede, 2001). For example, educational systems in Australia,
Canada and the Netherlands have been influenced indirectly through globalization which has affected the economic systems worldwide and consequently have led to privatization of Universities (Currie et al. 2003) as further elaborated in a later section 3.4.3. Consequently, privatizations in these countries have lead to less funding for Universities according to the authors, which as a result have created more temporary jobs. For the citizens working in higher educations in these countries this means an increase in flexibility among staff, which automatically has lead to increase in cultural diversity within the universities, creating direct consequences within the organizational culture.

However in the cultural context of Hofstede’s IDV dimension, the understanding that certain characteristics of human beings are determined by the cultural group they belong to, such as individualism or collectivism in this case, and the diversity of the group, indicates that the learning about these particular cultures may help us in this study to better understand the values and the behavior towards organizational change and leadership. In addition, besides that leadership behavior is influenced by the national culture according to Bass, (1990) in House et al. (1997) it is also influenced by other situational variables such as organizational and managerial characteristics within the particular University. Organizational culture and family culture can also be sub-cultures as highlighted by House et al. (1997). Therefore, on the organizational level we discuss the Universities’ culture and climate, its size and nature of their partnerships in section Research Design, and on the managerial level we discuss the level and function of the interviewed manager/leader; their background, actions, position, power, and authority in the Discussion chapter. Thus, concepts such as PDI and IDV will help us in analyzing leadership styles and implemented change (strategic plans) towards internationalization.

### 3.3.3 Hofstedes’ cultural dimensions

Research in business management pioneered by Hofstede (2001) emphasized culture as an important variable in determining managerial attitudes and behavior, whereas Triandis (1997) in House et al. (2004) declares that culture includes all that has worked in the past has become a shared perspective and is being transmitted from generation to generation. This transmission reflects on the assumption of Thomas and Inkson (2003) that culturally intelligent leadership involves focusing not on the leader but on the followers. Although several studies have examined cultural differences, one of the most comprehensive was conducted by Geert Hofstede (Verluyten, 2001). From 1967 to 1973, Hofstede collected and analyzed data from more than 100,000 individuals working in more than 50 countries and three regions. From those results, and later additions, Hofstede developed a theoretical framework that identifies four primary dimensions that differentiate cultures: power distance (PDI), individualism/collectivism (IDV), masculine/feminine, and uncertainty avoidance (Thomas et al., 2003). This paper is mainly focused on the IDV cultural value dimension where each country, on the basis of its employees’ responses, is assigned an individualism score between 1 and 100 as illustrated in appendix 1. According to this dimension, all cultures can be characterized by the strength of social forces, which bring individuals together into social entities. Individualism is an attitude that emphasizes the importance of individual over the group identity and collectivism is the opposite tendency that emphasizes the importance of “We” identity over “I” identity according to Triandis (1995) in Samovar et al. (2007). Although Hofstede is not the only scholar who has researched these crucial intercultural
dimensions his taxonomy is a widely used framework for differentiating among cultures. However, Triandis who derived an entire cross-cultural research agenda that focuses on these concepts, quoted:

“Although no culture totally ignores individualistic or collective goals, cultures differ significantly on which of these factors they consider more critical” (Samovar, Porter & McDaniel, 2007, p.141).

The authors point out some traits which define the IDV continuum and are used in this study to explain the behavior and approaches towards internationalization between collectivist and individualist mind oriented cultures. Nevertheless, as there is correlation between PDI and IDV clusters, according to Verluyten (2001) which represent areas where there are common problems and different solutions in social inequality, including the relationship between the individual and the group (IDV) and the relationship with authority (PDI) we will also discuss this cultural dimension briefly.

### 3.3.4 Individualism versus Collectivism

The dimension of individualism-collectivism is related to social norms, which Hofstede (1991) defined as: “the degree to which people in a country have learned to act as individuals rather than as members of a cohesive group” (p. 13).

In other words, individualism is on the one side versus its opposite, collectivism, that is the degree to which individuals are integrated into groups. To clarify the importance of the cultural dimension and its influence on attitudes and behaviors regarding to decision making and strategic implementations towards internationalization, it is vital to explain the different norms and values of the cultures on the IDV dimension, which include several concepts and observations related to the culture’s position.

#### 3.3.4.1 Perception of moral behavior

An important way to describe both the similarities and differences among cultures is by their underlying values of the IDV cultural dimension. According to Thomas et al. (2003) these cultural values are fundamental shared beliefs about how things should be or how one should behave. For example, someone from an individualistic country is rather personal and independent, and his personal goals have priority over the group’s goals, indicating relative importance of personal attitudes as pointed out by (Berry, Poortinga, Segall and Dasen, 1992). Now, if that same person finds himself working in a collectivistic oriented working environment he might experience a cultural conflict on perceptions of moral behavior, simply because in collectivist countries the group’s goals have priority over individual goals. Thus, from this example it is easy to see how it might be difficult for individuals from one group of countries to know how to behave socially in another culture or to understand the process of making decisions.

Furthermore, individualism (characteristic of the US and many Western countries, including US, Canada, Australia, UK and Sweden) countries studied in this research, is associated with needs for achievement according to Thomas et al. (2003), while collectivism (characteristic of Latin America and many Asian countries such as Thailand and Taiwan) usually involves high need for affiliation like for example close
personal relationships. Consequently, these findings confirm the relationship between the cultural dimension and what kind of behavior will be acceptable to people in management practice, including institutions such as Universities. Similarly, this statement corroborates Hofstede’s reasoning what is considered moral behavior in a group oriented culture may be considered unethical in a high individualistic country, and vice versa (Verluyten, 2001).

Overall, the dimension of individualism-collectivism will provide us with a conceptual grid in explaining the choice of leadership styles and the decisions made that vary across cultures (House et al. 2004; Ting-Toomey, 1999; Samovar et al. 2007). In order to conduct this comparative study we will clarify our understanding of how the various identities of the cultural orientations influence our everyday communication and behaviors in individualistic and collectivistic cultures in this section but also in chapter 3.6, relating more to cultural expectations and leadership. How are university decision makers responding to the challenges and opportunities of internationalization? To what extent are universities developing towards internationalization? What are the differences and similarities on the IDV cultural value dimension? Has international recruitment affected the management processes and how? And how culturally aware are the decision makers? To examine this in the context of International Universities in individualistic versus collectivistic countries we aim to link similarities and highlight the differences in cross-cultural leadership and organizational change as consequence of internationalization at both the institutional and national level. The importance of highlighting cultural differences and similarities is to convey the challenges, opportunities and issues related to leadership and organizing change in order to provide direction how International University Partners should build enhanced intercultural communication between each other and within the institutions towards their multicultural working environment. Finally, the purpose is to depict specific approaches/behavior within International Universities towards internationalization on the IDV dimension and test its value.

3.3.4.2 Relational view

In a conceptual analysis as highlighted by Berry et al. (1992) Kagitcibasi distinguishes two ways to think of the dimension: normative and relational, where normative I-C represents the view that “individual interests are to be subordinated to group interests” (p. 66) and relational is more concerned with “interpretational distance versus embeddedness” (p. 66).

This paper focuses rather on the relational thinking of the I-C dimension in order to conduct the similarities and differences in cultural characteristics of embedded relationships such as belief, open communication, and joint problem solving. This statement indicates that how one communicates, behaves and makes decisions includes characterizations of I-C cultures (Berry et al., 1992). In this paper we consider characterizations, proposed by Triandis and colleagues. Those characterizations include; self-reliance, competition, emotional distance from in-groups and sociability (Berry et al., 1992). Moreover, for example in collectivistic cultures these characterizations influence one’s behavior within a community in terms of collaboration, shared interest, harmony, tradition and maintaining face, as opposed to individualistic cultures where people pay more attention to personal rights and responsibilities, privacy, personal
opinion, freedom, innovation and self-expression (Samovar et al., 2007). On the basis of
the sparse empirical studies of factors leading to network embeddedness within the
working environments and across boarders, we aim to identify organizational change
and leadership implemented towards internationalization within the IBU’s in
individualistic versus collectivistic countries as a potentially important institutional-
level factor. Since Individualism-collectivism has emerged from the literature as a high
level psychological concept…”that explains cross cultural differences in behavior over
a wide range of situations” (p. 66) according to Berry et al. (1992) we can assume that
people in cultures on this dimension perceive differently what is effective leadership
and organizational change towards internationalization. This statement confirms the
argument by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (2004) that societal culture influences
leadership behaviors and effectiveness.

3.3.4.3 Loose or tight culture

On the individualist side we find societies in which the ties between individuals are
loose: everyone is expected to look after him/herself and his/her immediate family,
whereas decisions are made by the individual according to the judgment he or she
makes as to what is appropriate (Verluyten, 2001). In a general sense, individualism
refers to a culture’s tendency to be competitive and focused more on “individual
success” and the individual rewards that will accrue versus group success whereas
people primarily view themselves as collectives rather than as autonomous individuals
according to Pelto (1968) as asserted by Thomas and Inkson (2003).

On the collectivist side, we find societies in which people from birth onwards are
integrated into strong, cohesive in-groups (Hofstede, 2001), which throughout people’s
lifetime continue to protect them in exchange for unquestioning loyalty. Moreover,
collectivists are known to be self-sacrificing toward in-group members and thus more
focused on group success versus individual success (House et al. 2004). With this in
mind the tendency to act according to the best interest of the group in collectivistic
cultures means that there may be less need to use rewards and performance measures to
align the interest of the individual with the interest of the group or organization and that
in the collectivistic oriented cultures we will find different ways of motivating staff and
students within the class rooms. These actions and behaviors indicate that management
may find it more effective to emphasize work-unit cohesiveness and provide team-based
rewards and training. This is important to be able to analyze one of the interview
questions which is finding out about the implemented team building methods within
individualistic versus collectivistic cultures, but also to illustrate the individual level that
reflect on the University systems. To confirm these differences of loose and tight
culture, in the analysis we also briefly take into account our findings from the pilot
interview and other student experiences at the selected Universities as mentioned in
chapter 2.2: Observations.

According to House et al. (2004) this bipolar factor of I-C was derived from a post hoc
analysis and consisted of several items that related to differences in preferences for
work goals. The individualistic pole of the dimension is associated with preferences for
considerable freedom on the job, having challenging work and spending sufficient time
for personal or family matters (House et al. 2004). By contrast according to the authors,
the collectivist pole of the dimension was associated with preferences for training opportunities, being able to use skills on the job, having good physical work conditions and building long-term relationships in terms of work and family and friends.

3.3.4.4 HRM practices

HRM practices, which basically recruit staff in organizations according to various studies as assessed by House et al. (2004) in individualistic cultures generally, reflect shared assumptions of the need for systems that promote rational exchanges between members and the organization. First, the authors mention that the selection of staff recruitment is based on a rational calculation of the degree to which the applicant has knowledge, skills, and abilities that fit with the needs of the organization, as identified through job analyses. Here they give an example of rational decision-making models developed primarily in the US and used to predict the performance of prospective applicants. Furthermore, the jobs are designed in a way that individuals have autonomy and variety in order to ensure that individuals can experience meaningfulness and responsibility, and consequently are rewarded in direct relationship to their contribution to the individual success of the task (Trompenaars and Hampde-Turner, 2004).

By contrast, HRM practices in organizations that have a collectivist orientation are less likely to focus on rational exchanges between members and the organization (House et al. 2004). Rather, long-term relational dedications are generally honored as mentioned earlier indicating that these relational commitments serve as some kind of guide lines for behavior. Hence, selection of staff recruitment within organizations/institutions in collectivist oriented cultures can be significantly influenced by the relations that applicants have with other members within, with whom the organization/institution has contact. As such, House and colleagues (2004) imply that hiring a person with the best contacts and relationships within the organization in collectivistic cultures might be preferred over hiring the most qualified person. Unlike in individualistic cultures, jobs are likely to be designed around cohesive work groups to maximize team-experienced meaningfulness with focus on team autonomy, team responsibility in order to meet the social and technical aspects of the job. Thus, rewards are based on team performance rather than individual act. (Thomas et al. 2003)

3.3.5 Power distance

According to Hofstede (1981) Power distance (PDI) is influence, which is basically the essence of leadership. To be effective as a leader, it is necessary to influence people to carry out requests, support proposals, and implement decisions (Yukl, 2005). Before we explain the cultural dimension ‘power distance’ it is important to understand the concept of power, which has been used in different ways by different writers, thereby creating considerable conceptual confusion.

Power as asserted by (Minzberg, 1983) in Yukl (2005) is a useful concept for understanding how people are able to influence each other in organizations. As power involves the capacity of one party (the agent) to influence another party (the target) that can refer to an agent as a group or organization and sometimes even an individual according to Yukl (2005) indicates that this concept is flexible and can be used in many different ways.
In this case, the power distance Hofstede is talking about is the distance between power and the members of a particular culture. As stressed out by Samovar et al. (2007) power distance is summarized by Hofstede as a characteristic of a culture defining the extent to which the less powerful person in society accepts inequality in power and considers it as normal.

Therefore, power distance can be defined as:

“the extent to which less powerful members of institutions and organizations accept that power is distributed unequally.” (Hofstede, 1991, p.28)

In high power distance (HPD) countries, people strictly obey their superiors. To approach and contradict a superior directly would be regarded as highly disrespectful. In low power distance (LPD) countries, the dependence on superiors is far less, to the extent that there is interdependence between the two and a preference for consultation when decisions are made. (Verluyten, 2001). The difference between the two is perhaps clearer when put into an organizational context.

As asserted by Verluyten (2001) and Thomas et al. (2003) the dominant decision-making style of managers will tend to be more autocratic in HPD cultures, more participative in LPD cultures, and managers/leaders themselves will tend to accept more participative behavior from their subordinates in LPD countries. Another important factor related to leaderships on this dimension for this particular study is the correlation between the IDV cultural dimension and PDI dimension. Because people from high IDV cultures feel that they can and should do things by themselves as much as possible, without asking others as asserted by Verluyten (2001); in addition, these people are also from low Power Distance (LPD) countries, and they tend to have difficulty issuing orders and coping with submissive behavior. In low IDV, HPD cultures, however, dependency relations are common.

Therefore, it is safe to say that in all the countries selected for this study, cultures combine either high PDI and low individualism, or low power distance and high individualism and that they are correlated. To illustrate the reverse correlation very clearly we use one of the Hofstedes’ graphs as demonstrated in figure 1.2 on the next page. The countries selected for this study are circled abbreviations of the countries.
As one can see, the countries selected for this study in the upper right hand quadrant are (high PDI, low IDV) and in the lower left hand quadrant countries selected are (low PDI and high on IDV) indicating the correlation as discussed above.

### 3.3.6 Homogeneity versus Heterogeneity/Multiculturalism

As outlined by Barrett (2002) the question today, is whether one can already describe the world today as having a homogenous culture spread out worldwide or is it still made up of a set of heterogeneous cultures. Moreover it cannot be argued that growing cultural similarities is a fact. As shown by Blyton (2001) which describes the increase of similarities as a result of globalization and internationalization “the influence of nation states, and the significance of national differences are in decline and progressively will continue to be so, given the increased economic domination by global corporations, in turn facilitated by policies of trade liberalization and closer integration through supranational groupings such as the European Union (EU)” (p 593).

Nevertheless this state of a homogenous culture has not yet been reached, and as Robertson and White (2003) argue, there is a chance that it will never be reached at all since as they put it “As long as the project of cultural globalization is in progress, it should be resisted by the attempt of cultural localization […] in this way, we might well expect that in the context of Globalization, the new framework of world culture in the 21st century will be characterized by different cultures coming to have dialogue and merge in some degrees”

However even if based on Cheng’s (2005) definition of heterogeneity “a cultural state in which the contextual culture is very diverse among members” could be applied to Robertson’s and White’s view of the world today, they tend to describe the world today
as a state of multiculturalism which implies mingling between separate cultures. Barrett (2002) agrees with this argument and presents multiculturalism as a more probable outcome to Globalization as a homogenous culture. Indeed even if he agrees based on numerous authors that homogeneity of culture is indeed increasing through globalization, he also argues that diversity will always remain, whether it is due to the opposition to Globalization or due to the human nature which mentally denies the disappearing of cultural diversity. As shown previously educational systems are not an exception to Globalization. Indeed we haven not yet reached the state of a single common educational system for all; however harmonization is the current tendency as mentioned earlier. The question is whether this phenomenon will lead to a homogenous, multicultural or heterogeneous culture within Universities worldwide.

3.3.7 Importance of cultural awareness

Now that the reader is acquainted with the principles and practices of cultural aspects, the cultural differences and how they are reflected in different people’s behavior, we will discuss the importance of cultural awareness in the business context, related to higher education institutions. We highlight how the lack of it can have a negative affect on business interactions and how being culturally aware can have rather a positive affect. Nevertheless, related to this subject matter later in this section we also discuss leadership across-cultures, including global leadership qualities.

Being unaware of the key features and biases of our own culture, not recognizing when our own cultural orientation is influencing our behavior and being unable to adjust to living and working in another culture are just a few of the examples given by Thomas et al. (2003) of people failing or having difficulties in intercultural situations. In other words, these examples indicate the lack of cultural awareness and the importance of it in the working environment, especially when the working environment is multicultural, but also when working with partners across boarders. We believe that lack of awareness can be described by the subjectivity of people, because The New Dictionary of Cultural Literacy (2002) defines subjectivity as: “An expression used of someone who is too involved in the details of a problem and not understands the general situation to look at the situation as a whole”. In other words subjective in the cultural context can be described as to be too close to own culture (values and beliefs) and therefore not being able to recognize similarities nor understand the differences between cultures. Being subjective in this matter we would like to refer to as somebody that lacks cultural awareness and can be best described by the old saying: “Not see the forest for the trees”. On the contrary, one that is culturally aware could be rather seen as objective, as it means to take a step back and look at the whole picture, because an objective person is uninfluenced by emotions or personal prejudices (Dictionary of Cultural Literacy, 2002) which are also influenced by cultural values and beliefs according to (Hall, 2002; Samovar et al. 2007).

Some scholars and people in general assume that people’s way of thinking, reacting and communicating are becoming more global as the economy does, translated as global homogeneity as mentioned earlier. Even though Kishan (2007) assessed that there is increase in standardization of higher education as well as global communication and creation of global networks, this still does not mean that cultures are converging into one culture. This because, as Thomas et al. (2003) described it; many people believe
that cultures are converging to a common norm, assisted by phenomena such as mass communication and the standardization, but these authors as well as Verluyten (2001) specifically mentions that this is not the case yet, nor it will be any time soon. Intuitively and naturally, most of us tend to use our own, familiar framework of values and communicative habits to interpret situations and predict the behavior of people from other cultures (Verluyten, 2001; House et al. 2004). Therefore, developing one’s sense of cultural awareness is a crucial skill in intercultural situations, especially those of the decision-makers as they are the ones leading people with different cultural backgrounds, and making decisions on internationalization processes. As mentioned earlier institutions are also becoming more and more involved in internationalization, and feel a growing need for intercultural awareness and skills (Verluyten, 2001). This is not only important for the academic staff working within the international universities, but also for the students as they are the core of the university. In other words, if decision-makers and academic staff within International Universities are not culturally aware it might have negative consequences not only on the partnerships they have across cultures, but also on the whole society which consist of students in this generation and generations to come.

This statement in terms of culture’s effect on higher education is also confirmed by Chen and Starosta (2003) which declare that today’s Faculties/Universities find themselves in the position of teaching and working in intercultural classrooms. For this reason Powell and Andersen (1994) in Samovar et al. (2007) suggest that simply knowing one’s discipline is insufficient. Spitsberg (2004) assessed therefore that one needs intercultural awareness and competence, as quoted in Samovar et al. (2007): “behavior that is appropriate and effective in a given context” (p.314).

In order to be able analyze the decision-makers and Universities’ level of cultural awareness we will look at their actions towards internationalization in its various aspects. Furthermore, we will discuss a few ways of dealing with the cultural globalization of their working environment, which imply the institutional and individual level affected by the societal norms and values and which are consequential for the societal level.

First, one way of dealing with this development, or rather as we would like to call it a problem that brings about change, is trying to deal with it by sticking to the ‘Be like me’ policy and try to brazen it out as assessed by Thomas et al. (2003). In other words, in the working environment this means; insisting that people with different cultural background get acquainted with the national cultural systems/organizational culture of doing and behave as the people from that particular culture where they work. These findings also reflect on the earlier described ‘tolerance’ of one’s culture by Verluyten (2001). However, Thomas et al. (2003), and Powell and Andersen (1994) point out that this way of dealing with the problem will rather rob people of the great gift of diversity and the novelty they can bring in the form of new ways of thinking and working and that under these circumstances, any business opportunity will soon disappear.

Second way of dealing with multiculturalism within the working environment is understanding cultural differences (Thomas et. al. 2003), which reflect on the openness (Verluyten, 2001); being open and understanding of other cultural traits and values as discussed in paragraph, Culture. This approach attempts to include understanding of other cultural traits not just what the key cultural characteristics are, but also the expected behavior of that culture, the detailed customs to be followed, the type of
speech inflections to use, and expressions and actions that might be considered offensive, as well as functional information on matters such as education for example (Thomas et al. 2003; Samovar, et al. 2007). Although openness, which reflects on this approach has a more positive connotations than the first approach, and may lead to a positive appreciation (related to the third approach) of foreign practices and values, hence indicates rather a formal and abstract knowledge of other cultures, which need to be supplemented by and integrated with experience of the culture in order to be totally culturally aware (Verluyten, 2001; Thomas et al. 2003).

The third approach to the problem is to become culturally aware or culturally intelligent (Thomas et al. 2003). The authors describe cultural intelligence as being skilled and flexible about understanding a culture, learning more about it from your ongoing interactions with it, and gradually reshaping own thinking to be more sympathetic to the culture and own behavior to be more skilled and appropriate when interacting with people from another culture. Again, also this approach reflects on Verluyten’s (2001) argument of positive appreciation behavior, which includes fondness of other cultural practices and values that one might even take over. A major advantage of this approach according to Thomas et al. (2003) over the second one is that as well as acquiring growing competence in a specific culture decision-makers/managers but also all people, simultaneously acquire general cultural intelligence, making each new cultural challenge easier to face because of what has been learned from the previous experiences.

In sum, the importance of cultural intelligence/awareness should be considered as an important incentive by decision-makers/leaders within International Universities because of the forces of globalization that are dramatically changing the working environment of higher education around the globe. Nevertheless, from the above described literature it is clear that cultural intelligence involves understanding the fundamentals of intercultural interaction, developing a mindful approach to intercultural interactions, and finally building adaptive skills and a repertoire of behaviors so that one is effective in different intercultural situations.

3.4 ORGANIZING CHANGE

According to Tomas Müllern the rational model, presented to us during one of his lectures in September 2007; Change is a solution to a problem. Since, and we will discuss this later again, before a decision to change is made, the decision maker should have respected a process enabling him or her to come up with the most effective change. Therefore in theory this implies that a change is by definition a good solution. However, it is quite easy to say that this is not always a true statement, countless examples can prove this wrong and the rational model also points this out and explains that change is a solution to a problem which later on (sooner or later) brings about new problems. This brings us to ask ourselves a first question: why do we change?

It is quite common to say that businesses have to adopt change in order to adapt to the ongoing evolutions in their environment. This statement can not be argued, but maybe this is not the only reason why companies decide to change.
Every change in the environment has an impact on business, and can create opportunities, or challenges. However in order to understand why we change we have to focus on the reaction of a company/institution to this change; this is basically the origin of the rational model. Mintzberg and Huy (2003), pointed out three types of reactions.

The first one is referred to as a dramatic Change, which is basically a violent reaction, which inquires big changes. This is a typical reaction if there is a big opportunity for business or a strong obstacle that a company has to overcome. We will later discuss how this type of changes could be done, and what impact they could have on the effectiveness of the company.

The second type of change described in the article called “The Rhythm of Change” by Mintzberg and Huy (2003) is organic change. This type of changes could be seen as maybe a typical type of reaction to a change in the environment of a company. In this case the change comes across naturally, and is basically forced upon a company.

The third and last type of reaction they describe is Systematic change, which is a planned out type of change which in the end can be seen as a gradual reaction spread over time.

However in order to be effective those three types of changes have to be combined in order to create stability. One could argue that this theory deceives the rational model because if a solution can lead to stability, this would indicate that a solution does not necessarily bring about new problems.

3.4.1 Organizational Change

We believe that even if stability can be obtained, it is only temporary since Universities evolve in a continuously changing external environment, which Cheng (2005) refers to as the Globalization. However as Cheng explains the Globalization level on an organization is made up of many influential factors, such as for example economical, political and cultural factors. In our case, and since our thesis is a cross-cultural comparative research, we decided to define the external environment of universities, as what Cheng refers to as Cultural Globalization, meaning external cultural factors affecting organizations. Moreover we decided to approach organizational change through an extended version of the rational model introduced to us by T. Müllern.

Indeed, we decided to integrate Cheng’s triplization model, describing the three different levels of culture: Globalization, Localization and Individualization; to a more detailed version of the rational model.

As explained above we consider Cheng’s level of Globalization as the external cultural environment influencing universities. Indeed as mentioned in the previous section, and validated by many authors, it is undeniable that firms or universities have to implement change in response to external environment influential factors. Moreover a decision to change is necessarily taken with the intention for an improvement, however as the rational model (Problem→Change→Problem) suggests implementing a change triggers a domino effect which eventually leads to more change. Therefore in order to have a better understanding of this phenomenon we decided to break down the rational model in different steps.

The model below, which is our interpretation of the rational model combined with Cheng’s model, suggests a method for the implementation of organizational change.
Indeed at the origin of change is necessarily a goal which Latham (2003) qualifies as a super ordinate goal, and which should be set using his SMART method. This means that the goal should be “specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and have a time-frame”. The use of SMART method is also the method used to describe the aim of this study. Once a goal is set it should quite naturally lead to problems or obstacles which will have to be overcome to attain the goal. Nonetheless, the problem to overcome should also be looked at in more detail which is what Balogun and Johnson (2004) refer to as ‘sense making’. Moreover according to them, during this step decision makers should take into consideration several variables, such as the size of the company, over how much time they want to implement the change, and so forth and so on, in order to come up with a detailed strategic plan for change. This process of building a strategic plan can be considered as Cheng’s (2005) Localization level, since it includes all the factors to take into consideration within the university. Once a strategic plan has been drawn, the next step is to implement it. However, success is jeopardized if the accurate leadership style and the culture of individuals involved in change are not taken into account as shown by Furnham (2002). This step can be regarded as Cheng’s (2005) individualization level, since it comes down to integrating the individuals involved into your strategic plan. At last, in order to determine whether or not the change has been successful, it should be measured using criteria specified during the sense making step as explained by Balogun and Johnson (2004). If the outcome is not what expected, it indicates that errors were made during the sense making step, meaning that the original problem has not been solved, and therefore should be addressed again on the institutional level. At last if results are satisfying then in that case, according to the rational model new problems should appear, however as mentioned in the section above this can occur after a period of stability. This model, illustrated in Model 1.1 will be used later on in our analysis to address organizational change within universities in individualistic and collectivistic countries.
Model 1.1: Organizing Change Model (van Eysendeyk and Rebac, 2009)

Goal

Problem A

Localization level:

Sense making

Frame of change for strategic plan:
- Resources
- Time
- Measurement
- Size/structure
- Human
- Internal Environment

Implementation of change:

Key factors of success
- Leadership
- Culture

Measure outcome:
- If outcome insufficient
- If outcome sufficient

Results

Problem B

External environment
3.4.2 Organizational Culture

The first question we will try to answer is how organizational culture relates employees to their company. It is not only about wearing a uniform or a badge. Higgins and Mcallaster (2004) define organizational culture as the values and norms, the myths and sagas, languages, systems and processes, rituals, and physical surroundings within a firm. In other words Organizational culture can be seen as the rhythm, regulating daily activities for employees. 

So, how does Organizational culture relate to change? To summarize, organizational culture is the global behavior of a company, it is how a company functions: “the way we do things around here” (Wall, 2005). As a result, when one thinks about changing he might often times affect the company’s way of working. Wall (2005) takes this statement even further and argues that one actually needs to change the company’s culture in order to increase chances for success. The reason for this necessity is that if a change is brought in but the culture is not changed, well then employees will simply continue doing things the old way since that is how it is done until they are told otherwise (change of culture).

Nonetheless, changing organizational culture is easier said than done, since often times it has a lot to do with human psychology, thus if the working environment is multicultural it has to do also with cross-cultural psychology. Therefore, now that we underlined one of the aspects of the relationship between individuals and their company/working environment, we can already state that change can jeopardize this relationship. Consequently, changing processes, in this case towards internationalization have to integrate the concept of organizational culture in order to assimilate the human aspect to change and therefore increase chances of success.

3.4.3 Specificities of University culture

According to Wilson (1981) in Cobern (1998) education literature has shown a growing awareness that, for education to be effective, it must take much more explicit account of the cultural context of the society which provides its setting and whose needs it exists to serve. However, the extent of this awareness and initiative will depend on various specificities of the University culture as explained further in this section.

3.4.3.1 Private or Public institution

In the attempt to describe Culture within universities we first have to decide whether universities are considered public or private institutions or even both. Indeed this is of some significance since this implies making a difference between Bureaucratic culture often applicable to the public sector and Organizational culture, which are applicable to the private one. As mentioned previously, and as Currie, Deangelis, Boer, Huisman and Lacotte (2003) repeat on many occasions Globalizations definitely affects universities across the world, even though it is not always with the same intensity. It has done so, for several decades and has on many occasions affected the governance of universities. As Currie et al. (2003) show, one of the most widely spread “consequences” of Globalization in regards to universities, is the fact that they gained autonomy:

“For instance, many governments initiated public sector reforms, introducing greater institutional autonomy for universities in a more deregulated, economic environment, and new controls, such as “steering from a distance mechanisms”, resulting in disguised governmental control” (p.2).
Still according to these authors, in certain countries this phenomenon radically transformed the educational system, since the reforms mentioned above took the form of privatization. Of course several degrees of privatization exist, nevertheless for our research we will refer to public universities when describing universities strictly under government control; and to private universities when an institution is asked to act as a private company even though the government remains to some extend one of the stakeholders. Moreover, this research does not intend to compare the public sector to the private one in regards to quality of education; it simply intends to outline the impact that the role of the government can have on the governance of the university and the bureaucratic culture. Indeed privatization regardless of the extent to which it has been implemented proportionally affects institutions’ structure.

“The public sector was to be smaller and less trusted. Using private corporate models, reformers of public sector management deregulated by outsourcing, selling public assets, initiating markets or quasi-markets, reallocating competitive resources, and replacing bureaucratic or planned decision making and coordination” (Currie et al. 2003, p.51)

In short, empirical studies show that strictly public universities are becoming a rare breed and not only in western countries, meaning that most universities can actually be considered to some extent private (Currie et al. 2003; Global Education Digest, 2006), bearing in mind that as mentioned above several degrees of privatization exist, and some countries do still consider their educational systems as public in spite of the fact that it is not the only stakeholder.

3.4.3.2 Bureaucratic or organizational

Nevertheless this finding does not necessarily imply that universities are no longer organized in a bureaucratic fashion. Nevertheless, Bureaucracy as Peters (2001) explains suffers from clichés which are for most part based on reality even if they can be argued against. Indeed Bureaucratic structures often imply strong sense of top down hierarchy, with often high levels of control generally slowing down processes, and which in the end also turn out to be expensive. This cost issue is at the often at the origin of privatizing decisions, since as mentioned earlier according to Currie et al. (2003) are more and more asked to act as private companies. First of all this implies to take into consideration what Vasu, Stewart and Garson (1998) refer to as the ultimate goal of a public institution in Currie et al. (2003). “The public organizations primary goal is equity, fairness in resources distribution” (p.7) with the objective of fulfilling their constitutionally and legally designated task.

This is in opposition to private organizations which are by “necessity concerned with efficiency; that is, getting the greatest level of output for a given level of input.” (p. 7) which most importantly raises the question of funding which is related to the cost effectiveness mentioned earlier when referring to bureaucratic structures. In fact the level of input automatically leads to discussing the issue of funding. Indeed as Currie et al. (2003) point out privatization usually indicates a decrease in funding which has a direct impact on institution’s structure. As a matter of fact, less funding impacts the hiring strategy which according to Currie’s et al. (2003) study often represents one of the larger sections of a university’s budget. Therefore their research shows that “fixed
contractual, temporary, and part-time employment schemes have generally increased in universities and society where public sector privatization has occurred.” (p.139). This phenomenon indicates increased requirement for flexibility, which must surely to some extent lessens the degree of bureaucracy since as Peter (2001) explains bureaucratic structures are often known to be rigid.

### 3.4.3.3 A unique culture

To summarize the first two parts of the specificities of culture within universities, based on the researches universities can be addressed in general as oftentimes public institutions, acting as private companies using most of times a neo-bureaucratic structure as we like to call it, by which we mean a hierarchical, with an increase effort for flexibility within the organization. Nevertheless, some exception has to be made for some universities since Currie et al. (2003) describes the trends within universities in regards to adaptation to globalization. Nonetheless, these characteristics set the political and economical environment of universities, which is significant since it sets the background for the study of culture within universities, “Current political and economic pressures and constraints upon universities are forcing a move from a person-oriented to a role- and power oriented culture” (Sergiovanni and Corbally, 1986, p.131).

According to their research the analysis of culture within universities has to be broken down into two different parts. First there is the material culture which is pretty straightforward and stands for the material artifacts of a university (for example the buildings, tools, equipment, books etc). The second part is the symbolic culture which is made up of for example the language, rituals, beliefs, etc. Moreover the symbolic culture basically looks into the organizational/institutional culture, which as mentioned above is influenced by strong economical and political factors but also according to them, is “power-, role, task and person oriented” (Sergiovanni and Corbally, 1986, p.131).

### 3.5 LEADERSHIP IN CROSS-CULTURAL STUDIES

Generally, cross-cultural research suggests that cultural environments can influence leadership concepts and results from various GLOBE research findings (House, Wright and Aditya, 1997; House et al. 2004; Chhokar et al. 2007) However, in relatively large number of cross cultural leadership studies, cultural differences are often taken for granted or only verbally described according to Hunt and Peterson (1997) in Dickson, Hanges and Lord (2001). Nevertheless, according to Morrill (2007) leadership as a process of change and motivation in higher education remains a repressed theme. The lack of adequate measurement and tasting of leadership, especially within Universities as also mentioned in the first chapter, makes it difficult to convince people that those identified differences, are the result of, or even related to, claimed cultural differences. Here we would like to make an assumption that maybe it is difficult to convince people that those cultural differences exist, which influence the way people perceive leadership, because it brings about rather salient changes affecting human organizations and institutions. Consequently, we can assume cultural challenges are also very much relevant to Universities governance, which includes also strategic planning towards internationalization and performed leadership styles. This because, Mallon (2004) in...
Morrill (2007) indicated that strategic planning and decision making is related to the governance of Universities. 
As Morrill (2007) quoted: “The role of governance is to define and delegate formal responsibility and authority within the organization, which are derived from the legal powers and fiduciary responsibilities vested in the governing board. (…) In turn, however, the operational and governance systems cannot function effectively unless there is a strategic link between them. The strategy systems set goals and priorities and allocate resources in the name of an overall direction for the future” (p. 82).

Although we do not intend to discuss the complexity of University governance and structures these findings are important because they are influential on the leadership. Nevertheless, this information is relevant to explain the decision making processes and leadership styles of the respondents later in the analysis.

Furthermore, according to Morrill (2007) the lack of research on leadership within Universities is an unusual and troubling form of neglect given the ever increasing demands on Universities in a challenging environment. If we are to bring new resources to bear on this neglect it will be in qualitative measure of leaderships that have emerged in a variety of styles within the selected Universities. To better test and modify leadership constructs and styles across cultures, we attempt to measure cultural differences and similarities that globalization has influenced so far, and relate these leadership variables to the interest of this study, which are based on collectivistic or individualistic cultural values.

The term leadership is usually defined by researchers according to their individual perspectives and the aspects of the phenomenon of most interest to them according to Yukl (2005). Consequently, leadership has been defined in terms of traits, behaviors, influence, interaction patterns, role relationship, and occupation of an administrative position (Yukl, 2005). First, in order to minimize the additional confusion that is caused by the use of other imprecise terms such as power, authority, management, administration, control, decision making and supervision to describe similar phenomena of leadership in this study we refer indeed to all these terms at some point as leadership. And, second for the interest of this study we have chosen the definition of leadership by Bass (1990) in Grint (1997):

“Leadership is an interaction between two or more members of a group that often involves a structuring or restructuring of the situation and the perceptions and expectations of the members… Leadership occurs when one group member modifies the motivation or competencies of others in the group. Any member of the group can exhibit some amount of leadership…” (p. 156).

This is essentially the definition of leadership adopted in this thesis. The only exception is that, herein, leadership is viewed as constituting to motivate or influence constructive behaviors aimed at pursuing group goals/organizational goals as quoted by House (1999):

“The ability of an individual to influence, motivate, and enable others to contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the organization…” (p.184).

However, as this study includes leaderships across- cultures, where leadership can be perceived differently as well as be effective in one culture and in others not, it is
important to define global leadership traits, behaviors, influences, interaction patterns...etc. across boarders. This statement is confirmed by Thomas and Inkson (2003) when they argued that there is no ‘one best way’ of leadership and that different leaders influence their followers in different ways. They quote: “A leader may capture the loyalty of some followers, while being rejected and ridiculed by others” (p. 126).

Finally, increasing globalization of education makes it more important to learn about effective leadership in different cultures within Universities, whereas it is vital to remember that the values and traditions in a national culture can change over time, just as they do in an organizational culture as pointed out by (Yukl, 2005). Moreover, according to Morrill (2007) change in the academic sphere is a test for the effectiveness of strategic leadership, and the issues that will occur will come into sharpest focus in initiatives that propose new or revised programs of study or methods of teaching and learning. So, if change is a test for the effectiveness of strategic leadership, we can assume that change can be also a test for effectiveness of any type of leadership within the higher education which can assist us in the analysis of the initiatives taken by the leaders towards multiculturalism and strategic plans towards internationalizations. The reason for our assumption is that these initiatives include new or revised student exchange programs, international recruitment and international partnerships. Although we are not discussing the effectiveness of the leadership, we do analyze if the interviewees perceive their leadership styles to be effective even when these strategic changes have been implemented or did they need to adapt their leadership styles to these changes. Therefore, further explanation of leadership theory in a cross-cultural sense will be discussed further in the next two chapters.

3.5.1 Review of leadership theory

Our understanding of culturally intelligent leadership begins with a look at different leadership styles. Although there are multiple frames and styles of leadership (Morrill, 2007) we discuss only the leadership styles that we assume to find within the tertiary education. Much of our understanding of how leadership works across cultures is based on research conducted by (Thomas et al. 2003; Trompenaars et al. 2004; Samovar et al. 2007; Yukl, 2005; Grint, 1997; Goethals and Burns, 2004; Morrill, 2007) and by GLOBE researchers (House et al. 2004; Chhokar, 2007; House et al. 2004), which is conducted by various groups/collaborators/coordinators from Universities across boarders. Two of the major GLOBE collaborators include also professors/faculty members of the two following selected Universities for this study: University of Calgary, Canada and National Sun Yat-Sen University, Taiwan.

As all of these researchers indicate that the tasks of a leader/manager are multifaceted and varied, the ultimate objective is to motivate employees to work cooperatively and productively in the achievement of a specific goal. And, as asserted by Samovar et al. (2007) for an international manager, the complexity of these tasks are compounded by the influence of culture, which shapes our expectations of leadership styles, communication behaviors, decision making processes, negotiation procedures, subordinate relations, personnel recognition and reward, considerations for promotion, and all the many other aspects of the workplace as mentioned earlier throughout the paper. Since there are three types of variables according to Yukl (2005) that are relevant for understanding leadership effectiveness, we will also discuss some of the (1)
characteristics of leaders in this paragraph, and (2) characteristics of followers on the IDV dimension in the next paragraph, which are important for this study. The primary basis for explaining the leadership styles and followers’ expectations is to limit the focus explicitly on the characteristics such motives and value traits and behavior of the leaders towards the followers; and behavior of the followers. Finally, (3) characteristics of the situation, such as the type of organizational unit (University), the size of it and complexity of University structure we have already discussed earlier in chapters 3.3.8 and 3.3.9.

Consequently, we will illustrate some well-known leadership styles in this chapter, for which their descriptions are important in order to analyze the leadership styles executed by the interviewees and if these have changed over time due to increase in cultural diversity in the working environment. These include:

- **Autocratic, Laissez-faire, Democratic and Bureaucratic leadership**

Grint (1997) highlights how Lewin and his colleagues have distinguished democratic leadership from autocratic and Laissez-faire styles, arguing that democratic leaders rely upon group decision-making, active member involvement, honest praise and criticism, and a degree of comradeship. By contrast, leaders using autocratic styles were domineering or uninvolved, bureaucratic similar to autocratic and Laissez-faire, in other words ‘hands off’ leadership style, which is also to some extent uninvolved are discussed in detail here below.

### 3.5.1.1 Democratic leadership

As asserted by Grint (1997) the most common name for ‘alternative leadership’ styles may be ‘democratic leaderships’ which have appeared repeatedly during the last seventy years. Democratic leadership includes various ‘alternative leaderships’ such as participative, transformational and servant leadership styles which are discussed briefly here below.

The reason for these alternative styles to be called under the common name democratic leadership style is that they all encourages employees to be a part of the decision making (Grint, 1997). This statement is also confirmed by (Yukl, 2005) as the author stated that democratic societies uphold the right of people to influence decisions that will affect them in important ways. In other words, a democratic manager would keep his or her employees informed about things that will affects their work and share decision making and problem solving responsibilities. This style requires the leader to be a coach who has the final say, but gathers information from staff members before making a decision, such as in transformational alternative leadership style (Riggio, Murphy and Pirozzolo, 2001).

Many employees like the trust they receive and respond with cooperation, team spirit, and high morale. Typically the forms of alternative styles of the democratic leader all to some extent develop plans to help employees evaluate their own performance, allow employees to establish goals, encourage employees to grow on the job and be promoted and recognizes and encourage achievement (Riggio, Murphy and Pirozzolo, 2001) as explained further in this section.
Participative leadership
Participative leaders accept input from one or more group members when making decisions and solving problems, but the leader retains mostly the final say when choices are made. Group members tend to be encouraged and motivated by this style of leadership according to Brody (2004) as he argues that participative leaders emphasize relationships and value staff as individuals, and value workplace satisfaction and harmony. This style of leadership often leads to more effective and accurate decisions, since no leader can be an expert in all areas, however in situations where staff needs direction, this style by itself is not sufficient (Brody, 2004). Input from group members with specialized knowledge and expertise creates a more complete basis for decision-making (Yukl, 2005) in comparison to directive leadership. However, important to notice is that participative leadership according to GLOBE research (2004) had only positive effects in the US, presumably because high individualism reinforces beliefs in participation. Hofstede (1980) also indicated that participative leadership behavior was not effective in cultures that were Collectivist and high in Power distance. Is this is true for International Universities in these cultures now that the globalization has brought about change?... is yet still the question.

Transformational leadership
With transformational leadership, the followers also feel trust, admiration, loyalty, and respect toward the leader, and they are motivated to do more than they originally expected to do, play as their coach and pay special attention to individual achievement (Riggio et al. 2001; Yukl, 2005). Because the original formulation of transformational leadership theory by Bass (1985) as asserted by Yukl (2005) triggers (1) behavior that arouses strong follower emotions and identification with the leader, (2) behavior that increases follower awareness of problems and influences followers to view problems from a new perspective; and (3) includes providing support, encouragement, and coaching to followers it is clear that a transformational leader can increase intrinsic motivation by increasing the perception of followers that task objectives are consistent with their authentic interests and values (Yukl, 2005). In other words, as Trompenaars et al. (2004) argued: “In the transformational style the leader transforms the consciousness of those led, and those led, by their response, transform the consciousness of the leader” (p. 204).

Servant leadership
Unlike leadership approaches with a top-down hierarchical style, like autocratic leaderships, servant leadership instead emphasizes collaboration, trust, empathy, and the ethical use of power and can be described rather as bottom-up style (Greenleaf and Spears, 1998). At heart, the individual is a servant first, making the conscious decision to lead in order to better serve others, not to increase their own power. The objective is to enhance the growth of individuals in the organization and increase teamwork and personal involvement (Greenleaf et al. 1998). These findings are also established by Trompenaars et al. (2004) when he highlights the importance of the mission of the company for a servant leader to give service to customers, which in this study would be the students of the University. If a servant leader is concerned with the service of customers/students, we can assume that they are keen on finding out what they want, which indicates that a servant leader would know how to listen, foresight, give empathy, be committed to the growth of the students, and build a community. Trompenaars’ also
points out that servant leaders are forever trying to give their status away, only to get it back again in gratitude and admiration.

3.5.1.2 Autocratic leadership

The extant literature on leadership in the business world suggests that autocratic leadership is useful in some contexts and should be avoided in others. It is one in which the manager retains as much power and decision-making authority as possible. The manager does not consult employees, nor are they allowed to give any input. Employees are expected to obey orders without receiving any explanations. The motivation environment is produced by creating a structured set of rewards and punishments. (Goethals et al. 2004) Like democratic leadership, autocratic leadership can be multifaceted (Goethals et al. 2004). Even though there is no written literature that autocratic leadership can be used as a common name for various ‘alternative leadership’ styles the statement by Goethals implies that there are facets that somehow differ in autocratic leadership decision making and that autocratic leadership is also closely tied to authoritarian personality type. Furthermore other studies by Riggio et al. (2001) and Conger and Kanungo (1998) also imply that a few alternative leaderships discussed here below all indicate that the leader always makes the final decision. Besides, Yukl (2005) points out varieties of autocratic decision, one in which the leader merely announces an autocratic decision, and the other in which the leader uses influence tactics such as rational persuasion, but in both ways always makes the final verdict. As the various authors have shown that different leadership styles within the frame of autocratic leadership do exist, we have chosen to discuss the following leadership styles as ‘alternative leaderships’ under the common name autocratic leadership: Directive and Authoritarian.

As asserted by Goethals et al. (2004) autocratic leadership leads to more accurate decisions when the leader is well versed in the subject under discussion and it can increase worker productivity, but only when the leader is present. Another example when autocratic decision would be inappropriate is when a decision is important and subordinates possess relevant knowledge and information lacked by the leader as asserted by Conger and Kanungo (1998).

**Directive leadership**

This leadership style involves focusing on followers’ work tasks: guiding and structuring followers’ activities, defining roles and communication patterns, planning, scheduling, and assigning responsibilities, clarifying expectations, goals, and work methods, motivating and conveying expertise and the importance of meeting quality and quantity requirements (GLOBE research: By Chhokar, Brodbeck, House, 2007). The focus on followers’ work tasks indicates that directive leaders are feeling personal responsibility for making major decision how things should be done and then acting as a taskmaster to get things done. The declaration of a directive leader to be in charge of the work process is also confirmed by Brody (2004) when he argued that directive leaders, although may occasionally ask questions or allow limited dialogue, there is no doubt that the decision is essentially and primarily theirs. Directive leader behaviors reflect for instance: the traditional autocratic patrón model of many Latin American countries in history, where the elite leader maintained a sizable social distance from followers who were generally compliant and showed due respect and loyalty to the leader (Chhokar et al. 2007). Moreover, effects on followers are strongly influenced by situational and
follower characteristics. The situational factors that increase effectiveness of directive leadership are rather found in larger groups, bureaucratic organizations, leaders with high expertise, and leaders who are supportive (Brody, 2004).

**Authoritarian leadership**

Authoritarian leaders provide clear expectations to group members on what should be done, when it should be completed, and how it should be accomplished (Chhokar et al. (2007). According to the authors they are high on demandingness and expect compliance from all concerned. They have a traditional conception of leadership based on obedience and respect for positional authority and status. They tend not to negotiate or consult with staff, students or the community, but expect their orders to be obeyed without question (Currie et al. 2003). Standards and expectations of the authoritarian leader may be high and reinforced by extrinsic motivation. There tends to be a high degree of dependency on the authoritarian leader who has the final say on everything. Schools led by authoritarian leaders can be characterized by low risk taking and innovation (Conger and Kanungo, 1998). Furthermore, according to Trompenaars et al. (2004) authoritarian leadership is best used in situations when there is little time for group decision-making or when the leader is the one best equipped to solve the problem or give directions.

**3.5.1.3 Laissez-faire leadership**

In this style, the leader allows the employees to make the decisions. However, the leader is still responsible for the decisions that are made. This is used when employees are able to analyze the situation and determine what needs to be done and how to do it. In this leadership style priorities are set up and certain tasks are delegated. This style is mostly used when the leader fully trusts and has confidence in the people under his/her lead and is rather useful when the leader is often away (Ting-Toomey, 1999). Another important issue to point out is that laissez-faire leader does not interfere when he/she gives power away according to Goethals et al. (2004).

**Delegative leadership**

According to Yukl (2005) delegation is a distinct type of power-sharing process that occurs when a manager gives subordinates the responsibility and authority for making some types of decisions formerly made by the manager. In other words, delegative leaders allow group members to make decisions. Because delegative leadership has almost the same traits as laissez-faire leadership we could say that it is a common style of ‘hands off’ leadership as Goethals et al. (2004) put it in which the leader does nothing. This style is best used in situations where the leader needs to rely on qualified employees. The leader cannot be an expert in all situations, which is why it is important to delegate certain tasks out to knowledgeable and trustworthy employees (Trompenaars et al. 2004).

**3.5.1.4 Bureaucratic leadership**

According to Morrill (2007) the objective of the Bureaucratic leader is rationality. Or as Lamore (1988) indicated in Morrill (2007) bureaucracy as the embodiment of all, encompassing ‘formal rationality’. Also Sergiovanni and Corbally (1986) indicate that
bureaucratic organizations are built on ideas of rationality, whereas rationality is built on ideas about the way decisions should be made.

In order to explain the relation of rationality and bureaucratic leadership we first use Webster’s definition of rationality. “Rationality as a term is related to the idea of reason, derived as much from older terms referring to thinking itself as from giving an account or an explanation” (Webster’s’ dictionary). However, if rationality is built on ideas about the way decisions should be made and if cultural values and beliefs have an impact on the decisions made, we can assume that rationality is perceived differently across cultures. This assumption is practically confirmed by Peters (2001) as he assessed that use of rational authority as a means of controlling individuals, suggested in formal models of bureaucratic management, is a culturally determined concept.

Before we discuss the characteristics of bureaucratic leadership style and the sources of authority we would like to elaborate briefly the relation between authority and bureaucratic leadership. Sergiovanni and Corbally (1988) described it best by highlight MacGregory Burns’s (1978) massive study on Leadership defining bureaucracy as “the simple application of authority from the top down” (p. 215). In other words, bureaucratic leadership style is based on following normative rules and adhering to lines of authority from top to bottom of the hierarchy.

For Max Weber (1968) highlighted by Sergiovanni and Corbally (1988), leadership in a world where funneling purpose through set of channels, performing activities that would otherwise not take place consists of the ability to point bureaucratic entities in particular directions, setting policy and defining organizational mission. However, in his classic account of bureaucracy Max Weber according to the authors includes the following characteristics of the bureaucratic style: Leaders that impose strict and systematic discipline on the followers and demand institution-like conduct in the workplace; Leaders that are empowered via the particular political and oral institution they hold - position power, where the followers are basically promoted based on their ability to conform to the rules of the institution. In other words followers are expected to obey leaders because authority is bestowed upon the leader as a part of their position in the institution/organization, where we can say that the leaders and their followers work ‘by the rules written’ to ensure that everybody follows procedures exactly.

In general though, studies show that in economics, sociology, and political science (Peters, 2001), a decision or situation is often called rational if it is in some sense optimal, and individuals or organizations/institutions are often called rational if they tend to act somehow optimally in pursuit of their goals. This also reflects on our earlier assumption on different perceptions of rationality because as mentioned in the literature review, many Universities consist of culturally diverse classrooms and working environment that consists of a group of people with different goals, expectations and communication styles, which indicate that the authority of leadership will be used differently across cultures even if all Universities would have a bureaucratic culture to some extent (Sergiovanni and Corbally, 1986; Peters, 2001). Therefore we discuss briefly also Weber’s three sources of authority in society as described by Peters (2001):

- First, the authority exercised by individuals within government or privately owned institutions, in which Universities are often both as described earlier, in a
traditional society would be performing a traditional hierarchy, but also confirmed by Brundrett, Burton and Smith (2003), Sergiovanni et al. (1986), Brundrett et al. (2003) and Peters (2001) all indicate an important factor for this thesis that this hierarchy may be designed by some divine/high connection, or because of possessing property which leads to a source of authority that is not flexible to any rational challenge/change.

- Second source of authority stems from the force of personality of the individual says Weber in (Peters, 2001). Here Peters mentions that over time, charisma tends to be institutionalized and converts into rational authority, where the leader is capable of commanding respect and obedience through the force of its individual personality according to Yukl (2005).

- In the third variety of authority the followers willingly accept the authority of the leader, simply because of the hierarchy of the Institution or society. In other words, a superior position in the hierarchy automatically provides the individual with authority.

However, important to notify here is that the more the society in whole values greater power distance the more this source of leadership will be excepted and followed without reasoning or questioning the authority. On the contrary, in societies where power distance is low, even though the University might have bureaucratic traits in their way of working, we can assume that the followers will not just unquestionably respect and obey the leader.

According to Chhokar et al. (2007) it seems that the old-fashioned leadership ideal of individual responsibility within a clear hierarchy (bureaucratic, administrative orientation) is changing toward a leadership ideal of interpersonal competencies and team orientation, which might be the consequence of the mixture of culture within the institutions, as well as them working with partners across-cultures (Warner, 2003) in order to react and adapt successfully to the rapid changes in the global environment. Here Warner (2003) gives an example that in Asian countries one can find organizations where the management system typically reflects the style of the majority or dominant partner they work with. If this is factual to some extent for the selected Universities we will find out in the analysis.

3.5.1.5 Variability in Leadership Styles

In the past several decades, management experts and researchers as clearly identified in the previous chapters have undergone a revolution in how they define leadership and what their attitudes are towards it. They have gone from a very classical autocratic approach to a very creative, participative approach. However, somewhere along the line, it was determined that not everything old was bad and not everything new was good as explained later in this section. Rather, different styles were needed for different situations and each leader needed to know when to exhibit a particular approach.

For example, countries in which the traditional autocratic political systems are replaced by democratic systems are likely to become more accepting of participative leadership and empowerment in organizations according to Peters (2001). One of the reasons for this change might be due to globalization and its effects on the increase of cultural diversity in the working environment. Furthermore, Yukl (2005) pointed out for
example that participative leadership can include a variety of different decision procedures to involve other people in making these decisions in which most theorists would acknowledge that there are varieties of participation. These, include Consultation: where the managers asks other people for their opinions and ideas, then makes the decision alone after seriously considering their suggestions and concerns; Joint Decision: where the manager meets with others to discuss the decision problem and make a decision together, having no more influence over the final decision than any other participant; and Delegation: where the manager gives an individual or group the authority and responsibility for making certain decisions.

Also transformational leadership may be directive or participative (Bass, 1999) and autocratic leader may present a decision made without prior consultation or participation, but is willing to modify it in the face of strong objections and concerns; or presents a tentative proposal and actively encourages people to suggest ways to improve it; or presents a problem and asks others to participate in diagnosing it and developing solutions, but then makes the decision alone (Yukl, 2005).

For example, Brody (2004) implies where a crisis exists, where staff have become complacent, or where difficult budget or personnel decisions must be made, directive leadership style would be rather appropriate over delegative or participative one. Furthermore, because Universities contain to some extent bureaucratic culture according to various scholars (Sergiovanni and Corbally, 1986; Peters, 2001), in which most of the faculty members, staff and administrative workers are highly educated with high expertise on different levels of education, we can assume to find a variety of directive leadership styles within the selected Universities. However, literature shows that we might also find for instance transformational or charismatic leadership in a bureaucratic culture according to Sergiovanni et al. (1986) and House et al. (2004). Warner (2003) also points out that authoritarian leadership, benevolent leadership and charismatic leadership interrelating with each other can be also found in many East Asian countries. Here, he gives an example that Thai society would be one who is primarily benevolent, though utilizes authoritarian approaches as needed.

On the other hand, important to notice are the findings of GLOBE research (House et al. 2004; Chhokar et al. 2007) that in the US and Western Europe, directive leaders are not necessarily autocratic or authoritarian when communicating with followers about their tasks. But in some Latin American cultural traditions, a status-oriented authoritarian style in dealing with followers has been more prevalent according to Chhokar et al. (2007). Besides, the authors point out that directive leadership had a positive impact on performance in for example Taiwan, China and in some Latin American countries, all three collectivistic cultures (House et al. 2004). Nevertheless, directive leadership for example is often combined with supportive behavior in most effective form, showing high results in certain collectivist cultures (Chhokar et al. 2007).

Another aspect of leadership important to discuss in education is leadership that may be either formal or informal in nature. Professors, department head, associate deans, union representative, member of the school’s governance are among the many designations associated with formal teacher leadership roles according to Brundrett, Burton and Smith (2003). Those appointed to formal leadership roles also are sometimes expected to induct new teachers/academic staff into the school, and to positively influence the willingness and capacity of other faculty members/administrators to implement change...
in the University (Brundrett et al. 2003). However, some academic staff/administrators exercise informal leadership in their Universities by sharing their expertise, by volunteering for new projects and by bringing new ideas to the school (Currie et al 2003).

From these research findings it is quite clear that scholars imply that at times, a certain leadership approach may be more appropriate than other and sometimes are combined because of organizational context, culture or the nature of the situation. This statement is also confirmed by Lord and Maher (1991) as authors specifically implied that Leadership is most effective when the fit between followers’ leadership concepts and attributes of the leader is high. This because followers are more motivated and committed when their leadership expectations are met and misunderstandings and reluctance against influence attempts are less likely (Chhokar et al. 2007). In other words, the more leadership concepts differ between managers and followers, the less influence will be exerted and the more misunderstandings will occur. That leadership is hardly ever found in one style is clearly defined by Chhokar et al. (2007):

“Leadership styles overlap with each other and their relationships to societal cultural values are of particular relevance to predicting which leadership style will be successful –even if not all too positively valued” (p. 179).

In short, these findings also indicate that we might find variability of leadership styles within some of the selected Universities, both in individualistic and collectivistic cultures. While the proper leadership style depends on the situation, there are a few other factors that also influence which leadership style to use which are not thoroughly discussed, but are considered to some extent and are important to notify for the limitation of this study. Some of these factors are discussed earlier in the paper and some later in the section Research Design and Methodology. As employees are individuals with different personalities and backgrounds the leadership style use will vary depending upon the individual employee and what he or she will respond best to. However, we refer to cultural background of the followers expectations in terms of individualism and collectivism. From the leaders perspective we consider only his/her cultural background, values and leadership ethics towards internationalization in terms of cultural diversity and international recruitment and not their personality, knowledge, and experiences. And last but not least, we consider University culture (values and traditions), systems, multiculturalism of the working environment and strategic plans towards internationalization that all to some extent influence how a manager/leader acts.

3.5.2 Global leadership qualities

From these empirical findings it is clear that more and more leaders find themselves dealing with followers who are culturally diverse due to globalization, in settings where different traditions and expectations for leadership exist. Therefore it is vital for any leader or prospective leader to develop a culturally intelligent approach. For example, people from different cultures will react to autocratic or democratic leadership in different and often unpredictable ways, where Thomas et al. (2003) mentions that there are also numerous other factors, such as the structure of the tasks that need to be accomplished, the power of the leader, and the behavior of subordinates. Here, the authors highlight the importance of the subordinates to be frequently trying to influence the leader just as he/she is trying to influence them. So, this means that many possible
propositions about leadership must be hedged in order to create global leadership qualities.

Yet, an important leadership responsibility is to interpret confusing events and build consensus around strategies for dealing with threats and opportunities as pointed out by Yukl (2005). How a leader influences follower perception and prospects for success is relevant for evaluating ethical leadership within a multicultural environment (Verluyten, 2001). Thus, in situations where sharing information and interpreting events involves competing values, there are complex ethical issues to be resolved and the Yukl (2005) points out that this aspect of ethical leadership deserves more attention.

Even more controversial is an attempt to change the underlying values and beliefs of individual followers. Some writers contend that this type of leader influence is clearly unethical, even when the intended outcome is to benefit followers as well as the organization (Yukl, 2005; Verluyten, 2001). Furthermore, Verluyten (2001) asserts that a large-scale organizational change, which might be a University, will not be successful without some changes in member beliefs and perceptions. So, if leaders must also be able to understand how people from different cultures view them and interpret their actions, we can assume that an ethical approach, such as being culturally aware must be integrated when leading a multicultural team.

And finally, as suggested earlier, another aspect of culturally intelligent leadership (global leadership qualities) involve also focus not on the leader but on the followers which will be discussed further in chapter 3.7 in the cultural context of IDV value dimension.

3.6 CULTURAL VALUES AND EFFECTS ON LEADERSHIP

According to various authors, cultural values and traditions can influence the attitudes and behaviors of leaders in a number of different ways (House et.al. 1997; Yukl, 2005). Nevertheless, cultural values are likely to be internalized by managers/leaders who grow up in a particular culture, and these values will influence their attitudes and behavior in ways that may not be conscious. In addition, cultural values are reflected in societal norms about the way people relate to each other (Yukl, 2005).

Not only from the managers’ perspective will the perception of leadership differ, but also employees’ perceptions and expectations. As stated by Thomas et al. (2003) cultural differences in expectations of leadership affect the perception of who is perceived as a leader and what they expect from him/her. In other words, how employees from different cultural background might understand a situation, whether they might expect a leader to decide for them what they should do, or expect from the leader to be pointed out to share their opinion in meetings, or whether and how they might seek to exercise influence in their own right will differ per employee. This proclamation is confirmed by Thomas et al. (2003) by indicating that different cultures have different prototypes of what a leader should be like. Nevertheless, Warner (2003) corroborated it best when he asserted that the influence of individual attitudes and behaviors in organizations is likely to be pervasive, extending to matters such as the motivational consequences of managerial practices and styles, norms of communication, the willingness to take
individual responsibility, the conduct of meetings, and modes of conflict resolution. Because the IDV cultural dimension measures the degree to which individuals are integrated into groups as mentioned in paragraph 3.3.4 and because it is one of the most used and tested cultural dimensions in the field of cross cultural management and organizational studies (Thomas et al. 2003) we will discuss its different cultural expectations on leadership here below.

3.6.1 Individualistic cultural expectations and leadership

Thomas and Inkson (2003) argue that Westerner countries tend to be individualist, where both leaders and followers will attempt to involve themselves in decision making to maximize their individual influence and gain for themselves a good result as opposite to collectivist societies discussed here below. In Hofstede’s (1980) terms, North America and Western Europe are individualistic and low in power distance as discussed earlier. Related to the correlation of these dimensions, Ting-Toomey (1999) asserts that in low power distance work situations, power is evenly distributed, where subordinates expect to be consulted, and the ideal boss would be a resourceful democrat. According to Hoppe (1998) in Hofstede (2001) this translates into a culture that values individual contentment, equality, practicality, is at ease with change, achievement oriented, and task driven. These results underlay much of current Westerner management psychology, including an emphasis on individual responsibility, individual rewards, action orientation, valuing tasks over relationships, a measurement driven approach and focus on short-term gains and winning, just to name a few that are highlighted by (Riggio, et al. 2001).

Besides, Thomas et al. (2003) corroborates this individualistic state of mind to be common for managers in individualistically oriented culture to bear the total responsibility for either success or failure of the business/project, which also emphasizes the importance on individual achievement. Furthermore, findings from GLOBE research (2004) discussed in chapter 5 confirm that we could assume to find particular differences in the volume of multiculturalism in the working environment, leadership styles and implemented change within the selected International Universities on this cultural value dimension.

3.6.2 Collectivistic cultural expectations and leadership

In collectivistic culture even though the leader might play the most important role in successful accomplishment of the task, reward is often given to all collective members as opposed to in individualistic cultures. According to Hofstede (2001) collectivist societies are inclined to value pro-social behavior that conforms to social norms, morals and traditions. For instance, in the Chinese distinctively collectivist culture Chinese education emphasizes the goals of the group or society, fosters in-group belonging, demands cooperation and interdependence, stresses moral behavior, and pursues harmony (Samovar et al. 2007). Moreover, the authors point out that Chinese teachers, consequently, hold a position of moral authority and instruct students in the culture’s moral rules of conduct. This statement reflects on Ting-Toomey’s (1999) argument that in large power work situations, the power of an organization is centralized at the upper management level, where subordinates expect to be told what to do, and the ideal boss would be the benevolent autocratic role.
These values are commonly expressed in a number of forms that are of particular relevance to management in many countries. For instance collectivist societies can rely more on the leader to involve the group, because that will be the shared expectation of both leader and group members (Ting-Toomey, 1999). In many Latin American and East Asian countries respect for hierarchy and learning means that long-serving senior figures in organizations are readily accorded to their leadership status (Warner, 2003). In sum, all the above points tend to increase the followers’ expectation that their leaders’ characteristics should fit into the traditional leadership prototypes in their minds. Not conforming to social norms and values is likely to make followers quickly perceive a leader as incompetent and not deserving of that position, despite his/her personal achievements. This means that in collectivist society, followers are more likely to accept the leadership that fits into their implicit leadership prototypes, rather than being aroused to compliance and devotion by leaders’ extraordinary performance as in the opposite continuum of this cultural dimension.

3.7 LITERATURE FRAMEWORK MODEL

![Figure 1.3: Model of the impact of globalization on the cultural functions of educational readiness towards internationalization (van Eysendeyk and Rebac, 2009)](image)

The research model summarizes the frame of the whole research giving a broader overview of the influences involved concerning higher education. Although, every aspect illustrated in the model is correlated, the model should be looked at from left to the right. The research model is basically an inverted telescope which illustrates that the
Global environment has influence on the cultural environment, which has affect on the educational environment and consequentially on the internal environment of a University/Institution, affecting individual’s behaviors how they react towards internationalization and how they manage/lead their subordinates. So, basically, as we refer to the purpose of this study, the importance here in the end is to find out if their behaviors and actions have changed due to globalization.

The model is designed to provide reasoning behind the discussed literature review and research framework, and to clarify the use of the adapted framework of Dopfer and Potts (2008) as explained in chapter 1.1.5 and 2.1 on Macro: Globalization, Meso: Localization, Micro: individualism; which we have based on Cheng’s model of Triplization of Education, illustrated as the educational environment quadrangle in this model. The reason for limiting this research down to only cultural globalization functions of the educational environment on these three levels is because Cuvusgil and Das (1997) asserted that cross-cultural research to remain valid should not try to look at too big of a picture, but rather narrow down to a specific function/environment. From the literature and as illustrated in the model it is clear that Globalization has influence on national culture, which includes the values of individualism and collectivism. The educational environment on the societal level of cultural functions we focus only on Hofstede’s IDV cultural dimension, which influence the behavior and actions taken on the institutional/localization level. In other words, cultural values of individualism influence actions implemented by the Universities towards internationalization. Nevertheless they also influence the individual level of cultural functions. With this we mean that individuals’ behavior within the Universities is influenced by their cultural values of individualism how they react towards the many facets of Internationalization, as consequence of the Global challenges. More in detail, we refer here in the last quadrant to organizing change and leadership as institutional variables which are the groundwork of the field research and have influence on the whole educational environment. In other words, literature review on the Global environment, Cultural environment, Educational environment and Internal environment of Organizing Change and Leadership are the foundation of the field research, which is based on findings on strategic implementations towards internationalization and leader’s attributes and behavior towards multiculturalism within the working environment.

In sum, the three levels of Chengs’ (2005) cultural functions, which we also describe as macro-meso-micro levels of educational environment correlate with each other and are dependent on each other. But, also all the environments are correlated with each other, including the influences of other global factors such as economic, technological and political factors, which we do not focus on in this thesis. Our thesis as clearly defined in the beginning focuses only on educational systems, specifically influences by the Cultural globalization of society’s basic values: individualism versus collectivism, therefore leaving all the other global factors out.

3.8 DELIMITATIONS OF LITERATURE REVIEW

The selection of available documents, books, articles published on the topics discussed in the literature review are used to make better understanding of the interest of this particular study. Although we do not use all the information stated in the literature review, it is important to clarify for the reader the gaps that one might miss if not...
discussed in order to understand the purpose of our study. Furthermore, it was important to evaluate certain topics in a larger sense in order to identify relevant information and to outline existing research conducted to point out that there has been insufficient research conducted in a cross-cultural context within the higher education as mentioned throughout the Literature review. The literature review also evaluates thoroughly the content of the research framework producing a rationale and justifications for our study. The research framework on the other hand refines the topics; Globalization, Internationalization, Leadership and Organizing change related to cultural aspect in higher education that is rather designed to highlight the perspective of the research, unlike the literature review that is designed to enrich the understanding of the field for the reader. Because interpretations of cultural issues, values and norms are culturally related, we have tried to include literature written on this matter by Western and non-Western scholars. However, most of the literature we found is rather written by Westerners, limiting our views on Westerners’ interpretation of the cultural aspects and possibly creating biases of our perceptions of later analyzed data as well. Furthermore, much of the collected data by the scholars in cross-cultural comparative studies is qualitative data, leaving space for the researchers for personal interpretations according to Creswell (1994). The personal interpretations of the findings can also create a possible bias in the literature affecting our interpretation of the findings too. We have tried to minimize this limitation by also using collected data through quantitative studies, such as for example by Hofstede, (1980) House et al. (2004) and Chhokar et al. (2007).

4 RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter outlines the research design and methodology that was used to explore the implementations of change and leaderships towards internationalization of higher education between collectivistic and individualistic countries. The fundamental aim is to depict a successful implementation of change within the Universities if needed at all by using the correct and appropriate design and methodology for this research as in detail explained in this section.

4.1 RESEARCH DESIGN

Type of cross-cultural management research: Comparative research

4.1.1 Execution procedures

Composition of the research team: The research is conducted by two people from different cultures, originating from Belgium (individualistic) and Bosnia and Herzegovina (collectivistic), living most of their life in France and the Netherlands (both individualistic) with various international experiences, including study abroad programs to three of the selected universities, which are in Sweden, Canada (individualistic) and Indonesia (collectivistic). Important to mention is that both researchers have experienced living, working and studying in both collectivistic and individualistic cultures, which makes us throughout experiences culturally aware of the similarities and differences of the cultural dimension. Nevertheless, we have both experienced the different University cultures on the IDV dimension. In short, the
research is conducted by multicultural researchers that are culturally aware, creating decentralized interpretations of the findings.

**Conceptual equivalence:** The translation of the key terms is explained and translated rather in a dynamic mode (also known as functional equivalence as mentioned earlier) (Eglene and Dawes, 2006). Meaning that the research attempts to convey the thought expressed in a source text or to create conceptual equivalence (if necessary, at the expense of literalness, original word order, the source text’s grammatical voice, etc.) rather than literal equivalence of the key terms. The reason for this is because this cross-cultural comparative research is aiming to analyze cultural dynamics when implementing change throughout in-depth semi constructed interviews. With this approach we attempt to depict cultural behaviors and natural rendering in the particular cultural dimensions rather than trying to conduct formal attempts to render the text word-for-word at the expense of natural expression in the target language that would create limitations to the research of finding out genuine cultural behaviors. Another reason for this approach is that the interviews are conducted in English and for some of the selected countries it is not their first language. Therefore, with this approach we aim to minimize the limitations in validity of the research.

**Research instruments:** In order to produce equivalent results across cultures this research is conducted with assistance of the following research methods: First, desk research includes secondary data based on quantitative research as well as on gained statistical data from the interviewees themselves. With this approach we seek causal determination, prediction and generalization of findings such as the volume of mobilizing international students in the university, the volume of heterogeneity within the institution (University), the increase of multiculturalism within the organization (international staff recruitment), but also institutional variables, such as organizational change and leadership styles (Hofstede, 2001) between societies. However, we limit our research to one Faculty of the Universities, in particular the Business Faculties. Consequently, the field research provides also primary data based on qualitative research seeking enlightenment, understanding, and examination to situations such as leadership behaviors, organizational behaviors, cultural artifacts and dealing with change management towards internationalization (Hoeplf, 1997). With use of different instruments we aim to understand the strengths and minimize the limitations of reliability and validity of the research. Further explanation about the methodology is discussed more in depth in section 4.2 including clarification of the etic approach of this research.

**Selection of translators:** As we aimed first to collaborate with a Spanish/English speaking translator to minimize the limitations of the language barrier for the selected University in Colombia, where exchange programs are offered only in Spanish, it was in the end not needed because the decision maker in Colombia is from German origin.

**4.1.2 Data analysis procedures**

**Culturally specific versus universal findings:** The universal perspective suggests that some concepts are generalizable across cultures. This comparative research focuses on concepts of individualistic versus collectivistic cultures that are generalizable across countries and have generally same values and beliefs on this particular cultural
dimension. Furthermore, the general idea of leadership is considered as a universal phenomenon, at least some attributes as asserted by Bass (1997) and Hofstede (1980) in Hersen (2004) that no society has been found without some kind of leadership. On the other hand the culture-specific perspective suggests that individuals with different cultural values may perceive leadership and organizational change differently (Hofstede, 2001). Therefore, we aim to find culturally specific results of individualists and collectivists.

**Cross-country analysis:** It is important to consider that this cross-cultural or cross-national analysis of the results is more complicated endeavor because of the language problem, physical distance and time differences between the researchers and the interview participants. However, we believe the mixture of secondary research and primary research data conducted has assisted us to develop a richer understanding of the material. Furthermore, with assistance of the current technology of online telecommunication we were able to conduct 8 interviews with the decision makers/Associate Deans across-cultures for free, using Skype and 12Voip programs to conduct the interviews, which was possible because of the influence of the technological global influence. And, one interview and the pilot interview have been conducted face-to-face, which were at JIBS in Sweden.

### 4.1.3 Research sample

**Number of cultures:** Nine cultures divided on Hofstede’s cultural dimension individualism versus collectivism; four scoring high on collectivism and five scoring high on individualism.

**Languages involved for conducting the research:** In the four selected individualistic countries the local language is English, whereas in the five of the selected countries/universities main language spoken is the local language offering programs in English or bilingual programs. And in Colombia the student exchange programs are only offered in Spanish. However, the interviews are executed only in English.

**Culture as a variable:** The cultural is captured through secondary sources as well as interviews. Moreover, culture is defined for the purposes of the study rather than a broad definition.

**Sample selection:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individualistic:</th>
<th>International Universities</th>
<th>Respondents:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. United States (91)</td>
<td>United States, Fresno California State University: Graduate School of Management: Craig School of Business <a href="http://www.craig.csufresno.edu">www.craig.csufresno.edu</a></td>
<td>Associate Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Australia (90)</td>
<td>Australia, Melbourne Victoria University: Faculty of Business and Law <a href="http://www.vu.edu.au">www.vu.edu.au</a></td>
<td>Associate Dean International</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Cross-cultural comparative study – Master Thesis - JIBS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>University and School Details</th>
<th>Role in the University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>Great Britain, The University of Manchester: Manchester Business School <a href="http://mbs.ac.uk">www.mbs.ac.uk</a></td>
<td>Director of Manchester Enterprise center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Canada, Calgary University of Calgary: Faculty of Management: Haskayne Business School <a href="http://haskayne.ucalgary.ca">http://haskayne.ucalgary.ca</a></td>
<td>Director of Centre for International Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Sweden, Jönköping Jönköping University: Jönköping International Business School <a href="http://hj.se">www.hj.se</a></td>
<td>Associate Dean for Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Colombia, Medellin Universidad EAFIT: Management School <a href="http://eafit.edu.co">www.eafit.edu.co</a></td>
<td>Head of International Business Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Indonesia, Jogykarta Gadjah Mada University: Master of Management Program and the Faculty of Economics and Business <a href="http://mmugm.ac.id">www.mmugm.ac.id</a></td>
<td>Head of office of International Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Thailand, Bangkok Chulalongkorn University: Faculty of Economy <a href="http://econ.chula.ac.th">www.econ.chula.ac.th/</a></td>
<td>Director of International Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Republic of China, Kaohsiung National Sun Yat-Sen University: College of Management <a href="http://nsysu.edu.tw">www.nsysu.edu.tw</a></td>
<td>Head of Division of General Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Collectivist:

1. Colombia (13)
   - Colombia, Medellin Universidad EAFIT: Management School [www.eafit.edu.co](http://eafit.edu.co)
   - Head of International Business Department

2. Indonesia (14)
   - Indonesia, Jogykarta Gadjah Mada University: Master of Management Program and the Faculty of Economics and Business [www.mmugm.ac.id](http://mmugm.ac.id)
   - Head of office of International Affairs

3. Thailand (20)
   - Thailand, Bangkok Chulalongkorn University: Faculty of Economy [www.econ.chula.ac.th/](http://econ.chula.ac.th)
   - Director of International Affairs

4. Republic of China, Taiwan (17)
   - Republic of China, Kaohsiung National Sun Yat-Sen University: College of Management [www.nsysu.edu.tw](http://nsysu.edu.tw)
   - Head of Division of General Affairs

### 4.1.4 Background of the Universities selected

**Craig School of Business, FCU, US**
California State University, Fresno was founded as Fresno State Normal School in 1911. Craig School of Business is one of eleven Academic Schools and Divisions that Fresno California State University offers. Craig School of Business offers various undergraduate and graduate programs to program students as well as exchange students. According to their Mission and Strategic Plan 2009 the Craig School of Business at California State University, Fresno aims to continue in providing high quality business education to a diverse student body, offering well rounded active learning experiences.
and contributing to economic development in central California. Although the Business School has its own strategic plan, its mission is consistent with the California State University Fresno’s mission that includes the following priorities: economic enhancement of community, productive careers, engaging in research, community service and partnerships with professional community both learning institution abroad and business community.

**Faculty of Business and Law, VU, AU**
Victoria University (VU) was founded in 1916 as Footscray Technical School. After successive mergers with TAFE colleges in Melbourne's western suburbs, VU was established in 1990. They promote themselves today as one of the largest and most culturally diverse education institutions in Australia. Victoria University's Faculty of Business and Law is one of the three Faculties VU accounts. The Faculty specializes in business education, research and consultancy, and offers undergraduate and postgraduate courses. It exists of five teaching schools, as we would call it here rather programs, and three specialized research centers. Their International networks stretches across the world including Malaysia, China, Singapore, Europe, Japan, which are not only the their International University partners for exchange programs, but also research projects, and partners they sustain in some of those countries creating opportunities for other students across boarders to profit from their education. The Faculties’ vision is based on VU’s vision, which is to continue commit to excellence in teaching, training, research and scholarship. From their website it is clear that they aim to increase the participation in commercial ventures and activities and be recognized locally and internationally for the way they respond to the changing nature of work and the workplace.

**Manchester Business School, UofM, UK**
The University of Manchester has been created by bringing together The Victoria University of Manchester and UMIST, two of Britain's most distinguished universities, to create a powerful new force in British Higher Education. Both of the merging Universities have a long trace of history back to 1824 and 1851. The UofM is dividend into four Faculties. Then each Faculty is divided into a number of Schools, of which Manchester Business School is one of the largest ones. The merging propensity of UofM is also vivid at the Manchester Business School because the name of the School was formed as a result of the merger of the Institute of Innovation Research, The Victoria University of Manchester's School of Accounting and Finance, UMIST's Manchester School of Management and Manchester Business School in 2004. As a result the School offers now a wider choice of programs and electives to their students and more opportunities for career development amongst their staff. Their vision is to stand out as an international and progressive School in the increasingly competitive environment. Besides their International Partners, like in Australia they support a great number of students and projects and Schools worldwide through distance-learning and external programs.

**Haskayne Business School, UofC, CA**
The Haskayne School of Business is founded in 1967 and is one of the 14 Schools at the University of Calgary. The School is promoted as a progressive and innovative business school with an international reputation for in for influencing the practice of management and leadership through quality teaching and research. The business school offers a full
range of degree programs and a variety of non-degree Executive Education programs and services to corporate clients and working professionals, both in Calgary and internationally. UofC in general recognizes the global challenges of the 21st century and issues that are at the forefront of the forces that shape the world and the communities closer to together. This is evident because they mention this factor openly on their website and promote their commitment to internationalization which reflects the growing importance of international efforts playing in world-class university and education. They claim to support internationalization by recognizing it as an integral part of the economic, political and social realities of our campus and the wider community. Each School has its own International Partners network; however the UofC has also established three centers with a wider network system that each School can benefit from: Center for International Partnerships & Cooperation (CIPAC), Centers for International Students & Study Abroad (CISSA) and International Development Center (IDC). Moreover, the mission and vision statements of Haskayne School of Business could not be found on the website, probably due to the fact that a new Dean had just taken the position as stated in the latest news on their website and confirmed later in the analysis by the interviewee.

**Jönköping International Business School, JU, SE**

Jönköping International Business School (JIBS) was launched in 1994 and is one of four Schools Jönköping University encompasses. JIBS offers various undergraduate, graduate and doctoral programs, conducts research and also offers education for executives. On their website JIBS is promoted as internationally very well known for some areas, which include entrepreneurship and research, also the program we are taking at JIBS. They work with a large amount of Partner Universities across boarders, which will be discussed later in the analysis, but specific about JIBS from own experience is that the international dimension of the school means that even international students that study at JIBS can go and study yet again abroad. Important to note is that JIBS was able to recruit many and accompany many students in a short amount of time due to the fact that JIBS is part of a foundation and not state owned. Their vision states to be recognized as the most entrepreneurial, pioneering and bold business school by 2011. From their strategic plan 2009 – 2012 it is clear now that the development of international competitive research and teaching capacity has risen; the aim is to upgrade the overall organization through synergies between research and teaching.

**Universidad EAFIT, CO**

EAFIT University is a Higher Education Institution, founded in 1971. The Management Schools is one of the four Schools EAFIT University exists from and offers various undergraduate and postgraduate programs. Its mission is based on EAFIT University’s Mission, which is to form individuals able to participate in the development of their community, through programs offered that will give them international competences in their knowledge areas, within a framework of academic excellence. From their website it is clear that The University in whole seeks to be recognized nationwide and internationally for its academic and research excellence. Important to mention here that they explicitly promote their open and democratic culture that aims to develop the intellectual ability of students and teachers in all academic programs. Their importance lays in advanced technologies and a pedagogical model centered on the students, maintaining relationships with other educational institutions, both nationally and
internationally and to continue upgrading staff abilities and programs. And last, but not least the main objective of the Strategic Plan 2006 -2012 is to reach preeminence, that is, the recognition of superior quality by the academic community in the region, built on the following priority axes: learning, discovery, and commitment.

**Faculty of Economics and Business, GMU, ID**
The Faculty of Economics and Business at the Gadjah Mada University is one of the 18 Faculties offering a range of undergraduate, diploma study and graduate programs. The GMU is the oldest and largest University in Indonesia, founded in 1949. Also here, the Faculties’ mission and vision is based on the GMU’s stated vision on their website, which is to be a premier program in postgraduate professional business education at both the national and regional level. On the international level the vision includes to be part of international community mainly in postgraduate business education. Their mission is based on three levels: Educational, Research and Public Service mission. They all include development on national and international level, to provide modern economic sector with professional managers and resources of business academics and practices with qualified research results and business cases.

**College of Management, NSYSU, TW**
The College of Management is one of six colleges at the NSYSU in Taiwan. The establishment of the NSYSU has a long history of foundation that started in 1923 and attempts for re-establishment. But, in 1980 NSYSU was successfully set up in Taiwan by a succession of Presidents that all carry the tradition of nurturing the University’s growth and development. They promote themselves to have grown tremendously and being recognized as one of Taiwan’s important research and learning institution with international distinction. In 2003 they have put up an Office of International Affairs (OIA) for the purpose to better facilitate the International academic exchanges and collaborations between the Colleges and Institutions across boarders. One of their objectives is to strengthen their academic ties in the US, CA, EU, AU, NZ, JP and Southeast Asian countries. Their objective is to provide faculty and students with more opportunities to study abroad and to provide assistance to academic units in recruiting or inviting renowned scholars from abroad and in this way to broaden their international vision.

**Faculty of Economy, CU, TH**
Chulalongkorn University (CU), Thailand's first institution of higher learning, was officially founded in 1917. Chulalongkorn University is now composed of a total of 41 faculties, departments, colleges, academic, research, and service institutes, and academic offices. One of the Faculties is the Faculty of Economics, which came into being in 1970 as a result of the collaboration between the Department of Economics in the Faculty of Commerce and the Department of Public Finance in the Faculty of Political Science. Over the years, the Faculty has expanded in size and reputation, offering courses leading to the degrees of BA, MA and PhD and having acquired international recognition. They promote themselves to be committed to excellence in teaching and research, where they highlight that several faculty members have also been appointed advisors and consultants to numerous agencies, both domestically and internationally.
4.2 METHODOLOGY

The methodology part is essential, because it defines the process of the research and accounts for the validity and relevancy of the results as described by Creswell (1994). In the first part we describe our process based approach in terms of socio-cultural researchers. This leads us to describe the logic behind our reasoning and how our research conduct fits within the theoretical framework. Once the steps for the research are defined, we move onto describing how we defined our sample, to then describe it. Once the respondents are defined, we then explain what type of data we aim to collect. Furthermore in order to test our method of research we decided to implement a pilot interview, therefore a part of the methodology is dedicated to thoroughly explaining its purpose. The last sections are dedicated to describing our approach for the analysis of the data and the limits of the used qualitative data.

4.2.1 Methodology processes

This section aims to justify the validity and relevancy of our study. As matters of fact, many past cross-cultural researches have been criticized, especially in terms of relevancy, for example Hantrais and Mangen (1996) refer to some of them as broad-bush comparisons P.67. A reason for this is set forward by Cavusgil and Das (1997) who point out that the key to cross-cultural research is that it should be based on a specific methodology in order to remain relevant and avoid errors. Based on their research we decided to use their model figure 1.4, which describes the different processes necessary for building up a cross-cultural research. The first steps which are defining and constructing the theory have been thoroughly detailed in the earlier parts of this research and states the parameters which are the different cultures being studied based on their individualistic and collectivistic behaviors, and the different variables related to these. Nevertheless these are being summarized below in the research model figure 1.4.

The second step of the research which consists of acquiring sustainable knowledge of the parameters, variables, and cultures investigated has also been developed previously in the literature review. The following steps which have also been mentioned to some extend in earlier parts will be developed below.
Figure 1.4 A Generic Process Model for Cross-cultural research (Cuvusgil and Das, 1997)

- **Step 1:** Define
- **Step 2:** Theory & Construct
  - Parameters
  - Dependent variables (Organization level)
  - Independent variables (Socio-cultural level)
- **Step 3:** Conceptual Equivalence & Functional Equivalence
  - Conceptual knowledge (Local collaborators)
  - Multi-cultural researchers
  - Literature review of culture/domestic studies
- **Step 4:** Construct sampling design
  - Culture/country variety
  - Theory test/compare practices
  - Randomization
  - Sample size and cost factors
- **Step 5:** Develop instrumentation
  - Language (back translation, panel analysis, parallel analysis)
  - Equivalence of instrumentation (emetic measures, factor analysis, etc.)
  - Equivalency of administration (Timing, settings, local administration, etc.)
  - Equivalency of response (Sample size, incentives, local language, etc.)
- **Step 6:** Plan data collection
  - Timing
  - Subject ego, literacy, status, commitment, etc.
  - Local administrators
- **Step 7:** Do analysis
  - Aggregation/disaggregation (Congruency analysis, etc.)
  - Multivariate methods
- **Do interpretation**
  - Compare inter-country before intra-country
  - External validity
  - Cross-cultural researcher interpretation
4.2.2 Sample structure

As pointed out by Cavusgil and Das (1997), the validity of cross-cultural research is dependent of the sample which has to be relevant to the frame of work in order to produce usable date for the research. As will be further developed in a later section explaining the use of interviews and as Punch (2005) explains, there is a significant difference between designing a sample within the frame of qualitative and quantitative research. Indeed in the case of qualitative research, the choice for respondent included in the sample is far less based on representativeness, but more purpose of the research oriented. It is often referred to as purposing sampling. This said, in our case the purpose of our research strongly sets directions for the sample. Indeed the respondent will have to be located in collectivistic and individualistic countries which can be classified using Hofstede’s IDV. Moreover since the study intends to outline the impact of Globalization on Universities and more specifically their leadership style and their approach to organizing change, it therefore automatically implies that the respondents will have to be decision makers in regards to international affairs within universities. However this approach still leaves a question unanswered; who exactly are the decision makers in this case. This question is of significant importance as Miles and Huberman (1994), point out that the quality of a sample can depend of the homogeneity in the choice of the respondent. To address this question we decided to focus on the homogeneity of responsibilities that each respondent has in regards to internationalization of their institution. We considered their responsibility being the fact that they are decision makers in regards to managing both the external and internal environment, of their school, however it does not necessarily mean that all interviewees are entitled to fulfill the same task, as we assumed that all universities studied have a different vision of internationalization, which will be confirmed or infirmed in the conclusions of our research. The biggest liberty we had was the choice of universities, which we decided to do based on partner universities of JIBS, since in our opinion it might have facilitated the answer to Punch’s (1998) last question, which are expressed in the following section and more particularly, how to organize the interviews. At last another aspect that has to be considered when building the sample is its size. Indeed the size of sample is a factor for the validity of research as explained by Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2004). Indeed they argue that the sample size is dependent on the type of research, but also by constraining variables such as budget and time. We aimed at total of 10 countries, on each dimension 5, however for the analysis we have reduced the data to make it to a reliable sample made up of 9 Universities divided into 5 individualistic countries and 4 collectivistic countries. This would be considered as a small sized sample however in the case of qualitative research as shown by Cohen et al. (2004), it appears to be the standard, and mostly is sufficient to collect valuable data.

4.2.2.1 Respondents

In understanding how leadership works across cultures within the selected Universities we have looked at every respondent (interviewee); how they describe their leadership style, what their cultural background is, team building methods they use, as well as their views on decision making towards internationalization and successful obtaining of acceptance of their staff regarding their decisions. Moreover, the participant’s views and/or attitudes towards international recruitment and changes in leadership towards
cultural diversity within the working environment, if any are discussed in the analysis. The point of the analysis is not to highlight the uniqueness of each participant and/or country or University, but rather to generalize the differences and similarities on the IDV cultural dimension. However, we do use examples and quotes from the respondents to highlight the leadership styles and decisions made towards internationalization between individualistic and collectivistic cultures.

The respondents are decision makers involved and responsible for internationalization within the selected International Business Universities, which have different position titles, differing per country and University, such as Associate Deans of Education & Internationalization, but also Directors of International office or International Affairs. In other words the participants are selected regarding to their role within the University and not the tasks that they perform. The importance is also not their title, but that they share a common responsibility. How they perform these responsibilities and the way they do it may differ per University culture as well as the national culture. Again, we highlight only the cultural characteristics of the Individualistic or Collectivistic cultural traits and behaviors.

4.2.3 Nature of collected data

As mentioned above this study is for a great part based on qualitative data which is rather unusual for a cross-cultural study according to Gudykunst and Mody (2002), who based on Johnson and Tuttle’s work (1989) come to the conclusion that a lot of previous work is based on quantitative research. Indeed as Hantrais and Mangen (1996) point out based on their analysis of other researcher’s work, quantitative research fails to show how individuals within a certain culture are affected on a more personal basis, so in other words it fails to identify behavioral traits. This taken into account, combined with Cavusgil and Das’ (1997) argument which states that quantitative data leaves a lot of space for errors, and at last but most importantly the fact that our study aims to compare reactions to organizational change and leadership within certain cultures, which is according to House et al. (2004) a typical behavioral trait, it therefore seems not only logical but also valid to base our research on qualitative data and use quantitative data to back it up. Nevertheless we will use quantitative data from our research as secondary information to support the findings based on the interviews, and more specifically in order to compare the degree of internationalization in collectivistic and individualistic countries.

4.2.4 Pilot Interview

According to McGivern (2006) pilot interviews can be based on quantitative and/or qualitative methods, which can be used for large-scale or small-scale studies at various stages of development of the study, but before the main research (interviews or surveys) is conducted. Furthermore, pilot interviews fulfill a range of important functions and can provide valuable insights for the main study (Cavusgil and Das, 1997). Although, as mentioned in the Introduction the topics used for this particular study have been relatively explored within the higher education, but in the context of Individualist versus Collectivism the topics are quite unexplored within the higher education. In order to uncover established issues from the literature on these topics if they are true also within
the International Universities, we have chosen to do a pilot interview that point out perceptions of one interviewee (employee) from a collectivistic culture, working within one of the selected International Universities in an individualistic oriented country.

The first phase of the pilot interview involved conducting a face-to-face, informal in-depth interview to confirm the issues related to the preliminary study (interviews with the decision makers), which has lasted for about 50 minutes. According McGivern (2006) a pilot interview can be used in two different ways for different reasons in social research. It can refer to small scale studies as a feasibility tool and/or as a trial run for the preparation of the main study (McGivern, 2006). For this particular study it has been used in both ways. Feasibility in terms of; if there is ground to our research and trial run is to see if the questions lead to expected answers according to the literature findings.

Furthermore, pilot interviews are conducted for a range of different reasons according to various authors (Creswell, 1998; McGivern, 2006 and Weiss, 1994), among which the following reasons are of importance for this particular study:

- assessing the feasibility of a small-scale comparative study: with this we mean to understand how leadership and ways of dealing with things is perceived by an employee with a collectivistic cultural background living and working in a University in an individualistic culture as mentioned earlier. More in detail, whether they might expect a leader to decide for them what they should do, or whether and how they might seek to exercise influence in their own right for instance; as discussed in the literature review about this matter
- assessing the proposed data analysis techniques to uncover potential problems that might occur also within the Universities, that reflect the literature findings
- record the time taken to complete the interview in order to decide whether it is a reasonable time also for the phone interviews with the decision makers, which are used for the main study

According to McGivern (2006) and (Cavusgil and Das, 1997) it can be difficult sometimes to assess objectively how an interview or a discussion analysis will work, in which the researchers are so involved in and being so close to it that they might make too many assumptions. Therefore the author points out that a pilot interview could be a crucial element of a good study design to minimize unnecessary or incorrect assumptions and to increase the likelihood of the main study, however does not guarantee success in the main study. Consequently, according to Creswell (1998) it should be recognized that pilot studies may also have a few limitations. These include the possibility of making inaccurate predictions, generalizations or assumptions on the basis of pilot data arising from contamination, but only if included in the main results. Therefore, this pilot interview is not used to generalize, but rather to verify that cultural expectations exist also within Universities and testing the value of Hofstede’s IDV cultural dimension as well as theories from other authors on this particular cultural dimension, which is conducted in the early stages of the research. Nevertheless, because we do not use the pilot interview data in the results or in the analysis this limitation is not of importance for this study.
4.2.5 Analyzing qualitative data

As mentioned above, the use of qualitative data is relevant within the frame of a research that aims to identify certain behaviors. However, as explained by Gomm (2004), when conducting qualitative research the researcher has to be able to accept that he will not be able to have all answers, which also justifies the pilot interview mentioned earlier, which can be considered as a way to minimize what he refers to as the “incorrigible”. Moreover analyzing qualitative data is somewhat delicate, not only because the researcher has to be prepared to treat a lot of data, but mainly, since as Creswell (1994) says there is “no right way” of doing it. The outcome of the analysis is highly dependent on the researcher since, he is subject to do his own interpretation. Nevertheless he suggests some techniques to minimize errors which we will apply. Indeed he suggests proceeding with the analysis while still gathering more data. This we have decided to implement through immediate re-transcription of the audio interview, and we decided to already take it a step further, by what Creswell (1994) calls “reducing” the data which we did by constructing an excel table, where the principle theme for each question is given with a compilation of answers per country organized in columns e.g. as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>US</th>
<th>CA</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>AU</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>TW</th>
<th>TH</th>
<th>CO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are three main categories: leadership, internationalization processes, and heterogeneity, and each one is subdivided with the main purpose of the question for, instance “Leadership style”, and every bit of the interview which is related to this particular subtopic is then submitted accordingly to the country. This methodology is an application of Creswell’s (1994) 8 step method, which enables the researcher to approach all the data in a systematic way, which according to him minimizes variation in terms of interpretation and therefore limits the number of errors. This method is also described by Gomm (2004) who even though recognizes its practicality, criticizes the use of themes which is according to him a manner to classify how people think and which therefore have to rely on several assumptions on human psychology. For example we all think alike in the same situation, which can hardly be verified. Nevertheless given the time constraint and the considerable amount of information we wanted to identify, it was important to use a practical method of analysis to make the research reliable, yet still valid.

4.2.6 Limits and argumentation of data collection

As described by Crano and Brewer (2002) many methods exist to collect qualitative data among which interviews is one of the most commonly used in order to conduct social studies. As they explain it allows collecting more thorough, personal and detailed information. However there are also different types of interviewing methods in the frame of research: structured, semi structured and unstructured interviews. In regards to qualitative research and according to Kotler, Kotler and Dubois (2000) semi-structured interviews often show best results. Nevertheless as Cavusgil and Das (1997) show one of the common limitations to cross-cultural research is the budget required to travel to different places. In our case this is really applicable which is why we decide to use
phone interviews and more specifically online telecommunication systems such as Skype and 12Voip which enabled us to maintain a low budget as explained previously. Nevertheless this decision does impact the data collected during the interviews. Indeed as Crano and Brewer (2002) point out, face-to-face interviews do allow the interviewers to usually collect more personal information and most importantly enable easier clarification in cases of misunderstanding or misinterpretation. On the other hand the reliability of our research is not jeopardized by this since their research also shows that phone interviews do show good results. At last, in regards to cross-cultural research, the language used can be a source of error, thus the importance in the cases where it is possible, to have interviewers speaking the same language as the interviewee as mentioned above.

All these issues related to interviews answer the six basic questions mentioned by Punch (2005) which have to be answered to validate and implement relevant interviews as a mean to collect qualitative data:

- “Who will be interviewed and why?
- How many will be interviewed, and how many times will each person be interviewed?
- When and for how long will each respondent be interviewed?
- Where will each respondent be interviewed?
- How will access to the interview situation be organized?”

Answering these questions addresses step 3 and 4 of figure 1.4. However, the answers to most of these questions are dependent on variables such as budget and timing as mentioned by Cohen, Manion, Morrison (2004), and are therefore relatively straightforward. For example as mentioned previously the answer to the fifth question meaning doing phone interviews, was forced upon us since travelling to every country studied would have drastically increased our budget. Second, we had to exclude one interview due to the available time of the respondent, not being able to answer all of our questions making it impossible to not reduce that data to make the quality count and as asserted by Eisner (1991) “understand a situation that would otherwise be enigmatic or confusing” (p 58).

4.2.7 Etic approach

As mentioned earlier this research is based on qualitative as well as quantitative research findings. The quantitative data collected from GLOBE research as well as statistical data from the universities is used as justification to support our findings from the in-depth interviews. The interviews used for the qualitative methodology are oriented to discover attitudes and behavior towards organizational change and decision making within International Partner Universities. To address the issues presented in the discussion where we argue the similarities and differences between the cultures on the IDV dimension indicate rather an etic approach than an emic approach to this cross-cultural study (Poortinga et al. 1992). This because an emic approach is concerned with examining only one culture, where criteria is relative to internal characteristics according to the authors, whereas our study is rather concerned with absolute or universal criteria aiming to depict behavior from a position outside the system. Although we include a pilot study that is more focused on behavior from within the
system of the University only in Sweden; the findings are used to confirm some of the
issues discussed related to heterogeneous teams from the individualistic versus
collectivistic point of view rather than studying behavior from within the system
profundely. Our listing of questions was referred to in order to ensure that the topics had
been covered. The questions we used are based on the literature we studied and also on
information found on their websites regarding strategic actions towards
internationalization and facts about heterogeneity. The participants were sent open
ended questions prior to the interview to help them understand what we were after and
to help them talk without us asking questions during the phone interview in order to
minimize the noise of technical, and/or cultural communication. As asserted by
(Poortinga et al. 1992) cultural "noise" might be the channel or medium chosen, or the
level of language used. This indicates that we have minimized noise that may have
interfered with good communication and holding a successful interview.

5 DISCUSSION

5.1 EXPLANATIONS AND ANALYSIS

As mentioned on several occasions above, this is a comparative study that intends to
confront behaviors of universities located in individualistic and collectivistic countries
regards to Globalization on macro-meso-micro level as explained in chapter 1.1.4 and
based on the Cheng’s (2005) Triplization model of Education. In order to do so, as
mentioned above we studied several partner universities of JIBS in both types of
countries, through the use of interviews. Moreover we do not intend to look at each
country separately in fact, we mean to treat each set of countries as a group in order to
see if a general trend appears in collectivistic and individualistic countries in their
reactions to Globalization and more specifically in regards to leadership and organizing
change. However, in order to depict the general trend of the Universities in collectivistic
versus individualistic cultures, we do analyze them on the individual level such as the
leaderships performed by the respondents to confirm if they can indeed be generalized.
Nevertheless before looking more in depth at each of these aspects within the
universities, we first have to look at our findings in terms of Globalization to see
whether or not it is a reality that universities account with based on quantitative data.
Once we have pointed out how it affects universities’ development strategy we will look
at how it affects Organizing change and leadership. In order to simplify the analysis we
will treat individualistic countries and collectivistic ones separately in order to be able to
compare them in the Conclusion.

5.1.1 UNIVERSITIES IN INDIVIDUALISTIC CULTURES

5.1.1.1 Globalization and Internationalization

As assessed by several authors among whom Currie et al. (2003) Globalization is indeed
a phenomenon affecting universities in individualistic countries since as explained in
previous section competition among universities is increasing, and the world
educational market is on its way to become a Global market as explained by the
Associate Dean of the Craig School of Business in California and also the associate
dean of education at JIBS in Sweden.
“The strategic plan is driven by dramatically changing economic, cultural, and demographic changes”

“The first 15 years saw a strong focus on building up an internationally competitive research and teaching capacity at the International Business School.”

Therefore to stand out, and this is based on unanimous answers, universities in individualistic countries have decided to integrate Globalization through several internationalization processes, as described earlier in section 3.2 which will be developed in a moment when looking in more detail at strategic development strategies. This decision to integrate Globalization is also related to universities’ prime vocation which is to provide quality education to their students. As mentioned by the Associate Dean of the American university:

“one of the missions is that the university provides educational opportunities to enhance its students’ intellectual horizons, fosters lifelong learning, prepares them for future professional study, productive community involvement, and instills in them an appreciation of the arts, continuing education, and cultures other than their own”

Indeed all universities interviewed agreed to say that it is their duty to integrate Globalization within their curricular program, since as stated in the Research and Education Strategy 2009-20012 of JIBS their role is to prepare students for the economical world in place.

“JIBS has already adopted an international and intercultural perspective on undergraduate and postgraduate studies and offers an exciting and diversified environment, JIBS stresses internationalization in a number of ways, such as topics relating to business renewal and industrial restructuring all over the globe are important subjects of research.”

This aspiration combined with the increase of competition is at the origin of many internationalization processes implemented by universities in individualistic countries, already since a couple of years but also in the future.

**Internationalization processes within individualistic countries**

First of all, even if it is undeniable that internationalization processes are implemented in all individualistic universities studied, we cannot occult the fact that there are some disparities among them. Indeed, even if all universities declare internationalization as a priority, the comparison of their answers allows us to say that they not all stand at the same place. In fact if we wanted to depict a degree of internationalization, we could base our findings on the extent to which these schools already cooperate with other universities abroad, which would show that it is unequal with some having many more partners than others. Most universities have between 10 and 50 international partners with the exception of the Swedish university which has over 200 partners abroad as illustrated in appendix 2, graph 1. However, some Faculties have also access to bigger partner network if part of a large University, like for example Haskayne Business School that has their own network of partners, but also provide access to students to go
abroad to a University network of the whole UofC that accompanies over 2000 international students from more than 100 countries.

Of course when doing this, we have to look at the nature of these partnerships which can differ between research programs and staff and student exchange programs. Nevertheless this would not change much at least if basing the comparison on the number of foreign partnerships.

Another possibility is to measure the current degree of internationalization based on the number of international students within the university as referred in appendix 2, graph 2. Doing so, would not change the result of the above comparison, since here again large gaps would appear. Nevertheless these statistics could be related to past strategic decisions, but also to the size of the universities which are not all equal.

To remedy to this second influence, it is more relevant to base this comparison of the number of international students, as a percentage based on the total number of students. Nevertheless, this does not really reduce gaps since figures range between 4% and 25% as illustrated in appendix 2, graph 3. However in order to see if these statistics are relevant it is interesting to confront them to the national figures shown in the graph in appendix 8. This shows that the universities we studied do respect the general tendency at least in terms of internationalization of the student body.

Nevertheless it is important to repeat that this study does not intend to compare separate countries but sets of countries within individualistic and collectivistic cultures. Therefore it is important to look at the statistics mentioned above as a whole and simply understand that the trend in individualistic countries, shows that they have already in the past focused on partnerships facilitating student exchange creating diversity among the student body and intend to take it further as all their Long term strategy plans show.

Another approach to the degree of internationalization in university can be to look at the number of international staff members working within the universities. Nevertheless as mentioned above, comparison for this type of data is relatively delicate since there are large variances among individualistic countries. So again, we can formulate a same generalized analysis, stating that internationalization is definitely already at an advanced stage as shown by Fresno’s Associate Dean “Yes. Fresno state is a multicultural student body, and we have a multicultural body of faculty”; however the intentions to enlarge these numbers is not as pronounced as for the number of students. As confirmed by Faculty’s of Business and Law, Victoria University Associate Dean International: “Not exactly looking for international staff recruitment, but offering jobs and considering all candidates”

Indeed, it is surprising that although all universities interviewed admit that globalization and the objective to provide students with a quality education does require culturally diverse teaching staff, it seems like as for example the Associate Dean of the American institution agrees to say, they do not plan to implement an international hiring strategy, but would rather prefer to focus on the quality of applicants bearing in mind that internationalized profiles (whether it’s a local person or a foreign one) is becoming a required quality, reflecting the characteristics of individualist culture. As the Associate Dean International of the Faculty of Business and Law, Australia puts it such profiles are often relatively culturally aware.
“It has been much more helpful to have a much more internationalized teaching staff for example just because it increases the opportunities we have with people from broader spirits”

All in all, even if the figures do vary, from one university to another, they are still pretty representative of individualist universities reactions towards internationalization. In fact they allow us to say that cultural diversity is present, at least in most cases to a considerable extent in regards to the student body but still rather minimal in terms of staff. Most importantly these statistics allow us to have an idea on how far individualist countries stand in the process of internationalizing which is according to Currie et al. (2003) universities’ response towards globalization. However as mentioned above these figures only allow us to note that internationalization is in place, nevertheless given the disparity of figures, based on these alone we cannot identify a common trend. Therefore, it can be interesting to have a look in more details at the objectives universities are trying to accomplish through internationalizing, using their answers about their strategic plan.

As mentioned above, and this is based on Currie’s et al. (2003) findings, universities are shifting from cooperation to competition. This is confirmed by all individualistic countries who all state a desire to build strong international recognition, however the interesting paradox is that such objective depends on their international cooperation. As explained in the Manchester strategic plan: *Towards Manchester 2015* p6

“First rank international research universities behave like first rank international research universities, jealous of their reputation, protective of their “brands”, highly discriminating in the institutional partnerships they form and aware that they strengthen or undermine their national and international standing according to the ways they position themselves in relation to other institutions or clusters of institutions.”

Based on this, it is interesting to see with “whom” individualistic universities choose to partner up with and the nature of these partnerships. In terms of location of the partner universities, some common trends appear. Indeed it seems that individualistic universities prioritize on setting up in economically dynamic regions, but also on their own location. For example Faculty of Business and Law of Victoria University in Australia decided to implement a large number of partnerships in Asian countries such as China and Japan. Sweden for instance has a large number within the EU, and fewer in other regions, which seems to be the same case for the Manchester Business School. The assistant dean of Craig School of Business of Fresno University justifies these behaviors on economical basis “Basically where things are happening with the economy we are very interested in having partnerships”

This actually makes sense if we relate back as mentioned above to the prime vocation of universities, meaning providing a quality education for their students. Furthermore we can justify these choices based on the theories expressed in the global digest, which as mentioned in an earlier part explain that tertiary educational sector is representative of the economical strength of a country. Therefore this indicates that at least according to UNESCO the best institutions are located in developed countries, meaning that universities which seek high quality levels of education, which is the case for all individualistic universities interviewed, are likely to set up partnerships with universities from these regions.
Regarding the nature of these partnerships, all individualistic universities implemented a similar strategy. Indeed all of them in indicated having set up exchange programs for students and staff exchange programs. Moreover, in line with Friedman’s (2005) theory about technology enabling worldwide knowledge transfer, all universities also have created international research programs, which as shown in the *Towards Manchester 2015* strategic plan, are significant because they influence the international reputation of the institution. This cooperation can even go further, as explained by the Associate Dean at JIBS who aims to develop dual degree programs.

At last regarding processes of internationalization the most elaborate ones, are by far the ones set up by the Australian and English universities, who have not only implemented all strategies above but have also created off-shore campuses. They are the only two institutions interviewed that have implemented such strategy, which is not without any consequences. Indeed as the Associate Dean explains there can be some occasional “cultural misunderstandings” with the teaching staff working abroad. Nevertheless in spite of this, nor the Associate Dean of the Australian University nor the interviewee of the Manchester University seem to have changed their leadership style. This is justified by the Australian interviewee by a high sense of cultural awareness. However, it can be interesting to see if it affects in any way the implementation of change within the organization.

5.1.1.2 Leadership

**Decision making structures and their responsibilities**

Before we touch up on the leadership styles executed by the interviewees, first important for the validity of this small-scale study is to clarify and confirm the sample selection that the respondents’ responsibilities are indeed more or less the same. Furthermore, in order to understand the complexity of Universities structure that very much vary among each other we will explain the teams/units/departments lead by the respondents. Although the number of staff they lead varies from two to leading several units or even entire departments. As defined by Bass (1990) in Grint (1997) that leadership is an interaction between two or more members of a group it can be applied that it is quite common to find variety between the numbers of staff lead.

For instance, the Associate Dean International of Faculty of Business and Law, Victoria University (Australia), leads only 2 people and the Director of Centre for International Management at the Haskayne Business School in Canada leads 4 staff members. However, Associate Dean of Craig School of Business in the US and the Associate Dean of Education at JIBS, Sweden, both lead a number of units or departments, each lead by a manager/director. However the structure of the Universities and how decision processes are made are in some ways very different and in others not so much, which will be clarified later in this section. But, first to give the reader the starting point of the selected leaders/decision makers and its staff it is important to clarify the staff systematization of the 3 Universities that lead more than 10 people.

Associate Dean of Education, Sweden quoted: “My team is separated in 4 units: Programme Managers, Student recruitment, Study Counseling and Study Administration, and International office. Except the Programme Managers, each one of the units is managed by a director under my lead and I have one more employee under.
my lead, which is the Project manager. She is responsible for all the projects, however she deals a lot with the University Partners in China because of her Chinese cultural background.”

Associate Dean, US stated: “The separate teams would be varying departments and institutions, in total 14, all lead by a director that have their own teams. Just to give you a few examples how these departments are divided: Academic Resources, Graduate Studies, Undergraduate Studies, Institutional Research Assessment & Planning, Study Abroad and International Exchange, Continuing and Global Education...etc. all to some extent lead by me to serve the students and the Dean, which includes me too of course.”

Here the difference of systematization of staff between JIBS and Craig School of Business is that the Associate Dean of Craig School leads the entire departments and overlooks all Business matters for the school, among which Internationalization. On the other hand the Associate Dean of Education at JIBS leads only 4 units of one department only, primarily on the Internationalization matters. So, at Fresno California State also Associate Deans of other Faculties of Fresno California University give instructions to the same Directors of the Departments.

Although these findings show that the respondent’s responsibilities vary in the volume, and how many people they lead, the responsibilities of the interviewees do all contain making similar decisions regarding to Internationalization. Furthermore, as mentioned in the methodology, the staff working in those units or departments has basically the same responsibilities in all the selected Universities in Individualistic cultures, herein, divided among more or less staff members. To confirm that same type of decisions are made regarding Internationalization here are a few quotes:

Associate Dean of Education, Sweden: “I decide on how many students should be taken for each program, what Universities should we partner with and why, how many should be program and how many exchange students, budgeting...etc.”

Director of the Enterprise sector, UK: “Most decisions in regards to the number of students, curricular programs, budgets, set of objectives”.

Associate Dean, US: “I would say it includes budgets, how many students should be in which program, but also any decisions regarding curriculum changes, who we intend to hire in the future and choosing International Partners.”

Associate Dean International, Australia: “About management of international partnership, but also the other kind like: business decisions about priority and new development and off shore from Australia. I also decide how many students can be accepted for each program and decisions regarding budgeting. These include an overall budget and milting to budgeting to how much revenue we will get from each of the optional locations.”

Director of Centre for International Management, Canada: “For example, I get requests to consider different partner schools. So, I find out first of all, is that school acceptable to the University, I accredit that time of thing. And then do they have Undergraduate,
Graduate programs and how compatible are those with ours. And, then I talk to Undergraduate Associate dean or, depending upon the direction we are going, and I ask them if they are interested and if students are interested. And if they say no, then that’s it. And then I meet with the relevant people for final decision to be made”.

The differences between the numbers of staff led can be because of number of aspects that we do not discuss, but to make better understanding we want to remind the reader that the following should be also considered: the size of the University, the structure of the University, including departments/units and how the decision processes are organized. However, we have not focused on the complexity of the Universities’ structures, which are an important aspect of the governance of any tertiary education that are influential on the decision processes and leadership styles according to Morrill (2007) as mentioned in chapter 3.5. But, in order to understand why certain types of leaderships are executed it is an important factor to mention because as Morrill (2007) argued that University structure and culture do in fact influence individual behavior of decision makers as well as the national culture (Chryssochoou, 2004).

For example: JIBS has a formal structure, which the Associate Dean of Education called: “a sort of Matrix structure”. He explains that one basis of the organization is the ‘traditional line’ organization. Quote: “At the bottom of that organization are the departments”. The department head reports directly to the Dean, who formally is the only one that has the right to make decisions. However, certain types of decisions are delegated down to department heads, where propositions and opinions of colleagues are not systematically discussed before taking a decision. As he states: “The entire portfolio projects are my responsibility, for which some decisions are discussed with the colleagues and some decisions I make on my own”.

In Craig School of Business, US the decisions are made in the departments among all the faculty members and then those decisions/proposals come forward to the Dean and Associate Dean. As she stated: “We have an academic counsel where we meet with all the department heads where these proposals come forward.” However she mentions, if there are proposals that need to be decided among the entire college there are several government bodies, which are elected faculty members that make decisions on how resources are met or curriculum related decisions towards the future. So what is important to highlight here is that ideas/decisions that come from comities and government bodies originally come from faculty members, students and staff members’ ideas and then are presented to the Dean and the Associate Dean, where we can say that in Craig School of Business decisions are rather made from bottom-up. Quote: “At the point when all is considered and presented to the Dean we feel we have made a complete consultative loop. Everybody has had the opportunity to way in on these ideas, proposals and decisions, and then we are able to use that information to make the final decisions”.

The Director of Centre for International Management at the Haskayne Business School in Canada explains that a lot of the decisions are made within the unit. But if there are new programs introduces then the Dean and the Director of the program are involved. Here we can say that the University structure of Haskayne, regarding the decision processes is somewhat similar to the processes of Craig School of Business in the US.
Because, as she assessed: “So, it depends on what we are doing, who will be involved in the decision making. So, decisions made vary from the departments. Some are more flexible than others. So you can say that decisions go vertically and horizontally, depending on the issue. And at this point I am relatively fortunate, because unless I am really going in a different direction, I have a great deal of freedom to make decisions towards internationalization.”

In Australia, the Faculty of Business and Law is one of the three Faculties of the VU, and divided in several Schools and as the Associate Dean International further explains: “The whole Victoria University is lead by a rector as you would call it and we call it a vice chancellor. The vice chancellor has a nr of people called deputy vice counselors reporting to her and one of those what is called the higher education part of University and reporting to that person in terms that there are a nr of executive deans one for each Faculty. So, personally report to the executive Dean.”

Director of the Enterprise sector of Manchester business school in the UK: “The school is divided into separate programs with each of them having a director reporting directly to the dean (director of the business school) and faculty and staff for each program reporting to him. Decisions are first discussed with committees made up of representatives of staff, or general staff meeting for certain decisions.”

From these findings it is clear that the structure of JIBS is quite different from the other four Universities in the Individualistic cultures. Because JIBS is the only one to have a formal traditional line organization where propositions and opinions of colleagues are not systematically discussed before taking a decision, unlike in the other selected Universities. One reason for this difference could be explained that Sweden is not a country that scores very high on Individualism on Hofstede’s scale, therefore indicating more of a bureaucratic influence of decision making as we may say. First because the traditional line organization reflects on the Weber’s source of authority of traditional society performing a traditional hierarchy as highlighted by Peters (2001). Second, because the Dean is the one that formally according to the contract is the only one that has the right to make the decisions. This indicates that the Dean has the authority because he has a superior position in the hierarchy which provides him automatically with authority as highlighted by Peters (2001). And third, although certain types of decisions are delegated down to departments, which also indicates that followers would be promoted on their ability if they perform those tasks in conformity with the rules of the institution. The importance here is that in JIBS propositions and opinions of colleagues are not systematically discussed before taking a decision, which indicates that decisions are rather made following normative rules and adhering to lines of authority from top to bottom of the hierarchy (Sergiovanni and Corbally (1988). And also the line management reflects on MacGregory Burns’s (1978) massive study on Leadership defining bureaucracy as “the simple application of authority from the top down” (p. 215). In other words, JIBS’s structure has more of a bureaucratic way of decision making than democratic where employees are part of the decision making and uphold the right to influence decisions according to (Grint, 2007 and Yukl, 2005). On the opposite, the democratic way of decision making can be rather clearly seen in the selected Universities in the US and Canada. This because both clearly state either that everybody has the opportunity to share their ideas, proposals before the final
decision is made and/or has the flexibility to make certain decisions on their own. This type of decision making reflects on the literature findings of Yukl (2005) and Grint (1997) that in the democratic way information is gathered from staff members before making the final decision.

From these findings it is clear that the governance has indeed influence on the decision making processes as highlighted by Morrill (2007). While there is clearly a line in the structure within the Universities in Australia and UK, it will become more clear in the next section what type of leadership styles they perform when we evaluate the findings how the respondents perceive their leadership styles, how and what they delegate and how they deal with unpopular decisions they make.

Leadership styles
The leadership styles executed by the respondents indicate to be quite similar among four Universities in the Individualistic countries, only the leadership style performed by the Associate Dean of Education in JIBS differs. So, in the US, Canada, UK and Australia all the respondents perform democratic leaderships which include two different ‘alternative leaderships’ as suggested by Grint (2007): participative and servant leadership styles as discussed in chapter 3.5.1.1.

Associate Dean, US: “I would describe myself as a servant leader. I feel that my main job is to serve the students, faculty and the Dean. And things are rather discussed formally.”

Associate Dean International, Australia: “I would say that my leadership style is participative and informal”.

Director of the Centre for International Management, Canada: “I would say it is highly participatory”.

Director of the enterprise sector, UK: “My leadership style is rather participative and formal”.

At JIBS in Sweden the Associate Dean of Education sticks rather to the managerial structure as it is, where describes his style as rather directive than democratic. “You could even say that it is semi-autocratic leadership style”. And things are discussed quite informally and horizontally.

As we analyzed earlier that leadership is influenced by the University structure and its governance it is here also clear that the respondents in the more democratic structure of University perform a democratic leadership styles and that in a more Bureaucratic structure we find directive leadership, as we like to call it ‘alternative leadership’ style of autocratic leadership, because as Goethals et al. (2004) implied that autocratic leadership can also be multifaceted just like democratic leadership. Nevertheless, as earlier implied by the Associate Dean of Education at JIBS that not all decisions are discussed with the staff reflects to some extent on the statement of Brody (2004) on directive leaders to occasionally discuss and ask their staff for an opinion, but always make the final decision. The explanation why autocratic leadership is rather seen in a more bureaucratic institution could be because both autocratic and democratic decision making are often built on ideas of rationality (Yukl, 2005; Sergiovanni and Corbally (1986). Another reason we found why the Associate Dean of Education at JIBS executes a semi-autocratic leadership is because it is very probably influenced by two
situation factors that increase the effectiveness of directive leadership (alternative leadership of autocratic leadership) which according to Brody (2004) are the high expertise of the Associate Dean and working within a University with a bureaucratic structure.

However, semi-autocratic leadership in this case could be analyzed as that the Associate Dean of Education is performing a variety of leadership approaches from what we can analyze two leadership styles in different situations, informal and directive, which he might perceive as semi-autocratic. Also other respondents vary in their use of formality or informality in their democratic leadership styles as clear from their quotes. In sum, all the respondents use various approaches to their leadership styles, just as the literature argued to find variability in leadership styles as discussed in chapter 3.5.1.5.

Although there is use of variability in leadership styles they all encourage to some extent the staff to be involved in the decision making processes to maximize their individual influence and gain for themselves a good result, confirming the cultural traits/values of the Hofstede’s individualistic culture as asserted by Thomas and Inkson (2003). However an interesting finding here on the leadership style performed by the Associate Dean of Education at JIBS, Sweden, is the semi-autocratic leadership style. Even though, it is semi-autocratic, this style would still imply a higher power of authority than in democratic leadership styles, and can be perceived as a multifaceted autocratic leadership style as asserted by Goethals et al. 2004. However, Sweden scores rather low on Hofstede’s Power Distance cultural dimension according to (Hofstede, 1991). And, according to Verluyten (2004) in low power distance (LPD) countries, the dependence on superiors is far less, to the extent that there is interdependence between the two and a preference for consultation when decisions are made. Also Thomas et al. (2003) argued that in LPD cultures decision making style of managers will tend to be more participative, where managers/leaders themselves will tend to accept more participative behavior from their subordinates. However, on the contrary of what the theory of Hofstede (1991), Thomas et. al, (2003) and Verluyten (2004) the Associate Dean of Education at JIBS in Sweden executes rather semi-autocratic leadership style which is according to the authors rather used in HPD cultures. Yet, other decision makers scoring very high on Individualism on the Hofstedes’ IDV and Low on Power Distance scale, do indeed indicate to perform rather a participative leadership style and value each individuals’ development and achievement by encouraging them to be part of decision making processes and evaluating their individual performance as asserted by Thomas and Inkson (2003) to be a cultural value of an Individualistic oriented culture.

In terms of making decisions that were not so popular among staff they all say that they have made an unpopular decision at some point, except the Associate Dean International at the Faculty of Business and Law in Australia. But that is because he has only been in his position for 6 months. The Associate Dean for Education at JIBS indicates that some decisions have to be made even if the employees are not satisfied with it. Also the Associate Dean of Craig School of Business says that sometimes unpopular decisions need to be made and that no one can always have 100% agreement in her opinion and says: “It happens all the time”. The Director of the enterprise sector of Manchester business school in the UK as well said a similar thing on unpopular decisions made: “Of course it is part of the job”.

That a leader can not always satisfy all staff 100% is also argued by Thomas and Inkson (2003) when they argued that a leader my capture the devotion of some followers, while
being rejected by others. Another point what we would like to highlight is how the participants managed to successfully obtain the acceptance of their staff regarding such decisions, where the findings indicate that the respondents in US and Canada feel that they have obtained their acceptance successfully because they both indicate that it is important to communicate, collaborate with their staff and compromise towards a common solution when reasonable.

As the Associate Dean of Craig School of Business says: “Disagreements arise about resources, perceived power and who teaches specialized forces”. And when disagreements arise she says: “It’s very important to be a good listener, to be non-judgmental as you can to manage these issues, to remind the individuals of the process, which again is very consultative”. According to her the intent is to empower people to be part of the process for them to feel they are part of the decision even though they might not be always included when making the decision, and stated: “In US we call it ‘getting buy in’ “.

Very similar to the answers of the Associate Dean in the US, the Director of Centre for International Management at Haskayne in Canada says that she discusses and explains the facts behind the decision in order for them to understand why. However, as she quoted: “But, most of the time decision making is collaborative and we work towards a common solution”.

The Associate Dean for Education at JIBS indicates that some decisions have to be made even if the employees are not satisfied with it and says that he feels that he has not always been successful in obtaining the acceptance of his staff members and gives an example: “We did restructuring of the office to fit all the employees, however some were not satisfied with that decision. And as I considered later another possibility suggested by an employee things had worked out for the better and we had restructured it again.”

Also the Director of the enterprise sector of Manchester business school in the UK said that most decisions are discussed and approved by the committees, where they might consider adjustments later on if disagreed and implement extra meetings to discuss matters again and as he quoted: “Well I don’t know if I always obtained a 100% acceptance however some decisions have to be taken, but I do think that in most cases I have been successful”.

It is clear that a different approach is taken in UK and Sweden versus US and Canada in how they manage their staff when taking unpopular decisions and or make decisions in general. It is clear that in US and Canada the leaders are more concerned how the followers perceive their decision making by trying to make them understand, include them in sharing there opinion and motivate them even though they might not always be included in decision making. On contrary, in UK and Sweden the decision might be reconsidered and discussed with the staff only if there are complains or negative responses towards the decision made. So, from these findings we could even depict that maybe the formality in UK influences the participative leadership style and informality of communication also influences the directive style of leadership creating to some extent equality between the two in the processes of decision making.
Regarding to delegation of certain decisions, we find similarities between all the respondents indicating that they all delegate certain decisions, which include entire projects, budgets, choosing and interacting with partner Universities…etc. but in the end always report back to the leader.

Associate Dean, US: “I often delegate entire projects, give them and idea what I expect and I ask them to set up a comity and get it done and then report back to me. Sometimes it includes budget decisions; however the final decision on the budget is with the Dean and me”.

Associate Dean of Education, Sweden: “The unit managers prepare budget proposals for their units and I confirm if they are done accurately or not”.

Director of the enterprise sector, UK: “I fully trust my staff with their tasks, and otherwise the budget is their responsibility I review it and I just run it to the dean for final approval”.

Director of the Centre for International Management, Canada: “Well, they make a lot of decision. For example one of my staff members decides completely the matching what school to what students. I only involve when there is a problem. But budgets are already decided”.

The only difference in delegation approach we found is that the Associate Dean International, Australia and the Director of the Centre for International Management, Canada also use laissez-faire leadership approach in certain situations. We discovered this because they allow their staff sometimes to make certain decisions when they are away or not reachable which confirms Yukl’s (2005) argument that the delegation is a distinct type of power-sharing process that occurs when a manager gives subordinates the responsibility and authority for making some types of decisions. They feel that it is important to delegate because their staff has more knowledge and expertise on certain areas or when they are travelling for business trips and are not present to make the decisions.

Associate Dean International, Australia: “It is not only important for me to delegate because I travel a lot for my job, but also because of the different time zones, which means sometimes I need to make decision when I can not contact my staff quickly enough and other way around can happen as well that my staff needs to make a decision when they can not contact me”.

Director of the Centre for International Management, Canada: “For example, the person who looks at course equivalencies has a great deal of say to whether or not we accept the partner, because if we accept the partner in total incompatibility in the academic program we can not send anyone. So, basically it is import because some staff has more knowledge on certain subjects because they have expertise, because I don’t go about what the course content is”.

As argued by Trompenaars et al., (2004) delegative or laissez-faire leadership style is best used in situations where the leader needs to rely on qualified employees, such as in the case of the respondent from Australia. Furthermore, Trompenaars assessed that a
leader cannot be an expert in all situations, which is why it is important to delegate certain tasks out to knowledgeable and trustworthy employees, which would be more the case of the respondent from Canada. In sum, here we find variability in leadership approaches between participative and delegative styles or if we ought to say; the respondents use both democratic and laissez-faire leadership styles depending on the situation.

In terms of meetings they all have more or less the same amount of meetings. All the respondents/leaders meet with their staff regularly for a formal meeting varying per week, two weeks or per month and if there is a problem or a new decision they implement an extra meeting, preferably through direct contact. In all occasions e-mail is used often by all decision makers to communicate with their staff. However, for none of the Universities the frequency of the meetings has increased or decreased over the past years.

**Change or no change**

Using our findings showing that the volume of international staff and students has increased in all the universities, shows that the decision makers’ awareness that for development of internationalization there is need for more international staff, either in teaching or administration. However, literature implies that multiculturalism is the new millennium of education that emphasizes the need for effective multicultural education as a fact that must be faced by the education establishment as also confirmed by Samovar et al. (2007). If Universities want to face these challenges of globalization to achieve future effectiveness Cheng (2005) suggests that they need to consider all three levels (individual, institutional and societal level) when internationalizing. From the previous section it is clear that all the selected Universities/Faculties have strategy objectives to increase their partnerships across boarders and to increase the mobilization of the students, and some even to increase international staff. This, as indicated previously provides evidence to say that the Faculties have established new objectives on the institutional level to face the global challenges of competition, elevation of international competition in knowledge innovation and the development of human resources as asserted by (Kishan, 2007), which all indicate aspects of internationalization that bring about change also on the individual level as Cheng (2005) implied that all three levels are interrelated. This means when one level is affected the others are too, and can not be ignored. However, on the individual level, where we consider the leadership styles, most of the decision makers feel that there is no need for adjustments in their leadership styles. Only the Associate Dean in the US thinks that maybe some adjustments would be needed, which we will discuss later. However, some decision makers have just answered ‘No’ and others have given the following reasons why there is no need for change in their leadership styles:

Director of Centre for International Management, Canada: “*Not really, because as I said half of them are international. So, to me it is normal that everybody is different because I worked in Europe with 18 people form different countries and students. I don’t expect them to be the same.*”

Associate Dean for Education at JIBS: “*No. I stick to the managerial structure as it is. And as the most managers are Swedish and one German there has been no need for change in leadership styles.*”
Associate Dean of Craig School of Business: “Well, I haven’t noticed that. But I would think that there would have to be some adjustments in the type of the leadership we have here in which is bottom-up beginning at the faculty and the staff moving upwards to the administrators it accommodates and allows discussion.”

Although, the Associate Dean of Craig School of Business feels that some adjustments might be needed, we can still analyze that Globalization in the cultural context has not affected the leadership styles (the individual level of cultural functions: Cheng, 2005) in the Individualistic cultures because they have not changed. But the increase of cultural awareness of some decision makers might indeed have been influenced by the Cultural Globalization, which is discussed in the next section. It is however difficult to analyze why certain decision makers are more culturally aware than others, because many aspects can influence this factor as discussed in the literature review, including their personalities, backgrounds, experiences…etc. From the leaders perspective we consider only his/her cultural background, values and leadership ethics towards internationalization in terms of cultural diversity and international recruitment, team building methods and how they have managed to minimize cultural issues, if recognized. Here, we do not include their personality, knowledge, and experiences.

The fact that we have found that the leaders do not feel the need for change in their leadership style even though they work in an environment which is increasingly becoming more multicultural, does not imply that change has not been implemented earlier, because Cultural Globalization has already started a few decades ago. However, this can be confirmed to some extent analyzing the cultural awareness of the decision makers interviewed. With this we mean that the leader is aware of the differences of expectations of the followers towards them and their different perceptions of moral behavior. As asserted by Currie et al. (2003) a simple transfer of Western educational practices, which includes democratic leadership styles that are rather found in Individualistic and low power distance countries according to Ting-Toomey (1999), and our findings, to other cultures including ethnic minority cultures within the West will not be sufficient. Here it is also important to remind the reader that according to Thomas et al. (2003) Western countries tend to be Individualistic.

In other words, applying a democratic leadership alone or applying an autocratic leadership alone without considering the special merits of other cultures might cause misunderstandings and issues, which can be rather silent at the moment but will float above the water some time and by then they could be bigger issues. If these issues are ignored not only could they provide more problems, but it minimizes the effectiveness of the working environment. This because according to Chhokar et al. (2007) followers are more motivated and committed when their leadership expectations are met and misunderstandings and reluctance against influence attempts are less likely. In other words, the more leadership concepts differ between managers and followers, the less influence will be exerted and the more misunderstandings will occur.

An example of one of the problems occurring is already seen in teaching as the Associate Dean of Education, Australia implied. Although we do not intend to analyze the pilot interview, we do find it important to note that these issues on perception of moral behavior in teaching creating misunderstandings between the teacher and students have also been confirmed, among other issues such as speaking at the meetings, expectations of the leader, expectations of the students…etc. These findings can be
verified in appendix 7. Also Verluyten (2001) mentioned that when well managed, diversity becomes a productive resource to the team, however when ignored, diversity causes process problems that diminish the team’s productivity.

**Cultural awareness**

Although we can not measure the respondents’ CQ or generalize if these selected respondents are indeed culturally aware, we can however to some extent indicate what approach they are performing now based on their answers, if the decision makers have implemented any measures to minimize cultural issues and/or if they have recognized any, that undoubtedly are existent in the selected Universities. This because they all lead a multicultural team to some extent and work in a multicultural tertiary education or with an institution across boarders according to the statistics found. Therefore, here are the quotes of the respondents on the cultural issues:

**Associate Dean of Craig School of Business, US:** “In some ways these issues are culturally linked because people are representing their own territory or department. They are trying to represent and make sure that they get a fair share of resources, but sometimes disagreements are personality related”.

“The social norm in our professional business cultures is to share. I have mostly noticed where there are cultural differences it seems to be in interaction between collectivism and individualism and gender. So, I do not see culturally issues with men from collectivistic cultures, but I have seen women from collectivistic cultures sometimes maybe need to be encouraged to take on a leadership role in terms of sharing a comity and even in terms of encouraged sharing their own opinion. But, in the end the aim is that they become more comfortable with the social norm of our college. The cultural norm of the professional atmosphere in the end is to become the overriding behavioral aspect.”

**Associate Dean International of Faculty of Business and Law, Australia:** “We have over 200 teaching staff in the faculty and some of them are more inevitably culturally aware and have a better cultural understanding than others. But we do have on occasions, not with my particularly my team of people, but more the teaching staff working off shore we do have on occasion sort of cultural misunderstandings. None of those have had particularly great consequence, but to some extent.”

**Associate Dean of Education at JIBS, Sweden:** “No. Getting assimilated in the Swedish culture as soon as possible is the point.”

**Director of Centre for International Management, Canada:** “I think that only becomes an issue if we meet with a larger group. Because with my small group we know each other very well, there is a lot of give and take. But when we are in a meeting for example in a larger group, and that happens often we do consider cultural differences how to approach the meeting and the presentation.”

**Director of the Enterprise sector of Manchester Business School, UK:** “I wouldn’t say so, at least not in my case.”
Although there might be some biases on the analysis of cultural awareness because maybe some of the respondents did not have the time or the will to elaborate on this matter, we can analyze that 2 out of 5 decision makers are not culturally aware if they have not noticed any cultural misunderstandings in their working environment. Second, we find clearly that the Associate Dean of Education at JIBS deals with cultural diversity by sticking to the ‘Be like me’ policy (Swedish policy) and tries to impose it as assessed by Thomas et al. (2003). In other words, in the working environment this means; insisting that people with different cultural background get acquainted with the national cultural systems of doing and behave as the people from that particular culture where they work. These findings also reflect that the Associate Dean of Education at JIBS is rather tolerant towards other cultures, than open or showing positive appreciation towards other cultures, because as asserted by Verluyten (2001) tolerance means to ‘recognize and respect’ (in cultural context: others’ beliefs, practices, etc.) without sharing them. Consequently, Samovar et al. (2007) notes Powell and Andersen’s (1994) argument that simply knowing/recognizing one’s discipline is insufficient. In conclusion, according to Thomas et. al. (2003) this approach will rather miss out on wider range of viewpoints and ways of doing things of cultural diversity which can rather have higher potential of effectiveness if well managed according to Verluyten (2001). Therefore we ask the question by Chryssochoous (2004) again: Should they conform to the cultural norms of the country as established by the majority, but in private they can follow their own cultural norms? Or should people with a different cultural background be encouraged to keep their own ways of thinking in the private sphere and contribute toward building a common way of seeing the world in the public sphere, in order to increase the effectiveness of any multicultural working environment?

However based on the answers of the Associate Dean International of Faculty of Business and Law, Australia and the Director of Centre for International Management, Canada we can say that they are aware of the cultural misunderstandings that occur in their working environment and to some extent understand cultural differences (Thomas et. al. 2003), which reflect on the openness (Verluyten, 2001). Unlike tolerance, being open to what is new or unknown entails that one will look at features from other cultures with understanding, and be willing to share in the practices that go with them whenever possible and appropriate according to Verluyten (2001), which are clearly performed by Director of Centre for International Management, Canada when she holds meetings with a larger group consisting of cultural diversity.

And last, Associate Dean of Craig School of Business, US based on her answer, shows to be quite culturally aware about the cultural differences in moral behavior by recognizing the difference between women’s behavior from Collectivistic countries and trying to encourage them to take leading activities. Because this kind of behavior of a decision maker according to Thomas et al. (2003) and Verluyten (2001) shows that one is being culturally aware, which is being skilled and flexible about understanding a culture, learning more about it from ongoing interactions with it, and gradually reshaping own thinking to be more sympathetic to the culture and own behavior to be more skilled and appropriate when interacting with people from another culture. She has obviously shown to be aware of the Collectivistic cultural differences, their values and belief in the working environment because she recognized as asserted by (Ting-Toomey, 1999) that collectivist societies can rely more on the leader to involve the
group, because that will be the shared expectation of both leader and group members, unlike in the individualistic cultures, where both leaders and followers will attempt to involve themselves in decision making to maximize their individual influence and gain for themselves a good result.

5.1.1.3 Organizing change

As explained during the theoretical part section our analysis of their methods of organizing change is a direct confrontation of Universities’ response to Globalization to our model which itself is based on a combination of the theory about the rational model for change presented to us by Tomas Müllern during our first seminar in 2007, and Cheng’s (2005) triplization model, which as a reminder to the reader expresses the influence of the cultural influence (its 3 levels: Globalization; localization, and individualization) on universities. Indeed in our opinion this was the best way to analyze whether or not universities located in the individualistic countries had achieved to implement the changes they needed in order to achieve their goals in regards to internationalization. In order to respect our methodology, and ensure the validity of our findings the same approach will be used when analyzing organizational change within collectivistic universities.

Asserted by Latham (2003), the process of organizing change, should start with the creation of a goal which in our case is the result of the impact of globalization on educational systems across the world. This Goal which as expressed by all interviewees of individualistic countries, is to gain international recognition for the quality of research and education, as shown for example in the English university’s strategic plan Towards Manchester 2015:

“Become An International institution valued regionally and nationally for its international reputation as a world-class centre of learning, discovery, innovation and scholarly virtuosity, and identified by world class researchers, scholars and students as a premier higher education destination”

As explained in the theoretical section once the goal is set it has to be broken down into a problem. In the frame of our research we considered the problem being globalization which required a reaction from individualistic universities to respond to the increase of competition among educational institutions as stated by Currie et al. (2003). The response to globalization comes in the form an internationalization strategy which has been set up by all individualistic universities interviewed. As an example, in the model below we put that one of the aims of the internationalization plan is the increase in cultural diversity, however the reader should bear in mind that this is not there sole objective as expressed for example by the Associate Dean for Education at JIBS:

- “International students to be a minimum 20 percent of headcount
- maintain exchange program University partners
- Double degree programs
- Tight networking with fewer Partner Universities
- Maintain these partners after the new legislation for compulsory tuition fee in 2012”

Nevertheless to simplify the explanation on how to use this model when analyzing change, we will focus on this objective. The construction of the internationalization plan
is done at an institutional level since it according to Cheng (2005) takes all variable into account relative to the university. Once the plan is laid out it has to be implemented. As expressed in the theory by Furnham (2005), the implementation of change should be done in accordance to the leadership style. Furthermore, the theory explains that the leadership style should at least be consultative but mainly based on communication. This is the case to some extent for most individualistic universities. However according to the theories by Wall (2005) it should also take into consideration the cultural aspect of individuals involved. All in all the fact that these two factors facilitate chances of success shows that the individualization level introduced by Cheng (2005) should also be accounted for.

Once the change has been implemented its outcome should be measured. Since our example considers an increase of diversity, we will use the statistics about the number of international students and staff. As mentioned in the analysis of Internationalization, there is definitely a cultural diversity among students and also staff within the individualistic countries. Even if results are not homogenous among all universities, we will consider that the goal has been achieved. This is at least the case for the Swedish university:

“The first 15 years saw a strong focus on building up an internationally competitive research and teaching capacity at the International Business School. These efforts were then mirrored at the other schools, where research capabilities are now in a strong phase of development”

Therefore as a result, based on the rational model, we can say that a new goal should be set which will lead to new problems and will require further strategy building as shown in the model.

All in all if we consider that a high number of international students are representative of a cultural diversity, then we can say that at least in the cases of most individualistic universities the organizing of change was a success. On the other hand this might not be the case if we took into consideration all objectives of all their strategic plans, because according to their answers, none of them really implemented true organizational change.
**Model 1.2: Organizational Change**
within the Universities in Individualistic countries selected (van Eysendeyk and Rebac. 2009)

**Goal:**
Gain international recognition for the quality of research and education

**Problem A:**
Change in environment: Globalization

- **Change:**
  - Internationalization strategy
  - Aim to increase cultural diversity

- **Institutional level:** Universities

- **Outcome:**
  - Cultural diversity among students and staff has increased

**New Goal:**
Integration of cultural diversity

**Problem B:**
Integration of cultural diversity

**Implementation of change:** individual level

- **Key factors of success:**
  - Leadership
  - Culture: Individualistic

**Result:**
Have achieved larger cultural diversity

**Outcome:**
Cultural diversity among students and staff has increased
5.1.2 UNIVERSITIES IN COLLECTIVISTIC CULTURES

5.1.2.1 Globalization and Internationalization

As explained in the first part of the analysis, the impact of globalization on universities is best explained through the analysis of the extent to which universities have internationalized. Therefore in order to proceed with a valid comparison between individualistic and collectivistic countries, it is important to analyze the data in a systematic way as stated in the methodology. Consequently we will as we did for individualist start by examining quantitative data and more particularly the number of international partners, the number of international students, and their ratio in relation to the total amount of students. This will enable us to proceed with first comparisons with the data found for individualistic countries, at least as explained earlier in terms of how far they stand in terms of internationalization. The next step, as we did in the same section for individualistic countries will be to examine the qualitative data, meaning their internationalization strategies, in order to see if similarities exist with the collectivistic countries.

Internationalization processes within collectivistic countries

In terms of international partners, there are fewer differences than between the individualistic countries. Nevertheless it is still hard, and presumptuous to depict a general tendency. As the figures point out in appendix 3, graph 1 with the exception of Thailand and the Republic of China, who have the approximate same number of partners, we can see that the range between collectivistic countries in terms of partner universities is still quite high. As a matter of facts these numbers vary between 22 and 75. Nonetheless, we can still consider that these numbers are pretty similar to the ones obtained in individualistic countries. However as mentioned above if we stick to a general comparison of individualistic and collectivistic countries, then we can still consider that individualistic countries tend to have more partnerships with other international institutions see appendix 3, graphic 2. Nevertheless this statistic alone does not indicate that individualistic countries stand further in the process of internationalization. As proof for this we can simply refer to the university with the least number of partners, which is the American university and which is an individualistic country.

Many reasons, could explain these statistics, for example the size of the university. Then again this thesis does not intend to explain this phenomenon and can therefore be considered for further research. Consequently in order to measure internationalization of universities relevantly, this first interpretation, justifies looking at further quantitative data such as the number of international students. In regards to those statistics, we can see that we face a similar issue as in the previous section about individualistic countries, meaning that figures show a relatively high variation with results ranging from 17 to 67 students as illustrated in graph 3, appendix 3. Given this variation, and as explained earlier, it is quite difficult to consider this information as relevant to define the degree of internationalization in universities in collectivistic countries. Indeed if used in that way, results would show that the Republic of China is the most internationalized university in collectivistic countries, however as soon as we look at the ratios in terms of total number of students, this result would be proven wrong since the university of Thailand...
has 4.64% ratio whereas the Republic of China has only a 2.92% ratio, graph 4, appendix 3. Nevertheless this does not mean that those statistics are completely irrelevant. In fact, they do allow the appearance of a general trend at least in terms of comparison with individualistic countries. Indeed we can see in the graphic 1, appendix 4 that collectivistic countries have a lower amount of international students than individualistic countries. This is also confirmed through the ratio of international students in relation to the total number of students; see graphic 2, appendix 4. Nevertheless this does not necessarily mean that collectivistic countries are further behind in terms of internationalization however it certainly means that individualistic countries are more attractive to students than collectivistic countries, which is confirmed by the Global Digest of the UNESCO, and by Moran and Harris (2007) but also by a statistics provided to us by the university of Sun Yat Sen in the Republic of China, which states that they have 96 outgoing students, which means that they have more of their students going abroad than students coming to their university.

In order to gain certainty on the level of internationalization, it is now clear that the use of quantitative data only is not sufficient. As a result, it is necessary to analyze their internationalization strategies, in order to see if they can provide us with further evidence.

In terms of internationalization processes, there are no real differences with individualistic countries. Indeed all Collectivistic countries have set up partnerships of different natures with other international institutions as shown for example by the director of the international office at EAFIT University in Columbia or by the Associate Dean of the department of economics at Sun Yat Sen University:

“Well we have about 75 exchange agreements […] we have exchange programs but we have also research cooperation programs and staff development programs.”

“We have 35 partner universities in 15 different countries most of them are in the USA and in Europe. There are different sorts of partnerships, student exchange, study abroad staff exchange and research programs and also joint degrees”

Moreover these cooperative agreements which are a resultant of Globalization as explained by Currie et al. (2003) are actually implemented for the same reason as the individualistic countries. In other words through these partnerships they aim to reinforce their international reputation, and fulfill their primary mission, which is to provide their students with quality education. As an example of these intentions we can refer to the Chulalongkorn University in Thailand:

“emphasizing cooperative activities, academic exchanges with international institutions, and academic services to international communities in order to create role for Chulalongkorn University […] International Affairs was set up to develop and prepare academic readiness among personnel and students so as to enable them to keep abreast of academic development, and to communicate effectively on an international level”

The ambitions in terms of partnerships are actually almost completely similar to the one of the individualistic countries. Indeed not only are they set up for the same reasons, referring back to the paradox, explained in the section about individualistic countries, between the will to cooperate and the will to strengthen their competitiveness, but they
also plan to develop in similar ways meaning further development. The only real difference with individualistic countries is their choice of partners. Indeed all of them explain being involved in more partnerships with western countries, and actually intend to proceed in that way, as shown by the University of the Republic of China:

“We aim to strengthen NSYSU’s academic ties in the United States, Canada, Europe, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, and Southeast Asian countries”

Again referring to the same section of the analysis about individualistic countries, but also Currie’s et al. (2003) theory about the educational system representing the strength of a country is clearly the aim of these universities when setting up these partnerships. Indeed, as explained by Moran and Harris (2007), they seek international recognition, and competitiveness and it is therefore normal that they first endeavor implementing close relationships with institutions based in western or developed countries where according to Moran and Harris (2007) a large number of the world’s best educational systems can be found by the students who still according to the authors, wish to study there because they look for the best schools. The fact that these universities are less attractive could itself be a symbol of less internationalization. Indeed all interviewee agree to say that in today’s environment a global education is needed (Verluyten, 2001), and that the students choose universities in individualistic countries over the ones in collectivistic countries could signify that the ones in collectivistic countries have not yet achieved a high enough level of internationalization they require to evolve in the global environment. However this is left to interpretation, and could be the ground for some further research, nevertheless it is still safe to say that so far the analysis seems to indicate, that collectivistic countries are also at a pretty advanced stage of internationalization, nevertheless in order to compare it with individualistic countries, it is important to look more into detail at how or if internationalization is embedded in these Universities’ strategic plans for the future.

As we just mentioned earlier the universities interviewed in collectivistic countries plan to further develop their partnerships with foreign institutions. This is done in order to provide the best service to their students based on the fact that as the associate dean of the Taiwanese (Republic of China) University puts it “we firmly believe that international vision is one of the essential criteria that future business leaders must possess in the newly emerging global society”. Therefore, and as Friedman (2003) explains, in a globalized world knowledge is global too. How so? Well for collectivistic countries, access to global knowledge is done through research programs, as show the answers for all universities interviewed, nevertheless as explained by the Associate Dean of SunYat Sen school of Economics, another way to do so is through attracting foreign scholars to their universities:

“We hope to promote the exchange of scholars and students, which will provide NSYSU's faculty and students more opportunities to study abroad and broaden their international vision. By the same token, we hope to invite foreign scholars and students to NSYSU, and hope that their presence here will enhance the internationalization of our campus.”

However this is not completely new, since as we described it for individualistic countries, they also consider that having an internationalized staff is an important step to adapt to globalization. In terms of comparison of collectivistic universities and
individualistic universities their views of international staff somewhat differ. Indeed even if they saw the interest of having international staff, few of the individualistic countries (refer to section 5.1.1.1) showed the intention to implement an international hiring strategy. On the other hand collectivistic countries, on top of admitting that an internationalized staff is important, seem to be more active in terms of attracting them to their universities. However with the exception of Columbia, who has an international staff hiring strategy, which we will come back to, collectivistic countries do not seem to have an international staff hiring strategy either as shown by the answers below provided by the Chulalongkorn University and the director of the international office in MMUGM in Indonesia when asked if they have an international hiring policy:

“Well again we have not planned to hire them but in the past we already invited professors from other countries.”

“Not really to her knowledge but they do already have several guest lecturers and teachers coming”

Indeed, in terms of attracting teachers, it seems like the collectivistic countries tend to use more often invitations of foreign scholars for short time periods than directly hiring them. Which is an interesting fact since according to Hofstede’s theory of individualism and collectivism; collectivistic countries are usually more long term oriented. The interviewee from Indonesia is the only one who provided a possible explanation for this tendency; she justified this choice of strategy because of budget restrictions. Moreover, and in spite of the fact that we have not been able to have this information for all collectivistic universities interviewed, it seems like the numbers of foreign faculty are very low. This phenomenon could show that collectivistic countries have a less extended degree of internationalization then individualistic countries. On the other hand this can be argued too. Indeed Columbia has an international staff hiring strategy because they are in need for candidates with a Phd. Indeed as the director of the international office explained, it is apparently quite common that teachers do not have a Phd, for the simple reason that in Columbia and even in South America not that many Phd programs exist:

“here in south America it is not very common that teachers that work have a Phd and so for example you can’t get a Phd in international business in Columbia, so these candidates will either be someone who studied abroad or a foreigner […] The hiring of Phd staff is definitely part of the strategy so yes hiring more international people also.”

Nonetheless, as he puts it himself, it does not necessarily mean that the staff is not internationalized, because as for the individualistic countries, this means that an internationalized profile (whether it is a local scholar or foreigner) is highly considered too. This phenomenon seems to be also the case in the other collectivistic countries interviewed. Even if they admitted that they do not have a large number of international staff, they explain that many of their professors, have an international background since most of them obtained there Phd’s in foreign countries and in most cases in the USA as expressed by the Republic of China university:

“Many of the professors have studied in other countries especially in the USA actually 85% of our professors have received their highest degree from the United States.”
This taken into consideration, collectivistic countries do have an internationalized staff, however, even if having spent sometime abroad does procure cultural awareness, it has less impact on cultural diversity than if they were foreigners, because they do not bring an entirely new cultural background to the table. Based on this observation and on the answers provided by the interviewee, we can maybe find an explanation for the reason why none of the interviewee in collectivistic countries actually attempt to minimize cultural issues nor include it in their team building methods. Indeed even if numbers of international full time staff are very low, not much is done either for the temporary visitors. Only an integration week is planned for international students.

University of Thailand: “For our students there is an integration week but for the teachers you just provide them with many services and take them to visit.”
University of the Republic of China: “The staff of the OIA are always ready to assist foreign students and scholars on campus. We hope to create a friendly environment so to make our international friends feel at home in Kaohsiung.”

All in all, we can see that the internationalization processes within collectivistic countries are relatively similar to the ones used by individualistic countries, meaning that they are subject to an increase in cultural diversity. Nevertheless the fact that the figures regarding the number of international students, international staff and that individualistic countries are more attractive to students, seem to show that the level of internationalization is achieved at lesser extent than the one in individualistic countries. However this does not mean that it should not be taken into consideration, because it still could lead to cultural issues. This is what the next part will try to determine by looking into depth at the leadership styles in place.

5.1.2.2 Leadership

Decision making structures and their responsibilities
Like in individualistic countries, the respondents in the collectivistic oriented culture have the same responsibilities, including coordination of the international programs, curricular issues, budgeting, student exchange programs, part-time and fulltime teacher selection, participation in academic events, strategies…etc.
In terms of Universities’ structure the decision processes flow is always from top-down showing that all the Universities selected in the collectivistic countries have rather a bureaucratic structure because the statements of the respondents on the structure and leadership performed reflect on Sergiovanni and Corbally’s (1988) definition that bureaucracy is “the simple application of authority from the top down”. This is in the contrary of the Universities selected in the Individualistic countries, except JIBS in Sweden.

Another interesting finding is that they all indicate that instructions and functions are clearly assigned and that all the decisions are mainly discussed with the committee or University affairs that primarily examine and decide on proposals in cooperation with the Dean, the higher authority that is mostly elected by the committee. Indeed, also here the number of people led by the selected decision makers varies from a team of 2, 12 to a whole department of more than 25 employees.
Associate Dean, Taiwan: “The College is actually divided into 7 departments per study program, with each its own director. And then on top there is the President of the University system and there are board committees that serve on behalf of the University that have appointed the President. We all report to Dean of the college and he receives instructions from the President. In my department there are 27 staff members and it is our responsibility to organize our own department based on the strategic guidelines set by our dean.”

Deputy Director of the office of international affairs Faculty of Economy, Thailand: “In our office we are 12 people working, there is a director who depends from the director of the university. Well, main decisions are taken by the director of the department, but in other cases there are different procedures. For each department there is a decision committee who examines proposals and accepts or rejects proposals. Other decisions have to get the agreement of the ministry of University affairs.”

Head of international business department at EAFIT, Columbia: “In regards to the people involved, it depends, but in my case I belong to the business school, so we have the dean then department heads, and then you have the program coordinators getting involved too, there are clear assigned functions. Within the university we also have always weekly meetings, where all department heads come together with the dean and discuss the dean’s proposals. Consensus is sought for at all levels, we use committees for each issues, e.g. administrative committee, academic, research it is usually a committee who decides. Cut of course I have the final say in my department but I do consult before hand.”

Leadership styles
From the findings it is clear that the decision makers execute mostly a type of ‘alternative leadership’ of the autocratic style in combination with listening & consulting, which we could say that participation is encouraged to some extent. However, with this we rather mean that the decision makers encourage their staff to share an opinion, but not take decisions. Decisions are always made by them or even higher authority, like the Dean or the committee. This also reflects on the theory of Yukl (2005) and Goethals et al. (2004) that in the autocratic leadership style the final decisions are always made by higher authority, where Goethals et al. (2004) argues that autocratic leadership leads to more accurate decisions when the leader is well versed in the subject under discussion. Again as asserted earlier in the analysis of the Individualistic countries Goethals et al. (2004) mentioned that autocratic leadership can also be multifaceted, which explains why some respondents use a directive or authoritarian style as we called it “alternative style’ of autocratic leadership. Furthermore, they perform these leadership styles in combination with listening and consulting the staff for certain decisions that need to be made showing either other cultural traits in their management styles that reflects the style of the majority or dominant University partners they work with as asserted by Warner (2003) or changing towards a leadership ideal which have been a consequence of the mixture of cultures working within the institution as asserted by Chhokar et al. (2007). However, from the answers of the respondents and the statistical information on international staff working in these Universities, it is rather clear that in the collectivistic cultures the change would...
rather be because of their partners. However in the individualistic cultures it would rather be because of the mixture of cultures within the working environment.

The above mentioned statement by Goethals explains two behaviors indicated by the respondents. First, they all mention that for everybody it is clear what decisions are to be made showing the accuracy of decision making of autocratic leadership, which is supported by the governance/structure of the Universities, in this case the bureaucratic one. Like in the individualistic countries also here the University systems imply to have affected the leadership styles as argued by Morrill (2007).

Second, the allowance of discussion and concern for opinion shows that also in the Collectivistic cultures we can find variability in the leadership styles. This might also reflect on the argument by Warner (2003) that leaders in some Asian countries are often benevolent in nature. However, that the leaders listen and consult with their staff is also confirmed by Currie et al. (2003) where he argues that authoritarian leaders tend not to negotiate or consult with staff, students or the community and by Brody (2004) when he argued that directive leaders, although may occasionally ask questions or allow limited dialogue, but the decision is essentially and primarily made by the authority.

Associate dean, Taiwan: “Autocratic leadership style is performed. But it is important to listen and ask for the opinions on specific matters.”…”Yes it is important to have the opinion of the other professors and listen to them to know what is best for the team, but in the end I always make the final decisions which I am supposed to take and other are made by the Dean or President.”

Head of office of International affairs, Indonesia: “It is a directive leadership style with formal actions and the system allows us to discuss problems, ask for suggestions, in the end I take the decisions.”

Deputy Director of the office of international affairs Faculty of Economy, Thailand: “Well it is an authoritarian leadership because we believe that hierarchy works here, but we care and listen to the employees. Everybody is content in this way.”…” Most decisions are discussed by committee and I try to speak with the staff to have their opinion so that I can explain to the committee. We consider and represent what is decided by the Director because he knows what is best.”

Head of International Business Department at EAFIT, Columbia: “In my department, well as head of the department I could take certain decisions in a very authoritarian way, but what I usually try to do is reach a consensus during weekly department meetings where all 12 people from the international business department get together and discuss things, so as you can see it is trying to find a consensus among professors. So, I would say in this case, well it’s democratic but ok lets say I stand very much behind my views, but ok its true, but sometimes I want to get certain things through, but still I would say it is democratic because during discussions sometimes I change my opinion. Yes I am consultive, I consult people.” …”In most cases yes, but I mean in certain cases we have established procedures, so I don’t have to consult, but there are certain procedures regarding, I don’t know, complaints of students, review of exams, or
Certain things where there is a policy and where I right away take a decision. But in mostly we do that jointly.”

Although we find only the difference in leadership style in Colombia, which can be explained because the Head of International Business Department is originally from Germany (an individualistic country) and has worked in Colombia for 9 years. He clearly tries to perform a democratic leadership style and discusses and consulates with his staff, unlike the other respondents. However, from his answers a few things have come up. First, that although he tries to discuss things in a democratic way the system of the University clearly constrains him in doing so for certain decisions which have steady procedures of the bureaucratic structure that need to be followed. Thus, because Peters (2001) explained that bureaucratic structures often imply strong sense of top down hierarchy, with often high levels of control generally slowing down processes, from which we can assume to be less flexible and making it therefore for him difficult to change on other levels. Second, because he applies that he could use an authoritarian way of dealing with things it indicates that this form of leadership style is also accepted within the Colombian University. Nevertheless, like other interviewed decision makers in the collectivistic countries also he includes higher authority if disagreements occur and they can not find a consensus. However, the University system in Colombia shows also that the system allow foreigners working there to perform a different type of leadership, also before he came to work there, because he mentioned that the previous Head of International Business Department is Dutch in origin.

Here below are a few examples of the importance of higher authority when disagreements occur, but in general we can see that rarely employees question the decisions made. This type of behavior is also confirmed by Currie et al. (2003) that authoritarian leaders expect their orders to be obeyed without question. This statement also shows why the Associate Deans when having a disagreement that is not accepted, if hardly ever, they call in the Dean, even higher authority. Nevertheless, that the followers are not questioning the leader and that the leaders indicate that they find it important to listen and to take care and look after the best interest of all employees reflects on Hofstede’s (2001) collectivistic strong cohesive in-group integration, which are protected by their leader in exchange for unquestioning loyalty.

Associate Dean, Taiwan: “Sometimes there are some disagreements but in that case it is important to listen to what they have to say and explain the decision processes that are taken and if there is still problems the Dean comes in.”…“We take decisions on matters that we know and discuss. I take decisions and consider their suggestions and I take decisions on the budgets and then the staff reviews it to see if any changes they think is needed.”

In terms of successful obtaining of acceptance by staff the decision makers indicate that sometimes certain changes are made, but in general no one really complains, as the Associate Dean in Taiwan quoted the flowing about the staff: “They are hard workers and have always listened to me and I always try to look after the best interest of all.” The Associate Dean of the department of Business Management at the College of Management at the Sun Yat Sen University in Taiwan also implies that he tries to coordinate and makes sure that everybody does their job and takes care of any problems if they arise. He also mentions that things are discussed quite informally with the
professors, which are also highly educated and have expertise in many subjects and therefore is important to listen to their opinions.

Also the Head of Office of International Affairs in Indonesia asserts that all decisions are well understood by the staff.

Head of international business department at EAFIT, Columbia: “Yes, yes of course we had that, I mean unpopular decisions we also have to take them, but ok first I try to consult you know, with the department so my people and we try to find a consensus, but I mean in cases where I cannot find an agreement, what I usually do is, I bring in our dean, yes so basically for example I sometimes invite our dean to the meeting, so my boss, to also talk about it. So if I can’t find a consensus I invite my boss.” However, he feels that he has always successfully obtained acceptance of the staff, even when unpopular decisions are made because he listens and consults with them and expresses himself on this matter: “I think it is because it also a thing of consulting listening to people, I think that I manage this very well here”.

Deputy Director of the office of international affairs Faculty of Economy, Thailand: “Everybody’s tasks are defined so some for example are responsible for the administration others for relations with the university for example.”

**Change or no change**

Here we look at if there has been any evidence of change in the increase of meetings and change in leadership styles performed by the selected decision makers, based on their answers. Before we analyze the findings, here are a few quotes:

Associate dean, Taiwan: “We have meetings once every month. And really no change has been made.”

Head of office of International affairs, Indonesia: “Once a month. And it has not changed.”

Deputy Director, Thailand: “We have meetings with the entire staff every two weeks. I have worked here for 2 years now and I was a student here before and I went to Europe for 2 years to do a Masters. But, I think meetings are the same.”

Head of International Business Department, Columbia: “No it has always been like that, I am here now since 9 years and it has always been like that, we cannot always all meet but there is a space in the agenda every week on the same day on the same time.”

From these finding it is clear that the number of meetings also in the selected Universities in collectivistic countries have not changed, just like in the individualistic ones. Furthermore, they all think that the development of internationalization requires recruitment of international staff and mention that they all have visiting professors from abroad giving lectures or whole courses and that they recognize the value of new teaching methods that also bring about certain issues in teaching and changes in their tasks rather than issues and changes in their management/leadership styles. Nevertheless there are no special merits made for the individuals from foreign countries, but rather emphasizing care for the group and fostering in-group belonging for the foreigner teachers confirms as suggested by Samovar et al. (2007) that this type of behavior is valued by collectivistic cultures and as clear from their answers:
Deputy Director, Thailand: “We already invite a lot of foreign professors to the university, but of course hiring international staff is important to provide students with a good education…and most like it here. We know that Westerners have different approaches and we welcome innovative ideas. One of the professors I worked with in Europe was here last semester and is already planning to come back.” Although he implies to be open to new ideas of working and teaching he also states the following: “I have learned much from working in Europe, but things work here quite differently. We all respect the Thai values and they seem to be working quite well.”

Associate Dean, Taiwan: “We invite a lot of teachers from other countries to our university to teach some classes to our students and we believe that this is very important for them to receive quality education in an international environment.”

On the question if recruitment of international staff has brought any managerial issues he answers: “Yes we have to organize how the teachers will come and one classes they will teach. But we enjoy having these professors from other countries coming very much.” And again if his leadership style has changed therefore he answers ‘yes’, but implies to use the same leadership style that is in frame of the policy: “I use the same tactics and listen to our foreigner guests. It is important to work together and know what is happening and to provide a well organized environment for all employees.”

Head of office of International affairs, Indonesia thinks it is important that students receive a cultural education and one way to do so is by having international teachers teaching them, implying that it would be good to recruit more international professors. She also points out that they already have several guest lecturers and teachers coming from abroad especially for the language courses. However, she indicates because of the language barrier it would be difficult to hire a larger number of foreign staff since the working environment is mostly in Indonesian, where it is not necessary for her to change her leadership style. However, she highlights that a lot of their local staff has had experiences abroad and it is an important criteria when hiring. On the managerial issues she states: “The culture is very Indonesian in management, which is quite authoritative approach of teaching. There have been a few cultural shocks well due to religion during Ramadan new comers are not always aware of everything, and she heard from foreign teachers that Indonesian students do not participate a lot they mostly listen and it surprised some professors.”

Only according to the answers from the Head of international business department at EAFIT, Columbia we can state that management has changed not only since he arrived there 9 years ago, but also before by a previous Head of international business department that was also from an Individualistic cultures. Quote: “I would say so, just thinking about myself, as a German we have a different working style than Columbia, so yes management changed since I arrived. You always have to adapt but in my case I had to adapt but it’s a mixture they have to adapt too.” However, he does say that there are only few foreigners working in the whole University, so he only foresees more change in management if a foreigner is hired for the position of an Associate Dean, otherwise not.

Although we did not intend to analyze uniqueness of each country, in order to generalize and find differences and similarities but this was needed to some extent in...
In order to see the big picture and recognize possible biases. Furthermore, what we did expect to find is that the volume of multiculturalism in the working environment would be lower in the Collectivistic cultures than in the Individualistic ones. We also expected to find to some extent that Collectivistic cultures have taken over some Westerner cultural characteristics, but rather in Asia than in Colombia, because of the industrialization and economic development that is influenced by the West as asserted by Warner (2003). Therefore, from these findings we can say that globalization has influenced and changed the leadership style to some extent in the International University in Colombia, but in the selected Universities in Asia it has not as we had expected.

**Cultural awareness**

Important to explain why we have gained less information on this matter from the collectivistic cultures than from the individualistic cultures; including answers on other matters regarding to disagreements and cultural misunderstandings might be because of various reasons. First, as the theory shows according to Warner (2003) in most Asian cultures one values not to lose face and is rather not so keen on sharing information on things that do not go well because they are expected to serve the government or the monarchy they are in. More specifically, the system they work in. Second reason why we could not obtain much information is that there might be lack of transparency in business transactions because most decisions are made within the higher authority than the respondents’ have. And third, there simply might not be any cultural misunderstanding because the statistics show that their working environment is still very homogeneous, having only once in a while a teaching visitors over. But, also as explained earlier according to the theory and according to the respondents’ answers people in collectivistic culture are not supposed to question decisions made or argue against it, which indicates that people will also not share their disagreements. And last, but not least, from some of the answers it is clear that in some cases where the respondents mean to answer ‘no’ they have answered ‘yes’ with the opposite explanation to avoid criticism that might be implied if they would answer no. These findings reflect on the argument of Warner (2003) that in the selected Asian cultures one may convey denial of a question or a request by saying ‘yes’ to avoid confrontations, criticism of others because they are concerned about causing loss of face to others as mentioned earlier.

Associate Dean, Taiwan: “For visiting teachers we organize everything for them, but we don’t have an integration period but we introduce them to everybody.”

Head of office of International affairs, Indonesia: “Not really any cultural issues yet so no need for it, they meet with professor before and answer his questions if any about that.”

Deputy Director of the office of international affairs Faculty of Economy, Thailand: “For our students there is an integration week but for the teachers you just provide them with many services and take them to visit.”

And according to the Head of international business department at EAFIT, Columbia, which is one of very few from another cultural background and the only one from an Individualistic culture working in Columbia asserts that cultural issues do not exist and
from his point of view how he has dealt with it, he quotes: “learning by doing, adapting.”

However, according to their statements on minimizing the cultural issues we can generalize that the decision makers in the Asian selected countries are at the stage of tolerance towards other cultures, because they indicate to be glad to have their visiting guests from abroad over and introduce them to everybody and the system, but are rather limited in their answers. However because there is no integration period or much diversity according to the statistics and their answers, we can say that it is not near to close to multiculturalism within the International Universities in collectivistic countries. Where one can also not be more than tolerant towards other cultures as they have not been in any situation yet where they had to deal with cultural differences and need for openness and positive acceptance of other cultural values, at least not on the individual level. Although literature shows that many collectivistic (non-Western) countries have been influenced by the West on the institutional/localization level according to (Warner, 2003; Friedman, 2005), it is not evident yet that Western values have been adopted a great deal by the non-Western cultures on the individual level. We could say that maybe the autocratic leadership has been softened by the West through out the history as mentioned by Warner (2003) and we say that because they listen and consult with their staff, but that could also be just the paternalistic or benevolent leadership styles performed in combination with the autocratic style within the collectivistic countries (Ting-Toomey, 1999; Warner, 2003).

Only, for the Head of international business department at EAFIT, Columbia can we say to have positive acceptance of other cultures and to be culturally aware, because he states that learning and adapting is important. According to Thomas et al. (2003) this type of behavior, which he explains to be understanding, learning more about it and reshaping towards other cultures reflects on the behavior of culturally aware people. Furthermore, that he is able to perform a democratic leadership style in a culture where hierarchy and authority are valued and where subordinates have different expectations from a leader than in Individualistic cultures according to Hofstede (2001) can be explained by the literature findings of various scholars (Thomas et al. 2003; House et.al. 1997; Yukl, 2005). First, that culture can be learned according to Thomas et al. (2003). Second, that that cultural values and traditions can influence the attitudes and behaviors of managers/leaders, but also employees perceptions and expectations according to (House et.al. 1997; Hofstede, 2001) indicates in the case of Columbia that both the leader which is from an individualistic culture has influenced employees accepting democratic leadership style, but that he him self also sometimes takes decisions in authoritarian way. Here we find cultural awareness on both sides; the leaders’ and the subordinates’, which are mainly Columbian according to the respondent.

5.1.2.3 Organizing change

In order to conduct a valid comparison between the universities interviewed in individualistic and collectivistic countries, in terms of organizing change, it is important that we maintain the same approach to the model as in the individualistic countries. This is indeed made possible through the fact that all interviewed universities in collectivistic countries stated the same goal in terms of reaction towards globalization just like the
individualistic countries, as shown for example by the response provided by the university located in the Republic of China:

“Also we hope to promote the exchange of scholars and students, which will provide NSYSU’s faculty and students more opportunities to study abroad and broaden their international vision. By the same token, we hope to invite foreign scholars and students to NSYSU, and hope that their presence here will enhance the internationalization of our campus.”

Therefore since we will be using the same goal, meaning: “Gain international recognition for the quality of research and education” and that the problem facing is the same as for individualistic countries, meaning: an increase of competitiveness among educational institutions, which is a result of globalization, and therefore requires collectivistic universities to adopt a reaction. Moreover still in terms of maintaining validity for the comparison, it is also important to keep the same objective as in the interpretation of organizing change in individualistic countries; which is a desire to increase cultural diversity. The design of internationalization plan which they also all claimed to have done still has to be conducted through the sense making process described by Furnham (2005). Plus it has to be conducted on the localization level, or in other words it has to be done in respect to the universities internal environment. At last the implementation of change also has to be done, bearing in mind the individualization level of culture of the individuals but most importantly through the use of an appropriate type of leadership. In most cases the leadership style in the interviewed universities does not necessarily match the one described by Wall (2005), which therefore could be a source of resistance to change, however as explained in the analysis of their leadership style and as explained by Ting-Toomey (1999) and Warner (2003) benevolent leadership styles can still have good results in terms of loyalty and therefore minimize the risks of resistance. Based on this observation it is hard to say whether the leadership style in place could be at the source of the insufficient outcome or whether it’s other phenomena not taken into account during the sense making process. In every case when compared to individualistic countries, figures show a far smaller degree of diversity among students and an even fewer one for staff, which tend to lead to the conclusion that the implementation of their internationalization strategy did not have the intended results, which therefore means that the problem has to be addressed from the start again, and requires more thorough sense making.
Model 1.3: Organizational Change within the Universities in Collectivistic countries selected (van Eysendeyk and Rebac, 2009)

Cross-cultural comparative study – Master Thesis - JIBS

**Goal:**
Gain international recognition for the quality of research and education

**Problem A:**
Change in environment: Globalization

**Institutional level:**
Universities
Change:
Internationalization strategy:
Aim to Increase cultural diversity

**Outcome:**
Low level of Cultural diversity among students and even lower for staff

**Implementation of change:**
individual level
Key factors of success:
- Leadership
- Culture: Collectivistic

**Result:**
Haven’t achieved sufficient degree of internationalization

**Problem A remains unchanged**
5.2 RESULTS

1. In relation to the changes within the working environment caused by globalization, what are the differences and similarities in leadership styles, between individualistic and collectivistic countries?

The results of our analysis for this question came a bit as a surprise to us since we assumed that a growingly cultural diverse environment would necessarily lead to an increase in cultural issues and also a larger variety of responses to change. This would therefore lead to adjustments in terms of the leadership style. However it seems like this is not the case. Indeed most interviewed decision makers whether they are from universities in collectivistic or in individualistic countries indicate very few examples of cultural misunderstandings. In fact in the cases where they do; which is only in individualistic universities, they explain that it has very little incidence on their leadership style in general and even less in terms of organizing change. Since as we will see in a later question they prefer dealing with cultural diversity using cultural awareness. In the analysis we suggested a few reasons which could explain this phenomenon. In terms of collectivistic countries the one that prevails is the assumption that states that the degree of cultural diversity among staff is still relatively low and therefore does not require any specific measures yet. In regards to individualistic countries, we suggest that a possible reason for the lack of specific measures, is related to the fact that the individualistic universities consider themselves as institutions applying a very democratic style of leadership, it therefore implies that they are very participative and consequently already give a lot of consideration to their staff’s needs. Nevertheless, if this is the reason behind the lack of adaptation, we find that it might be a little presumptuous of them. Indeed, our findings show that they are not always as democratic as they claim to be and secondly, such a bold view fails to consider that people from different cultures might not have the needs they expect them to have.

In terms of comparisons of leadership styles, our findings were already a bit more in line with our expectations. Indeed in regards to collectivistic countries, a majority of decision makers apply a benevolent authoritarian leadership style. Which means that is a top down decision making process, very hierarchical, still very bureaucratic and rather nurturing behavior towards their employees, which in return considers unquestionable loyalty. This explains why there is use to some extent of consultancy methods in collectivistic cultures, enabling employees to give their opinion even if they will not be taking the final. Moreover in certain cultures examined, challenging the authority is not something common, which therefore implies that their leadership style does not need so much adaptation, especially given the fact that until today, the figures related to cultural diversity among staff are still fairly low.

2. How do Universities integrate globalization/internationalization within their strategic planning?

Our findings show that globalization has definitely been taken into account by all interviewees, meaning that Globalization is definitely taken into account in both collectivistic and individualistic countries. This can easily be identified by looking at their strategies. Indeed all strategic plans are based on a similar goal, that has been mentioned on several occasions, and which relates to Currie’s et al. (2003) findings but also Moran and Harris’s (2007) which relate back to the prime role of universities
meaning providing students with quality education. Well, all interviewee to some extend agree to say that in today’s context of Globalization, an international dimension definitely has to be given to the education in order to achieve this purpose. Moreover all universities express the wish to contribute to their own nation in terms of image of excellence, and also on an international level in terms of recognition for their research. Therefore in order to attract students and scholars from all around the world which contribute to this goal, all universities whether it is in individualistic countries or collectivistic countries have implemented cooperation measures, or in other words have set up partnerships to facilitate access to the knowledge that has to be included in the curricula. These partnerships are a representation of the definition of internationalization, which has been defined in the theoretical section, based on several authors such as Currie et al. (2003) and Friedman (2005) as the collaboration between two parties across borders but in respect of each other’s differences. These partnerships exist under different forms, they can be student or staff exchange programs, research programs, dual degree programs or even a combination of several of them. Both, collectivistic and individualistic countries make use of these. Actually these partnerships are set up between and among collectivistic and individualistic countries. However our analysis shows that individualistic countries seem to be more successful in terms of implementation of these partnerships, which therefore leads to the conclusion that individualistic countries have achieved a slightly higher degree of internationalization. Indeed even if there are some exceptions individualistic countries tend to have more partnerships with other individualistic countries, yet it is also the case for collectivistic countries. This phenomenon has been explained on the fact that a majority of high quality education institutions are located in western countries which are oftentimes located in individualistic cultures, example the US or the UK, and therefore tend to attract more partnerships because they bring a higher contribution to the achievement of the strategic plan mentioned above. Moreover as a consequence of this phenomenon individualistic countries tend to attract more international students and staff, conclusion reached through the fact that in spite of having the approximate same number of international partnerships, collectivistic countries have much smaller figures in terms of foreign students and staff. This, on top of budget issues, could be the reason why individualistic universities have hired a larger number of international staff. Indeed hiring international staff, shows a greater will of integration of an international strategy, nonetheless collectivistic countries have a tendency to invite foreign scholars for a short period of time. Another explanation found through our analysis for this same phenomenon is the fact that since a smaller number of Phd programs (reference in terms of quality of education) are available in collectivistic country, many scholars originating from collectivistic countries go abroad for their degree, and therefore when returning already contribute to the internationalization of the university they work for. This is certainly true, but it can be argued whether it is as effective in terms of internationalization of the staff. The answer to this question could be a starting point for future research, however and this will be developed in the next question, it does affect the degree of heterogeneity within collectivistic and individualistic countries.

3. How has internationalization effected the degree of heterogeneity within teams in collectivistic versus individualistic countries?

The previous question and this one are closely related, because before being able to provide an answer to this one we first had to determine whether or not
internationalization of staff was a common phenomenon to collectivistic countries and individualistic countries. As shown in the answer to the previous question, it is debatable whether or not this statement can be made. Indeed as described in the analysis, hiring of international staff is definitely an ongoing process within individualistic countries, even though this does not mean that it is part of a hiring strategy, since choices for candidates are skill based and not origin based, although an international profile is considered as an extra skill. On the other hand in regards to collectivistic countries, international staff hiring is not a priority, indeed they seem to much rather prefer the form of short term interventions enabled by invitations. Based on this finding and the simple comparison of the number of international scholars and staff, we can say that the degree of heterogeneity is higher in individualistic countries than in collectivistic countries. This statement matched our assumption; however we also thought that such phenomenon would have a greater impact on the organization of the universities in individualistic countries, than in the collectivistic ones. It turns out that our findings do not tend to indicate this and would on the contrary point out heterogeneity at least at this point does not influence to a great extent the management of the universities. Indeed, nor a more long term solution such as the one implemented in individualistic countries or a more short term one such as the one in collectivistic countries seem to have dramatic effects on their team building methods. Moreover in regards to both collectivistic and individualistic countries an increase of heterogeneity does not seem to affect leadership style. Quick reminder, in regards to these statements, there is a general view of what is happening in collectivistic or individualistic universities interviewed, indeed some exceptions might have been cited in the analysis (in this case for example Columbia), but those statements are based on recurrence in the majority of cases as explained in the methodology. Two possible phenomena were put forward to explain our findings. The first one being that it is not excluded that some leadership changes have been made before given the fact that globalization is not a new phenomenon. The second possibility put forward is the fact that the degree of heterogeneity might still be too low since the percentage of international staff has not topped 10% yet in most individualistic universalities, and hardly reaches more than 1 or 2% in collectivistic countries. These numbers are regarding to the ratio number of international staff over total number of staff (see appendix 3 & 4). In terms of team building, here again generalization of behaviors in individualistic countries leads to saying that cultural diversity is not taken into consideration is spite of the fact that Verluyten’s (2001) theory states that a well managed heterogeneous team leads to better performance. Same behavior applies to collectivistic countries. At last, it seems like very little is done in both individualistic and collectivistic countries to minimize management issues related to cultural differences. This statement can however be tempered by the fact that some decision makers in individualistic countries interviewed do integrate cultural awareness, even if results show that it is dependent on the background and leadership style of the person in charge, which will be further developed in the last sub-question.

4. To what extent has globalization made the leaders/decision makers in International Universities culturally aware?

As stated in the answers to the previous sub-questions, Globalization has with no doubt brought cultural diversity to both individualistic and collectivistic countries, even if it is to a far lesser extent in the second case. Nevertheless, it appears like neither
individualistic nor collectivistic countries have considerably adapted their leadership style to it. In fact the analysis shows that neither the collectivistic nor individualistic countries interrogated have done anything to integrate cultural diversity within their management systems which according to our assumption but also the theory is an efficient way of dealing with the cultural issues that may arise from an increase in diversity. One of the reasons that might justify this finding at least in regards to collectivistic universities interviewed is the fact that cultural diversity is in fact pretty limited. However, this does not seem to be the case for the individualistic countries, since our results show that even if it is not homogenous in all countries we looked at cultural diversity is in fact a reality. Though, the decision makers seem to have a different approach towards it than expected. Indeed they all recognize the existence of cultural diversity and have introduced the notion of cultural awareness, but then again they do not all show the same degree of cultural awareness. In fact, our results showed that cultural diversity can be dealt with, on three different levels. Indeed there is the decision maker who adopts a “be like me attitude”, which is to a certain extent an example of cultural tolerance. This means that even if he requests his foreign staff to adapt and adopt the local cultural system the decision maker still respects the other cultures. A greater degree of cultural awareness would be a decision maker who is culturally open. This means that not only does he respect foreign cultures, but he also understands them. Nevertheless the working environment is still very much oriented around local behavior and practices, even if on certain occasions they will account with the cultural differences presented among their staff. At last as explained by Verluyten (2001) and Thomas et al. (2003) the highest degree of cultural awareness, is to actually be “cultural aware” or in other words to have a positive appreciation towards foreign cultures. In short, to be culturally aware means that the decision maker actually prefers some aspects of an outlandish culture over his own and therefore goes as far as adopting these specific practices. However, our findings do not enable us to say that individualistic leaders have a certain degree of culture awareness as this according to our findings seems to vary from person to person and seem according to our findings to be related to their background, personality and other psychological factors.

5.3 PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

This paper provides decision makers with a method for the implementation of organizational change which is valid in a culturally diverse context. Furthermore, Globalization is still ongoing, meaning that cultural diversity will keep on increasing, therefore we suggest that cultural awareness is sufficient for now but it might not always be that way and in that case this paper provides suggestions how to embrace cultural diversity in the future through adapting leadership style and team building methods. At last this paper suggests a reason why universities in collectivistic countries have not achieved such great levels of internationalization, and therefore could use it as a basis to implement a new internationalization strategy.
5.4 LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Although according to Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2004) a small sample size (small-scale) studies are not particularly a limitation, however the assumptions made based on it might be bias to some extent. As we have only interviewed only one decision-maker within one department of a University/Faculty, in particular the decision makers on International Affairs, first it can not be generalized with certainty that all the decision makers within all the departments perform the same leadership style, even though leadership styles are influenced by the governance/systems and the culture of the University. Therefore, on this aspect it would have been better if we could have interviewed more decision makers. On other aspects such as finding out if there are indeed cultural misunderstandings and differences in expectations of moral behavior it would have been better if we also could have interviewed one of each employee/follower working under the interviewed decision maker that is from a collectivistic culture or individualistic culture working in the opposite culture. However, this type of cross-cultural research implies a larger sample for which much more time is needed then the given time for this master thesis. Another limitations is that this study did not take into account any sub-cultures, such as regional culture, and/or sub-cultures within the particular department of the University. Furthermore, we also believe that we could have gained more information through face-to-face interviews on certain questions, especially with the respondents from collectivistic cultures, because then we could have observed from their non-verbal communication if a question was not clear due to language barrier, or if a question is too perceptive for the respondent to answer due to cultural values and beliefs.

Further research can be conducted in various ways. We encourage this comparative study to be extended horizontally within the Universities, interviewing more than one decision maker, and/or more than one follower in different departments on the cultural dimension including leadership and organizing change and their expectations and satisfactions. However, on the same subject as this study we encourage to expend the study in the same geographical area and then compare them across cultures. With this we mean more International Universities within one culture and across cultures on the IDV dimension or even another cultural dimension.

However, these findings can also be used to conduct further research on which approach has shown best performance towards multiculturalism depending on the multicultural environment of the University, which we have presented here. The following research could be conducted on performance measurement in his form of employee satisfaction and student satisfaction. This would be central to the concept of University quality improvement; that would provide a means to define what Universities actually do, and to compare that with the original targets in order to identify opportunities for improvement in cultural context. The principal methods used for the following research would include measuring Universities’ performance through regulatory inspection, staff and student satisfaction surveys, third-party assessment, and statistical indicators, most of which have not yet been tested rigorously. While this study has merit, the methods need to be re-evaluated. The power of the study needs to be increased as mentioned earlier by obtaining a larger sample size. The numerous potential threats to internal validity of further research can be addressed and minimized where possible by using the results of this study. As explained earlier many cultural misunderstandings can lead to
unsatisfied employees and consequentially to ineffective performance of a multicultural team if insufficiently managed (Verluyten, 2001). Therefore it would be helpful to find out the satisfaction degree of employees in both, collectivistic and individualistic countries. Without these, it will be impossible to evaluate the potential meaningfulness of this study.

Furthermore, throughout the research we found that it would also be interesting to focus on another Hofstede’s cultural dimension, Uncertainty avoidance which can be linked to organizing change. In other words, the cultural dimension can be used to find out how decision makers and employees within Universities react to change in high and low uncertainty avoidance cultures.

And last, but not least, interacting effectively within Universities and with their partners is crucial because it effects generations to come across cultures, and as cultural intelligence (or CQ as its measure would be called) is a relatively new idea that builds on these earlier concepts (Thomas et al. 2003) but that incorporates the capability to interact effectively across cultures is another incentive for us to encourage following research to measure CQ of decision-makers within the International Universities.

6 CONCLUSION

To what extent does globalization accelerate and effect change in the working environment and leadership style within international universities between individualistic and collectivistic cultures?

In order to answer this question, we decided to approach it by breaking it down into different parts. However we came to realize that there is in fact some interconnectivity between all aspects covered by this question.

First of all we decided to address the question of globalization alone, and how exactly it manifests itself within universities in both collectivistic and individualistic countries. As it turns out, and this is confirmed by many authors among whom Currie et al. (2003) to name simply one, Globalization in the world of educational systems is a reality. Its impact on educational systems is rather curious since through an unexpected paradox it simultaneously drives institutions closer by encouraging the creation of boarder free partnerships, but also drives them apart since it encourages competition among universities from both collectivistic and individualistic countries. The competition is actually ferocious since all schools express the same desire to establish an international recognition and to provide their students with the best globalized knowledge as explained by Friedman (2005). This phenomenon, which actually is pretty representative of the internationalization process adjacent to globalization, is by far the fastest growing effect. Point proven by the fact that all internationalization plans we came across, mention the aim to develop extensively these networks. Nevertheless individualistic universities are further ahead in the process of internationalization and it is therefore but only logical that they are more exposed to another obvious impact of the Globalization phenomenon, which is the increased mobility of students and staff and leads to the increase of cultural diversity. Indeed the diversity does not seem to be distributed equally among individualistic and collectivistic countries. As a matter of fact
the degree of cultural diversity is much higher among individualistic universities than in collectivistic universities, however in terms of impact on leadership it is minimal in individualistic countries and close to zero in collectivistic countries. Indeed individualistic countries seem to cope with globalization through the use of cultural awareness, which for us was an expected finding.

To summarize, Globalization does indeed bring a lot of changes to the external and internal environment of universities, again to a greater extend in individualistic than in collectivistic countries. However in spite of the fact that they do integrate globalization in their strategies, none of them seem to integrate it in their structure.

For the time being issues related to cultural diversity seem to be contained, and therefore without much impact on universities’ way of working. However, Globalization is an ongoing process, and it does come along with cultural diversity which does also accompany cultural issues. Meaning that if all universities achieve what they plan for the future, chances are that it will at some point impact universities’ in both collectivistic and individualistic cultures to a much greater extent which will require evolutions in terms of leadership but also structure.
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8 APPENDICES

8.1 Appendix 1: Hofstede’s scale of cultural dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>PDI</th>
<th>IDV</th>
<th>MAS</th>
<th>UAI</th>
<th>LTO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arab World **</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh *</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria *</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China *</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic*</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Africa **</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia *</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary *</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg *</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta *</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco *</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland *</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania *</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia *</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia *</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surinam *</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad *</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Venezuela</strong></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Vietnam *</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Africa</strong></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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8.5 Appendix 5: Interviews Individualistic countries

8.5.1 Craig School of Business, FCU, United States

Interview

Position: Associate Dean  
University: Craig School of Business  
Location: United States, Fresno California State  
Nationality: American  
Cultural background: bicultural; British/ American

Leadership style & organizing change

1. What is the decision process/Who is involved in the decision process?

It is all focused on the student. In my work basically, all faculty and staff directly report to me. With the exception of our development and advancement officer, those are the people that raise funding for the future business. I report to the dean and he reports to the director of his own staff member.

Decisions are made in the department among all the faculty and then those decisions/proposals come forward to the dead and associate dean. We have an academic counsel where we meet with all of the department heads where these proposals come forwards. And, if it is a proposal that needs deciding among the entire college, we have several government bodies, which are elected faculty members that make decisions on how resources are met and that comity is called organization for research resources. And there might be other decisions related to curriculum or how we are moving towards the future. That goes to another government comity, very similar again elected faculty members and they proceed over those proposals. Now, from those comity then the care of the comity forwards the ideas/decisions to the Dean and the Associate dean. At that point we feel we have made a complete consultative loop. Everybody has had the opportunity to way in on these ideas, proposals and decisions, and then we are able to use that information to make final decisions.

The key thing in our culture in the collage the decisions are made up-wards, rather then from deans office down. So, they begin from the faculty and they move upwards. In other words, decision making is very consultative and bottom -up.

2. How regularly do you meet with your staff? Has this increased in the past 5 years? 
If yes, what were the main reasons?

I would say once a week or every two weeks. No, I don’t think so.

3. Do you systematically discuss different propositions and opinions of colleagues before taking a decision?

Yes, mostly its very systematic. However, I do make some decision without discussing and make them on my own.

4. What type of decisions are taken during these meetings?
Various decisions. I would say that it includes budgets, how many students should be in which program, but also any decisions regarding curriculum changes, who we intend to hire in the future. Also choosing International Partners.

5. **Have you ever had to deal with decisions that were unpopular among your staff? And if you did how did you manage to bring it through?**

   Absolutely! That happens all the time. That is part of understanding a complex culture and in that you will not always going to have 100% agreement. Often times, disagreements arise about resources, perceived power is another issue that keeps coming up, who teaches specialized forces.

   In some ways these issues are culturally linked because people are representing their own territory or department. They are trying to represent and make sure that they get a fare share of resources, so I would say so, but sometimes disagreements are personality related.

   Its very important to be a good listener, to be non-judgmental as you can to manage these issues, to remind the individuals of the process, which again is very consultative. And to all times try to compromise if reasonable.

6. **Would you say you were every time successful in obtaining the acceptance of your staff regarding your decisions?**

   Yes I would say so, in US we call it ‘betting/getting buy in’. The intent is to empower people to be part of the process. So, they feel they are part of the decision, even though they might not be always included when making the decision.

7. **When implementing a new decision what are the different steps taken to introduce it and pass it through the staff?**

   When decisions are made and we are in the process of moving proposals through various comities or units we must communicate where we are in the process. It is very important to communicate in a number of domains in it: the future meetings, where we are in the process. I have learned that it is important to communicate through mail, but also to talk to people personally, but also through blackboard, hardcopy. We keep a hardcopy of our future meetings in the break room.

8. **What decisions do you delegate to other staff members?**

   I am a very good delegator. I really trust the people that I work with. So, I often times I delegate entire projects, give them an idea what I expect and I ask them to set up a comity, make decisions, get it done and then report back to me. Sometimes it includes budget decisions, however the final decision on the budget is with the Dean and the Associate dean.

9. **Is your staff organized in separate teams? If yes on what criteria did you base your team building methods?**

   Yes, I would say so. The separate teams would be varying departments and institutions, in total 14, all lead by a director that have their own teams. Just to give you a few examples how these departments are divided: Academic Resources, Graduate Studies, Undergraduate Studies, Institutional Research Assessment & Planning, Study Abroad and International Exchange, Continuing and Global Education…etc. all to some extent lead by me to serve the students and the Dean, which includes me too of course.

   Team building for me means building trust, relationships and organizing gatherings where people come together and have a cooperative mission and an objective. We often do this
through retreat. Like, lunch meetings where we have lunch and a topic and we share about that topic. People really like that. So, there is a nr. Of ways we organize together and giving them to work on and collaborate.

10. How would you describe your leadership style?

I would describe myself as a servant leader. I feel that my main job is to serve the students, faculty and the Dean. It’s rather a formal leadership style.

**Internationalization strategy**

11. When and how was internationalization first introduced in the strategic plan of the university?

I am not sure when exactly internationalization has been first introduced, however, The University’s last three strategic plans: Plan for the ’90s, Plan for Excellence I (1997-2000), and the Plan for Excellence II (2001-2006) established a foundation for a new level of excellence and a culture of planning on our campus.

In addition, the new strategic plan differs from the previous three in that we are focusing on innovation and transforming the university. The strategic plan that includes internationalization of all the Faculties 2006 -2011 is led by the President and guided by the strategic planning committee. The committee includes faculty, administrators, and leaders of campus governance groups as well as staff representing collective bargaining units. The strategic plan is driven by dramatically changing economic, cultural, and demographic changes. The region is experiencing extraordinary increases in population; a very diverse and dynamic population.

12. How many international partner universities do you have? How many Western and how many non-Western partners? And what is mainly the nature of these partnerships?

Under 10 international partner universities. Primarily non-Western. I am not sure why they are mainly non-Western. But, some of it is related to discipline of business. We have a long standing partnership in China, we also have a long partnership in France. Basically, were things are happening with the economy we are very interested in having a partnership. We are also driven by partnerships just because of economics, that our students requested or want to make partnerships. But we also look at what we can offer other partners. We are in a region of California that is very economical, user friendly system bringing international partners on board. We also have our own international business program institute here.

For example the partnership in China, is because we want our students to go to China. And, we want them to understand what is going on in the world of economy in China. Also, I believe that in some of our partnership, some countries are subsidized partnerships. I am very sure China is one of them. In terms of partnerships, we see a two way partnerships. It is not just about what we offer, but also what other universities offer our students. And so we are very advanced at that. We have international partners for both, exchange students and also for research, projects based partnerships.

13. Do you plan to develop new partnerships/study programs with other universities throughout the world?

Yes, constantly. We are always looking for new partnerships. The terms for partnering with other universities are not necessarily the status of the university. If we are planning to partner
with a new university to send our students, we are looking for excellent faculty members at that partner, who are looking for an economical way to get our students to the partner school. We are also interested in how accommodating the partner is, regarding to housing making it convenient for our students while they are at an international location. Sometimes, language is an issue. So, for us in US, we are not like Europe, where we are exposed to many other languages, we often do require that our courses are taught in English. Those are some of the things we are thinking about when we partner.

I know that we had somebody visiting here from Australia and we have people visiting all the time. We had an interesting group visiting us from London. We have a long standing partnership with France, in Brussels (Belgium), and we are interested in other European countries as well.

14. What is the universities long term strategic plan towards internationalization?
What are the university’s objectives?

International program is a very strong mission of the business school. Mainly because we strongly believe that to be a highly educated business scholar that you should have international experience, given that the world is becoming a global market. We put our money where our mouth is.

We actually have a nr of international partner universities. Our summer programs always offer an international experience. Our executive MBA program has a required international training, where students go to an international location. We offer abundant scholarships for our students for an international experiences. So, its actually one of our four missions of our business school. All this is included in the Strategy Plan ‘Developing a diverse and global perspective’ from 2006 till 2011. The Business University is investing in to broaden our international program. Again we are an award winning University that is recognized for engagement. What that means that we are a University in which we expose our students to engage in activities in the community and the world. So, we want to offer more opportunity whereas students can become engaged in learning about the discipline, problem solving engagement outside the university. It is a high priority.

Furthermore, one of the missions is that the university provides educational opportunities to enhance its students’ intellectual horizons, fosters lifelong learning, prepares them for future professional study, productive community involvement, and instills in them an appreciation of the arts, continuing education, and cultures other than their own.

In addition, our region must take full advantage of our diverse populations. We will prepare all our students to function in a global economy and work and live in an increasingly internationalized environment. The university will encourage international students and academics to study, teach, and conduct research on campus in order to foster global understanding and international awareness. It will support programs that provide opportunities for students, faculty, and staff to participate in academic study abroad and other international experiences.

Strategy objectives:
• Encourage and support international experiences for all members of the university community in support of the region
• Increase support for, and participation in, study-abroad programs
• Increase our international student enrollment at both the undergraduate and graduate level
• Develop collaborative partnerships with international institutions
• Foster international collaborative research in areas of global significance
• Include diverse and international perspectives in undergraduate and graduate curricula
• Celebrate regional arts and culture through innovative centers and institutes
• Develop strategies and offer learning experiences that will assist students to become culturally competent
• Give students opportunities to apply their cultural competence to regional issues

Heterogeneity

15. Do you believe that the development of internationalization within the university requires hiring a larger number of international staff?

Yes. Fresno state is a multicultural student body, and we have a multicultural body of faculty. It is actually something that we want to improve in terms of being international campus that we would be able to attract, folks from all international perspective. We are definitely open to making it easier for international faculty and international students to come to our university. That takes a lot of work behind the scene. And often times there are cultural differences and having individuals that are familiar with those cultural differences is very useful when creating partnerships. We also offer workshops on cultural differences.

16. Does your development strategy plan to employ a larger number of international staff?

When we recruit we are open to any qualified candidate. We don’t specifically go after someone international hire. So, anyone can apply for our conditions. Often we do receive extremely qualified international candidates.

17. Has an international recruitment strategy already been considered or implemented in the past? If yes when?

Well, not exclusively, but the number of internationally staff in the past few years I would say that the majority that we hire are international and it has definitely increased.

18. If yes did the recruitment of international staff bring about new management issues?

Well, I haven’t noticed that. But I would think that there would have to be some adjustments in the type of the leadership we have here in which is bottom-up beginning at the faculty and the staff moving upwards to the administrators it accommodates and allows discussion.

19. Have you implemented any measures to minimize cultural issues? (example integration period)

I don’t see that we have any significant problem with accommodation of international staff from different cultures. Those cultural differences are usually shared within a unit and we actually see it as a value add it. So, I wouldn’t fit it in a problem category.

20. Has the recruitment of international staff (increase in heterogeneity) affected your leadership style? If yes in what way?

The social norm in our professional business cultures is to share. I have mostly noticed where there are cultural differences it seems to be in interaction between collectivism and individualism and gender. So, I do not see culturally issues with men from collectivistic cultures, but I have seen women from collectivistic cultures sometimes maybe need to be encouraged to take on a leadership role in terms of sharing a comity and even in terms of
encouraged sharing their own opinion. But, in the end the aim is that they become more comfortable with the social norm of our collage. The cultural norm of the professional atmosphere in the end is to become the overriding behavioral aspect.

21. Has the recruitment of international staff been integrated in your team building methods?

Yes. We see cultural differences as value added. We don’t expect from people to loose their culture to be affective workers here. And, we actually sensitively encourage cultural differences and similarities and again they bring value to the work environment.

22. What type of issues have occurred facing change management if any? Would you say that an international staff has affected your way of introducing new decisions?

No, we have not made many changes because the way in which the culture our organization is that allowed us to bring in international staff and having an international perspective in a very positive way. I would say that it is quite a flexible system, so it would not be opposed to change and I don’t thing the faculty would be either.

23. Have the international universities undertaken any organizational changes? What kind of changes and what kind of leadership styles did they implement in the last 5 years?

The same as previous questions. There are no visible or writtenimplemented changes within the organization within the leadership styles.

Quantitative questions:

1. How many staff members are there in the school?

The total nr of employees of the whole Fresno California University is 2355 from which:

- **Faculty 1,341**
  - T/TT 587
  - Full-Time 757
  - Part-Time 854
- **Staff 861**
  - Full-Time 811
  - Part-Time 50
- **Managers 153**
  - Full-Time 151
  - Part-Time 2

However, Craig School of Business has approximately 200 staff members.

2. How many international staff are there in the school? How many from each country?

I would say about a third of 200 is international staff. A nr. Of staff from Latin countries, Eastern Europe and a nr from China.

30% is multicultural. (is from foreigner countries) We have also a nr of faculty members from Iran, China, Latin Countries and Eastern Europe.

3. How many students are there in the school?
We have over 3000 undergraduate students, (to be more exact in 2007 it was over 2500 undergraduates which has increased in the past 2 years) and approximately 300 graduate students (which has greatly increased comparing to 2007 of less then 80 graduate students).

Full-Time/Part-Time Status of Undergraduate Students – Craig School of Business Fall 2003-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Full-Time/Part-Time Status of Graduate Students – Craig School of Business Fall 2003-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **How many international students are there in the school/faculty?**
Not sure about the exact nr., but it is in the 100. And again as I mentioned earlier Craig School of Business is the largest college of the campus regarding to international students. So, we are the best represented college of the campus.
I would say that now international students make out about 10% of the 3300 students. Mostly graduate students though. And it is rather increasing then decreasing within the Craig School of Business. Here are some figures on the Ethnicity of undergraduate and graduate students within The Craig School of Business

5. **How many people are involved in the decision process?**
Well, if you really want to know, I would say every single staff member has some decision making power.

6. **How many decision makers have another cultural background?**
However, in Craig School of business I would say that there are approximately 30% from another cultural background.
8.5.2 Faculty of Business and Law, VU, Australia

Interview

Position: Associate Dean International
University: Victoria University, Faculty of Business and Law
Location: Australia, Melbourne
Nationality: Australian
Cultural background: Australian (grandparents British)

Leadership style & organizing change

1. What is the decision process/Who is involved in the decision process?

The university is led by a rector as you would call it and we call it a vice chancellor. The vice chancellor has a nr of people called deputy vice counselors reporting to her and one of those what is called the higher education angle/part of university and reporting to that person in terms there are a nr of executive deans one for each faculty. I report to the executive dean. I should clarify that we have programs that we run in Australia that international students come to Melbourne to study, but we also run programs off shore in about 8 different countries. And so, that is one of the reasons I travel so much is to keep an eye on those programs that we run overseas. Like 4 times a year to China, and several times to other Asian countries and Europe. I am going to Germany and UK and US next week and just came back from China.

2. How regularly do you meet with your staff? Has this increased in the past 5 years? If yes, what were the main reasons?

In my own department the staff is not very multicultural. One is from New Zealand and the other Australian. We meet quite frequently. I would say every couple of days. No, it has not increased; however, I have worked in this position only a year.

The university has a central international operation that organize workshop on cultural awareness, but we don’t tend to do that per faculty. To do things like that it is the job of the central university international unit. The faculty business and Law counts for 70% of university revenue from international operation. It’s a very high proportion.

3. Do you systematically discuss different propositions and opinions of colleagues before taking a decision?

Yes, depending where I am, or if I need an urgent response. Sometimes I need to make decisions if they need an urgent response where I can not discuss them with my staff. But I think it is the background of knowing how we deal with things in generally, so we do things similarly often.

4. What type of decisions are taken during these meetings?

Cross-cultural comparative study – Master Thesis - JIBS
I lead only two people. There are different decisions I make. About management of international partnership, but also the other kind like; business decisions about priority and new development and off shore from Australia. I also decide how many students can be accepted for which program. Decisions made regarding budgeting is also included. And it includes an overall budget and milting to budgeting to how much revenue we will get from each of the optional locations.

5. Have you ever had to deal with decisions that were unpopular among your staff? And if you did how did you manage to bring it through?
Not in this chart. Not in this University, but I have worked in this position only 6 months and 1,5 year in the University.

6. Would you say you were every time successful in obtaining the acceptance of your staff regarding your decisions?
I think so, yes.

7. When implementing a new decision what are the different steps taken to introduce it and pass it through the staff?
It depends where I am. If I am away the decisions are communicated through mail. But if I am in Melbourne I contact them personally.

8. What decisions do you delegate to other staff members?
Either of my staff can interact with the partner universities we work with, and that is important because I travel a lot. And is not only important to delegate not only because of travel issues, but also because of the different time zones. Which means sometimes I need to make decision when I can not contact my staff quickly enough and other way around can happen as well, that my staff needs to make a decision when they can not contact me. So, they need to know what needs to be done.

9. Is your staff organized in separate teams? If yes on what criteria did you base your team building methods?
No separate teams.

10. How would you describe your leadership style?
I would say that my leadership style it is participative and informal.

Internationalization strategy

11. When and how was internationalization first introduced in the strategic plan of the university?
The university has had an internationalization plan since 2002-2003.

12. How many international partner universities do you have? How many Western and how many non Western partners? And what is mainly the nature of these partnerships?
There are two kinds of international partners we have. In terms of partners with whom we do projects overseas we have 12 of those. And the partners with whom we do exchange student agreement programs we have 35 of those all over the world.

At the moment we have more non-western university partners because right now most of the partners are in Asia. However, one of the things we are looking to do now as part of our strategy is to diversify the geography we are now working in just so that we are not too focused on one region or country.

The nature of the partners depends on the offers they have. However, we have international strategy within the faculty that identifies priority countries for us. China is one of those for example. We have sort out those partners that we think would be appropriate for the thing we wanted to do. And we have developed a relationship with them and progressively developed arranged activities with them. Usually starting of with a teaching program or an arrangement for students studying in Melbourne from China. But we are often looking for research partnerships and exchange as well.

13. Do you plan to develop new partnerships/study programs with other universities throughout the world?
We are looking at a few countries at the moment. And it is for the next year or so we are looking at 3 or 4 countries. And in long term there are probably 7 or 8 countries that we will explore. The countries that we will definitely move to partner with in the next year or two are France and Mexico. In the longer run includes UK, Canada, Ireland, Vietnam and the Philippines.

14. What is the universities long term strategic plan towards internationalization? What are the university’s objectives?
Cultural Diversity is part of our Internationalization strategy. Apart from our international student that come to Melbourne to study, the situation of our University in Melbourne that a lot of our students are domestic students that are born overseas whose parents do not speak English as their first language. We have a very diverse cultural mix in our student population as well as our staff, made out of international students and the one locally. We also have a main strategic plan for the whole Victoria University which is to be applied also for Faculty of Business and Law: Equity and Diversity Strategy for students, staff and community 2009-2011.

Strategy objectives:
A series of planned strategies and projects suggest new strategic directions for Equity and Diversity at VU in relation to students, staff and community:

Students
• Student Experience Strategy: has been framed across the period 2008-2010 and is aligned with the four student groups identified in the VU segmentation study – Australian undergraduates, second generation Australians, full-time workers, and international students. It aims to improve retention, progression and completion of VU students. The strategies for student success in Making VU provides a set of guiding principles on which this experience will be based, including: supporting informed student decision making, strengthening student relationships, improving learning pathways, focusing on student-centered learning, customizing learning, language and numeracy development, and strengthening student leadership and development.
• Student Equity and Diversity (SED) Integration Grants: have been developed to support the advancement of Equity and Diversity across the University. The grants will be made available to all departments, faculties and centers of the University to support the student focused strategic directions outlined in the Vice-Chancellor’s statement on Equity and Diversity.
• Refugee and Asylum Seeker Access and Retention Research Project: a scoping project to identify and assist students from refugee backgrounds in the western region to access and participate in HE and VE courses. This project will focus on strategies to overcome current systemic difficulties to access, and to increase participation and retention of students from refugee backgrounds.

Staff
• Increase the representation, access and success of targeted Equity and Diversity groups in all sectors of education as well as in employment across the organization.
• Ensure a learning and work environment which is inclusive, free of discrimination, harassment and inequity, values diversity and allows students and staff to realize their full potential.
• Develop policies and procedures which facilitate access and success of a diverse student population, enhance the University as a preferred employer in the Australian tertiary education sector and foster collaboration of the University with communities and International Partners.

Heterogeneity

15. Do you believe that the development of internationalization within the university requires hiring a larger number of international staff?
Numbers of staff exchange from other partner universities is not large but we do have it. I think for us it has been much more helpful to have a much more internationalized teaching staff for example just because it increases the opportunities we have with people with some broader spirits working off shore to teach and work within the departments independently.

16. Does your development strategy plan to employ a larger number of international staff?
Not exactly aiming for international staff recruitment, but offering jobs and considering all candidates. However, multiculturalism on staff and students has already increased.

17. Has an international recruitment strategy already been considered or implemented in the past? If yes when?
No.

18. If yes did the recruitment of international staff bring about new management issues?
No, my background since I have had a lot of experience working abroad in variety with different cultures I do not believe it needs to change a great deal. I believe that my management style includes cultural awareness and that it does not need to be changed even if the number of international staff increases.

19. Have you implemented any measures to minimize cultural issues? (example integration period)
No.

20. Has the recruitment of international staff (increase in heterogeneity) affected your leadership style? If yes in what way?
No.
21. Has the recruitment of international staff been integrated in your team building methods?

It's quite informal because my department is quite small. So, not really.

22. What type of issues have occurred facing change management if any? Would you say that an international staff has affected your way of introducing new decisions?

Well, on the issues occurring, in a sense contradicting to some of the things I said before, we have over 200 teaching staff in the faculty, and some of them are more inevitably culturally aware and have a better cultural understanding than others. But we do have on occasions, not with my particularly my team of people, but more the teaching staff working off shore we do have on occasion sort of cultural misunderstandings. None of those have had particularly great consequence, but to some extent.

23. Have the international universities undertaken any organizational changes? What kind of changes and what kind of leadership styles did they implement in the last 5 years?

Yes, if we look at the strategic plan towards cultural diversity it indicates that the university has implemented some kind of organizational change towards this phenomenon.

Quantitative questions:

1. How many staff members are there in the school?
   
   I would say about 227

2. How many international staff are there in the school? How many from each country?

   Between 10% and 15%

3. How many students are there in the school?

   20,891

4. How many international students are there in the school?

   4,156

5. How many people are involved in the decision process?

   3

6. How many from with another cultural background?

   1 is from New Zealand
8.5.3 Manchester Business School, UofM, United Kingdom

Interview

Position: Director of the enterprise sector
University: Manchester business school
Location: UK
Nationality: British
Cultural background: British

Leadership style & organizing change

1. What is the decision process/Who is involved in the decision process?
We just went through a significant merger which extended the structure but all in all The school is divided into separate programs with each of them having a director reporting directly to the dean (director of the business school) and faculty and staff for each program reporting to him. Decisions are first discussed with committees made up of representatives of staff, or general staff meeting for certain decisions.

2. How regularly do you meet with your staff? Has this increased in the past 5 years? If yes, what were the main reasons?
Once every week, it hasn’t increased.

3. Do you systematically discuss different propositions and opinions of colleagues before taking a decision?
In most cases yes.

4. What type of decisions are taken during these meetings?
Most decisions in regards to the number of students, curricular programs, budgets, set of objectives.

5. Have you ever had to deal with decisions that were unpopular among your staff? And if you did how did you manage to bring it through?
Of course it is part of the job. However most decisions as explained earlier have been discussed and approved by the committees, we might sometimes do extra meetings to discuss matters again, and all decisions come with feedback and adjustments can be made.

6. Would you say you were every time successful in obtaining the acceptance of your staff regarding your decisions?
Well I don’t know if I always obtained a 100% acceptance however some decisions have to be taken, but I do think that in most cases I have been successful.

7. When implementing a new decision what are the different steps taken to introduce it and pass it through the staff?
Well there is the decision process I explained before, and then well every decision taken is written in meeting reports. When possible decisions are addressed in person but you also quite often use mails.

8. **What decisions do you delegate to other staff members?**

I fully trust my staff with their tasks, and otherwise the budget is their responsibility I review it and I just run it to the dean for final approval

9. **Is your staff organized in separate teams? If yes on what criteria did you base your team building methods?**

Not really, they are organized in separate divisions but it is not really team building.

10. **How would you describe your leadership style?**

I think my leadership style is rather participative and formal.

**Internationalization strategy**

11. **When and how was internationalization first introduced in the strategic plan of the university?**

Early 1990’s

12. **How many international partner universities do you have? How many Western and how many non Western partners? And what is mainly the nature of these partnerships?**

We have 52 partner universities. They are spread around the world with a large bit in Asia and I think there is a majority of western countries but it’s not far from being even

13. **Do you plan to develop new partnerships/study programs with other universities throughout the world?**

Yes we probably will, but it is a bit particular because we are not looking too much for universities to do exchanges with but we are looking into building partnerships to provide our students with dual degrees

14. **What is the universities long term strategic plan towards internationalization? What are the university’s objectives?**

Part of the university’s mission is The idea of a university as a scholarly community whose members are profoundly committed to open, disciplined, rational inquiry and to international excellence in higher learning, research and professional education; but also:

To make The University of Manchester, already an internationally distinguished centre of research, innovation, learning and scholarly inquiry, one of the leading universities in the world by 2015.

- **An Innovative institution** that values and encourages the transfer of knowledge and technology to influence and advance economic development regionally, nationally and internationally, and that rewards and provides practical support to staff who engage in commercially significant innovation and/or create intellectual property.
• **An International institution** valued regionally and nationally for its international reputation as a world-class centre of learning, discovery, innovation and scholarly virtuosity, and identified by world class researchers, scholars and students as a premier higher education destination

• **Internationalization Goals,**
  - High International Standing
  - World-Class Research
  - Excellent Teaching and Learning
  - Widening Participation
  - Internationally Competitive Resources

**Heterogeneity**

15. Do you believe that the development of internationalization within the university requires hiring a larger number of international staff?

Definitely it is essential for a university's image to be able to attract scholars from all around the world.

16. Does your development strategy plan to employ a larger number of international staff?

Yes, it does even though we mainly seek for candidates with international recognition.

17. Has an international recruitment strategy already been considered or implemented in the past? If yes when?

Definitely it’s been in place since the mid 1990’s.

18. If yes did the recruitment of international staff bring about new management issues?

I wouldn’t say so no at least not in my case.

19. Have you implemented any measures to minimize cultural issues? (example integration period)

No.

20. Has the recruitment of international staff (increase in heterogeneity) affected your leadership style? If yes in what way?

No.

21. Has the recruitment of international staff been integrated in your team building methods?

Well not really even though I know that in some other departments international research teams are being set up.

22. What type of issues have occurred facing change management if any? Would you say that an international staff has affected your way of introducing new decisions?
As I told you before you recently experienced a major merger so I guess it takes some getting used to for everybody, so I make sure to be as available as possible and listen to the feedback from staff.

23. Have the international universities undertaken any organizational changes? What kind of changes and what kind of leadership styles did they implement in the last 5 years?

We are just experiencing a merger, so we will see what kind of change that will bring us.

Quantitative questions:

1. How many staff members are there in the school?
   About 300

2. How many international staff are there in the school? How many from each country?
   9%

3. How many students are there in the school?
   About 2000

4. How many international students are there in the school?
   About 300

5. How many people are involved in the decision process?
   17

6. How many from with another cultural background?
   4

8.5.4 Haskayne Business School, UofC, Canada

Interview

Position: Director of Centre for International Management
University: Haskayne Buisness School, University of Calgary
Location: Calgary, Canada
Nationality: Canadian
Cultural background: Bi-cultural parents (Scottish and French)

Leadership style & organizing change

1. What is the decision process/Who is involved in the decision process?
A lot of the decisions are made within the unit. But if we are bringing a new program, then the Dean and the Director of the program will be involved. So, it depends on what we are doing, who will be involved in the decision making. So, decisions made vary from the departments. Some are more flexible than others. So, for example, department for Marketing is far more flexible than Accounting. So, decisions go vertically and horizontally, depending on the issue. At this point I am relatively fortunate, because unless I am really going in a different direction, I have a great deal of freedom to make decisions towards internationalization.

2. How regularly do you meet with your staff? Has this increased in the past 5 years? If yes, what were the main reasons?

I see them all the time. It quite informal and formal when needed. So, formally monthly, but we will also meet in between if there is a problem. And use lots of email.

3. Do you systematically discuss different propositions and opinions of colleagues before taking a decision?

Oh yes. For example, the person who looks at course equivalencies has a great deal of say to whether or not we accept the partner, because if we accept the partner in total incompatibility in the academic program we can not send anyone. So, basically it is import because some staff has more knowledge on certain subjects because they have expertise, because I don’t go about what the course content is. My staff sends it to the relevant professor and that professor says this is good enough. And that is something that I think any international area needs to do, because I can not judge accounting or finance for example or you know out of my discipline.

4. What type of decisions are taken during these meetings?

For example, I get requests to consider different partner schools. So, I find out first of all, is that school acceptable to the University, I accredit that time of thing. And then do they have Undergraduate, Graduate programs and how compatible are those with ours. And, then I talk to Undergraduate Associate dean or, depending upon the direction we are going, and I ask them if they are interested and if students are interested. And if they say no, then that’s it. And then I meet with the relevant people for final decision to be made.

The most important criteria are courses available in English and then they are recognized by the departments’ Associate Deans. There has to be compatibility.

5. Have you ever had to deal with decisions that were unpopular among your staff? And if you did how did you manage to bring it through?

Probably. I may not always know. Well, to me I have also been a Dean CEO in Europe and I am a professor so from experience sometimes you have to make unpopular decisions. But I think the most important thing is to explain and give the facts behind your decision and then they understand why. And that generally goes across. But most of the time decision making is collaborative and we work towards the solution.

6. Would you say you were every time successful in obtaining the acceptance of your staff regarding your decisions?

Yes in a way I would say so, because I discuss things with them and explain the facts behind the decision for them to understand as I said before.
7. When implementing a new decision what are the different steps taken to introduce it and pass it through the staff?

No, its mostly informal and use of mail and if there is a problem we have a formal meeting.

8. What decisions do you delegate to other staff members?

Well, they make a lot of decision. For example one of my staff members decides completely the matching what school to what students. I only involve when there is a problem. But budgets are already decided.

9. Is your staff organized in separate teams? If yes on what criteria did you base your team building methods?

Within the unit I work with, my team has different functions, but not teams. I lead 4 people. We have one person that works on all of our Latin American programs and these are ceded funded and 16 activities going. Another person that is running our two master science program and we have started that program internationally and now have brought it to Calgary. And third person looks at all incoming and outgoing students. The other one looks at all of the partnerships agreements, scholarships and awards for students and the pru-program. So they have very different functions. One of my people is from UK and one of my other staff grew up in Indonesia and other parts of the world. One is originally from Latin America and the fourth is from Quebec.

10. How would you describe your leadership style?

I would say it is highly participatory.

Internationalization strategy

11. When and how was internationalization first introduced in the strategic plan of the university?

I would say around 1985.

12. How many international partner universities do you have? How many Western and how many non Western partners? And what is mainly the nature of these partnerships?

Between 45 to 50 partner Universities. We have a couple of them that are not based on student exchange, but just research related agreements. But I would say 95% is student exchange related. Very few in US and Canada.

13. Do you plan to develop new partnerships/study programs with other universities throughout the world?

Yes we do if students become interested in different areas. For example we would love to have exchanges in Japan, but the problem is that they are generally one year exchanges and a lot of our students can not go for a year. However, we have an advantage, if we don’t have an agreement with a school that our students would like to go to, but the UofC does they can go to CISSA, which is our Undergraduate office that arranges exchanges they can go to any 300 universities UofC have.
14. What is the university’s long term strategic plan towards internationalization? What are the university’s objectives?

Well, we have a new Dean now, so things have not been articulated as much and there are no published strategic plans yet. We have formed a partnership with Barclays School of Business to see what international activities we can do there, we have a new partnership with China now, in Beijing, with Peru, Ecuador…, so we look at it carefully and still take on new activities. And we are mostly looking for long-term relationships.

The new vision and mission and objectives articulated by the new Dean now in 2009 are the following:

**Vision:** Our vision is to be an internationally recognized centre of excellence for business education, research and outreach, principally in the core business areas that define Alberta.

**Mission:** to positively impact Canadian and global business practice through the interrelated areas of undergraduate education, graduate education, research, and public service. We create and communicate knowledge of critical significance; while contributing to the development of our student as leaders of moral character with professional ability equal to the best in their field.

**Strategic Priorities:**
1. To engage with individuals and firms so as to lead change in the business environment that creates material improvement in society.
2. To commit Haskayne Business School (HSB) to innovation and excellence in teaching, emphasizing the business disciplines, strategy and leadership, corporate social responsibility, ethics and personal responsibility.
3. To sustain and enhance HSB’s reputation for research excellence; scholarly publication, success with granting agencies, publication and dissemination with key impacts on business practice and public policy.
4. To enhance recognition for HSB through student competitions, international accreditation, publication and citations, ranking with international publications, effective marketing and public relations.
5. To differentiate HSB provincially and globally in areas of strategic importance; specifically in the areas of energy management and sustainability.
6. To enhance our facilities, with the goal of being at the forefront of technology, knowledge and information services, and career services.

**Heterogeneity**

15. Do you believe that the development of internationalization within the university requires hiring a larger number of international staff?

In probability yes. Although, right now all hiring is frozen. However, if we put a vacancy online we consider any candidate that is qualified for the job, so no matter their nationality.

16. Does your development strategy plan to employ a larger number of international staff?

As hiring is frozen right now there is nothing we can do right now. In general I would say at the University, it is going to be highly unlikely that anybody will be hired in the next 3 years. Due to the economic downturn, and the deceases we have, budgets are being cut, so it becomes very
difficult to hire again. Even if they lift the hiring freeze, the only way to hire somebody would be if they let somebody go.

17. Has an international recruitment strategy already been considered or implemented in the past? If yes when?

Yes. Way before I even worked here, which is definitely 8 years ago.

18. If yes did the recruitment of international staff bring about new management issues?

Not really.

19. Have you implemented any measures to minimize cultural issues? (example integration period)

I think that only becomes an issue if we meet with a larger group. Because with my small group we know each other very well, there is a lot of give and take. But when we are in a meeting for example in a larger group, and that happens often we do consider cultural differences how to approach the meeting and the presentation.

20. Has the recruitment of international staff (increase in heterogeneity) affected your leadership style? If yes in what way?

Not really, because as I said half of them are international. So, to me it is normal that everybody is different because I worked in Europe with 18 people form different countries and students. I don’t expect them to be the same.

21. Has the recruitment of international staff been integrated in your team building methods?

Not particularly the international staff. But, my team in general my team goes to orientations, upgrading, training, skill development and then time to time we go for lunch and I have them over. So, we do it more social activities then this is the team building session. I do have to do yearly appraisals on them and recommend merit.

22. What type of issues have occurred facing change management if any? Would you say that an international staff has affected your way of introducing new decisions?

We sit down and discuss what are the possible things we can do given the situation. We discuss it and come to an understanding what would be the best way to handle the change. No new directions of introducing new decisions as I said before.

23. Have the international universities undertaken any organizational changes? What kind of changes and what kind of leadership styles did they implement in the last 5 years?

We do have a new Dean now, so when he decides his new direction then there will be changes, but in the mean time there have been some, certain things that we are doing, he does not want us to continue.
Quantitative questions:

1. **How many staff members are there in the school?**
   
   200, of which 90 professors.

2. **How many international staff are there in the school? How many from each country?**
   
   Quite a phew professors are not Canadian. I would say a 3d from the 90. 25% of the 200. We have them from China, Nigeria, UK, Latin America and most I would say are from US.

3. **How many students are there in the school?**
   
   2700 undergraduate level and 500 graduate. So around 3000.

4. **How many international students are there in the school?**
   
   10% of the 3200. And a lot of them are from Asia. A lot of them are here not as exchange but as international program students. And exchange students we have about 50 a year and those are quite valid. And there are mostly from Europe then anywhere else.

5. **How many people are involved in the decision process?**

   Everybody is involved in decisions making to some extent as decisions are discussed with all staff members to use their expertise of knowledge on the subject. But final decisions are of course made by the Dean as he directs it from the start.

6. **How many from with another cultural background?**

   Not sure to say.

---

8.5.5 Jönköping International Business School, JU, Sweden

**Interview**

**Position:** Associate Dean for Education  
**University:** Jonkoping International Business School (JIBS)  
**Location:** Jonkoping, Sweden  
**Nationality:** Swedish  
**Cultural background:** Swedish

**Leadership style & organizing change**

1. **What is the decision process/Who is involved in the decision process?**
The formal structure we have it is basically a sort of a Matrix structure. One basis of the organization is the ‘traditional line’ organization. At the bottom of that organization is the departments. We have department of Economics, two departments of Business administration: Accounting and Finance and EMM (Entrepreneurship, Marketing and Management), Informatics, Law. For each department you have a department head. The department head reports directly to the Dean, but he is also CEO (formally). That is one part of the decision making in the organization. To be very formal it works actually like this: the only person that, based on the contract he has that is aloud to take the decisions is the Dean. However, the Dean can delegate to other functions that have the right to take decisions. And certain types of decisions are delegated down to department heads. That is how it is formally organized. Departments have the following responsibilities:
- Primarily providing courses
- Making sure that there are teachers teaching the course
- Making sure the course has a certain quality
- They have budget responsibility: each department has a budget and try to stick to that budget, they have a monitor, control systems, formally employed in one department, so you always belong to one of the 6 departments.

But then The matrix of it is: We saw that in JIBs there are certain processes running. Research Education and Graduate Education in addition to that we saw that there are some other processes. One is support administration. We also see that there is a need to develop our capacity to earn money to get addition resources coming in to JIBS. So, we identified 5 different processes: Research, Education, Doctorial Program, Quality and Development & Business Creation.
And personally, the entire portfolio projects are my responsibility.

2. How regularly do you meet with your staff? Has this increased in the past 5 years?
   If yes, what were the main reasons?

   1 or 2 meetings per semester and 2 per semester with the whole floor. No, I don’t recall any increase of the meetings.

3. Do you systematically discuss different propositions and opinions of colleagues before taking a decision?
   The meetings are rather informal with the 4 units: Decisions are not systematically discussed with the colleagues. Some decisions are discussed with the colleagues and some decisions I make on my own.

4. What type of decisions are taken during these meetings?

How many students should be taken for each program, what Universities should we partner with and why, how many should be program and how many exchange students, budgeting…etc.

5. Have you ever had to deal with decisions that were unpopular among your staff?
   And if you did how did you manage to bring it through?

Yes, for example we did restructuring of the office to fit all the employees, however some where not satisfied with that decision. As I had considered later another possibility suggested by an employee things had worked out for the better and we had restructured it again.

6. Would you say you were every time successful in obtaining the acceptance of your staff regarding your decisions?

Not always, but some decisions have to be made even if the employees are not satisfied with the decision made.
7. When implementing a new decision what are the different steps taken to introduce it and pass it through the staff?

Preferably direct contact, but e-mail is used often.

8. What decisions do you delegate to other staff members?

The unit managers prepare budget proposals for their units and I confirm whether they are done accurately or not.

9. Is your staff organized in separate teams? If yes on what criteria did you base your team building methods?

Yes my team is separated in 4 units: Programme managers, Student recruitment, Study Counseling & Study Administration, and International office. Except the Programme managers, each one of the units is managed by a director under my lead and I have one more employee under my lead, which is the Project manager. She is responsible for all the projects, however she deals a lot with the University Partners in China because of her Chinese cultural background.

10. How would you describe your leadership style?

We stick more/lean more to the managerial structure. I would say that my leadership style is informal, horizontal and rather autocratic than democratic. You could even say that it is semi-democratic leadership style.

**Internationalization strategy**

11. When and how was internationalization first introduced in the strategic plan of the university?

It started in 1994 when Research has maintained a close focus on entrepreneurship and business renewal, an approach that has won international recognition. Currently, JIBS receives more than SEK 50 million in annual external grants and has strategic partnerships with leading international academic institutions.

12. How many international partner universities do you have? How many Western and how many non-Western partners? And what is mainly the nature of these partnerships?

A fundamental part of JIBS’s success and attractiveness lies in its strong international dimension. We have established alliances with more than 200 partner universities and business schools in over fifty countries and on all six continents. To be exact we have 215 Partner universities. It is not an exact nr. But we have rather more Western partners then non-Western partners, which are more then 140 out of the 215 partners.

Main nature of these partnerships is building up a status of the University, partnering with Universities that offer high quality education and are ranked high on the world mobilization of student and staff exchange. According to the Research and Education Strategy of JIBS for 2009-2012 is Sweden’s third largest for economic research after the Stockholm School of Economics and Gothenburg University’s School of Business, Economics and Law. Close to 90 percent of JIBS teachers hold PhDs from which approximately 30% of total PhD’s are from other cultures according to the Associate Dean. In addition, more than 70 doctoral students are employed in
research programs. There are some 30 professors and visiting scholars from top universities around the world. As he stated: ‘JIBS is ranked 9th in the world and 3d in Europe for Entrepreneurship, Regional Economics, Tax and Law’.

Furthermore, to clarify the nature of partnerships as highlighted in JIBS’ strategy plan towards internationalization JIBS has recently signed an accreditation agreement for the nursing studies programme at Lockmanya Medical Foundation in Pune, India. The dental hygienist programme is working to set up corresponding courses in Vietnam and India and Partnership with the Sun Yat Sen University in China for their expertise on MBA teaching and health science. In the Balkans, JU has for years been involved in cooperation in courses for child supervisors. The International Entrepreneurship Academy (Intentac) is based at JU and operates in Europe and the Middle East. In teacher training and special needs teaching JU is coordinator of two ATLANTIS projects funded by the EU and the US government. This provides opportunities for double degrees in teacher training and offers an international master’s degree in early intervention for special needs children.

13. Do you plan to develop new partnerships/study programs with other universities throughout the world?

Personally, I think that there are too many partners now. We aim to decrease the nr of partner Universities, and rather focus on tighter relations with a fewer universities. However, this does not mean that JIBS will not encourage new partners, some for exchange of students, but others only for research or partnerships to create ‘Bridging the Gaps’ in research project/program as asserted in the Strategic plan, such as (VINNOVA, Vårdalstiftelsen and SKL). Its mission is to contribute to sustainable and comprehensive changes in patient and public health through changes to the healthcare system and continuous skills development of clinical staff. Research focuses on four aspects: learning, leadership, information logistics, and quality monitoring and measurement.

14. What is the universities long term strategic plan towards internationalization? What are the university’s objectives?

First important to mention is that JIBS has already adopted an international and intercultural perspective on undergraduate and postgraduate studies and offers an exciting and diversified environment. JIBS stresses internationalization in a number of ways, such as topics relating to business renewal and industrial restructuring all over the globe are important subjects of research. The university has extensive exchange with partner universities all over the world and is one of the leading universities in Sweden in the scope of its international exchange. Furthermore, the students are prepared for an international career through the Bologna adaptation of our educational programmes (most of the courses are given entirely in English) and by the studies-abroad scheme that JIBS offers with more than 400 incoming and 400 outbound students per year.

Strategic objectives
JU will in 2009 complete its first period as an independent foundation university under the framework agreement. The first 15 years saw a strong focus on building up an internationally competitive research and teaching capacity at the International Business School. These efforts were then mirrored at the other schools, where research capabilities are now in a strong phase of development. During the next period it is imperative that we upgrade the overall organisation to combine high levels of quality with ongoing progress. Synergies between research and teaching programmes will be increased at all the schools and the percentage of teachers holding doctorates will rise. General quantitative targets for the 2009-2012 period apply as follows:
- International students to be a minimum 20 percent of headcount. JU retains its national leadership in terms of outgoing students.
- maintain exchange program University partners
- Double degree programs
- Tight networking with fewer Partner Universities
- Maintain these partners after the new legislation for compulsory tuition fee in 2012
- Develop new and existing long-term partnerships with respected universities and institutes at national and international level with the help of a joint international secretariat.
- Percentage of teachers holding doctorates to rise to a Minimum of 65 percent
- Strengthen the joint organization for supporting international research applications, including within the EU.

Heterogeneity

15. Do you believe that the development of internationalization within the university requires hiring a larger number of international staff?

Yes, the need to find new economic engines is growing. However, we depend on around 60% of government funding says Thomas. Therefore it means that hiring international staff is limited to the funding.

16. Does your development strategy plan to employ a larger number of international staff?

We aim to increase the customer profile, like SME’s and larger companies. We plan to address BAP’s as well as international companies. Furthermore, the objective to extend JU’s research profile by prioritizing nationally and internationally competitive research environments will lead to increase of international staff visits and exchange. Nevertheless, in our strategy plan we highlight to aim to strengthen the international dimension of JU’s research environments through a high level of international mobility among teachers and postgraduates.

Developing the knowledge and expertise required to strengthen Swedish competitiveness at the global level requires the development of creative and effective scientific-based learning environments in schools, universities and working life. This demands a deeper and empirical understanding of how knowledge is created and used, a focus on the individual and society, and knowledge of how learning can be adapted to the specific strengths of the individual. This statement indicates that JIBS should consider hiring more international staff in order to compete effectively.

17. Has an international recruitment strategy already been considered or implemented in the past? If yes when?

‘preferably a mix between countries’ says the Associate Dean. As I recall we have students with approximately 78 different nationalities and 30 faculty members with different cultural background. If we look at the team I am leading it is a bit multicultural you can say. On my team I have 4 people out of 23 with the following cultural backgrounds: Syria, Canada, China and Finland and the rest is Swedish. However, there is rather no international recruitment strategy as we consider all the candidates that apply for the job offer, regardless his/her cultural background.

18. If yes did the recruitment of international staff bring about new management issues?

Not enough as it should
19. Have you implemented any measures to minimize cultural issues?

No. Getting assimilated in the Swedish culture as soon as possible is the point.

20. Has the recruitment of international staff (increase in heterogeneity) affected your leadership style? If yes in what way?

No. I stick to the managerial structure as it is. And as the most managers are Swedish and one German there has been no need for change in leadership styles.

21. Has the recruitment of international staff been integrated in your team building methods?

No, there has not been any special treatment or special teambuilding methods implemented. We all meet frequently and everybody can share their opinion and it can be discussed. We even have often ‘vika’ together where we can bond and share our views.

22. What type of issues have occurred facing change management if any? Would you say that an international staff has affected your way of introducing new decisions?

The changes that have occurred have not been to the same extent as towards teaching. However, change in management would be needed if more international staff will be recruited such as structure and strategy how to pass on the rules, have more workshops, minimize the growing problems of schedules and deadlines among professors to students, more meetings, and more written material like guidelines and strategy plans. But for now we have not implemented no change within the management due to this matter.

23. Has the University undertaken any organizational changes? What kind of changes and what kind of leadership styles did they implement in the last 5 years?

Not yet.

Quantitative questions:

1. How many staff members are there in the school?
   There are 164 employees, 25 Full professors, 28 Associate/ass. Professors and 64 PhD/LL.D students

2. How many international staff are there in the school? How many from each country?
   From the total of 281 (sum of the above mentioned staff) there are 20 Incoming teacher/staff members from other countries.

3. How many students are there in the school?
   To be exact there are now: 1,925 students in JIBS

4. How many international students are there in the school?
   From the 1925 students there are 475 Incoming international students (studies & work placement)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1795</th>
<th>1650</th>
<th>1632</th>
<th>1867</th>
<th>2177</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgoing exchange students</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incoming exchange students</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Movers</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How many people are involved in the decision process?

5

6. How many from with another cultural background?

1

8.6 Appendix 6: Interviews Collectivistic countries

8.6.1 Universidad EAFIT, Colombia

Interview

Position: Head of international business department
University: Management School, Universidad EAFIT
Location: Columbia
Nationality: German
Cultural background: Grew up in Germany moved to Columbia 9 years ago

Leadership style & organizing change

1. What is the decision process/Who is involved in the decision process?

In my department, well as head of the department I could take certain decisions in a very authoritarian way, but what I usually try to do is reach a consensus during weekly department meetings where all 12 people from the international business department get together and discuss things, so as you can see it is trying to find a consensus among professors. But in regards to the people involved, it depends, but in my case I belong to the business school, so we have the dean then department heads, and then you have the program coordinators getting involved too, there are clear assigned functions. Within the university we also have always weekly meetings, where all department heads come together with the dean and discuss the dean’s proposals. Consensus is sought for at all levels, we use committees for each issues, e.g. administrative committee, academic, research it is usually a committee who decides. Cut of course I have the final say in my department but I do consult before hand

2. How regularly do you meet with your staff? Has this increased in the past 5 years? If yes, what were the main reasons?
No it has always been like that, I am here now since 9 years and it has always been like that, we cannot always all meet but there is a space in the agenda every week on the same day on the same time.

3. Do you systematically discuss different propositions and opinions of colleagues before taking a decision?
In most cases yes, but I mean in certain cases we have established procedures, so I don’t have to consult, but there are certain procedures regarding, I don’t know, complaints of students, review of exams, or certain things where there is a policy and where I right away take a decision. But in mostly we do that jointly.

4. What type of decisions are taken during these meetings?
Well decisions regarding academic, administration but also courses, and yes also the number of students

5. Have you ever had to deal with decisions that were unpopular among your staff? And if you did how did you manage to bring it through?
Yes, yes of course we had that, I mean unpopular decisions we also have to take them, but ok first I try to consult you know, with the department so my people and we try to find a consensus, but I mean in cases where I cannot find an agreement, what I usually do is, I bring in our dean, yes so basically for example I sometimes invite our dean to the meeting, so my boss, to also talk about it. So if I can’t find a consensus I invite my boss

6. Would you say you were every time successful in obtaining the acceptance of your staff regarding your decisions?
Yes, all the time, even for the unpopular decisions, I think it is because it also a thing of consulting listening to people, I think that I manage this very well here

7. When implementing a new decision what are the different steps taken to introduce it and pass it through the staff?
Yes usually I mean, what happens when we take certain decisions, they are taken into the department meetings I talked about, and in these meetings we have what you call a memo, we also define next steps what needs to be done, and then usually it is more by email we follow up. But I mean also depends on the decision, but for instance decisions to open a new postgraduate program there is a clearly defined process within the university so it goes through different committees who push it through or reject it, but I mean if you refer to decisions in general there is a discussion, which is documented in a memo and then implemented via email and of course I then ask for feedback back to see if things work or not. And also in the department we have the annual planning in which we note things that we find necessary to do maybe in the next year, and we put it into an annual plan, and then we follow up also on those objectives about twice a year and we look how it is going for these issues

8. What decisions do you delegate to other staff members?
It depends on the decision you know, some decisions I consult with my boss and with my team, and well in the department we have people that are responsible for different things and well they can take there decisions, for example regarding courses I have a course coordinator who takes certain decisions

9. Is your staff organized in separate teams? If yes on what criteria did you base your team building methods?
We have teams organized by area, team for research, for academic area, program

10. How would you describe your leadership style?

(laugh) is there a list to choose from? I would say in this case, well its democratic but ok lets say I stand very much behind my views, but ok its true, but sometimes I want to get certain things through, but still I would say it is democratic because during discussions sometimes I change my opinion. Yes I am consultive, I consult people

Internationalization strategy

11. When and how was internationalization first introduced in the strategic plan of the university?

Well basically that was in 1992, the office for international relations was basically created in 1992

12. How many international partner universities do you have? How many Western and how many non Western partners? And what is mainly the nature of these partnerships?

Well we have about 75 exchange agreements, we have universities in asia south America, Australia, Caribbean islands, but a majority with European universities. We have exchange programs more but we have also research cooperation programs and staff development programs.

13. Do you plan to develop new partnerships/study programs with other universities throughout the world?

Yes we do, but in the moment we focus on Asia and personally I also work on Africa but that’s more a personal decision, I am looking at partnership in Uganda

14. What is the universities long term strategic plan towards internationalization? What are the university’s objectives?

In the strategic plan it is written that internationalization is one of our goals and we have several objectives but I mean for example one of them I to develop cooperation for joint degree programs, for staff development, for research development, these are basically things we want to focus more on., because we already have many student exchange programs, but in the near future of course we will expand the number of exchange students but we focus more on the other things

Heterogeneity

15. Do you believe that the development of internationalization within the university requires hiring a larger number of international staff?

I would say yes.

16. Does your development strategy plan to employ a larger number of international staff?

Yes, especially attracting more qualified personnal with PHd and here in south America it is not very common that teachers that work have a PHd and so for example you can’t get a PHd in
international business in Columbia, so these candidates will either be someone who studied abroad or a foreigner

17. Has an international recruitment strategy already been considered or implemented in the past? If yes when?

The hiring of PhD staff is definitely part of the strategy so yes hiring more international people also.

18. If yes did the recruitment of international staff bring about new management issues?

I would say so, just thinking about myself, as a German we have a different working style than Columbia, so yes management changed since I arrived. You always have to adapt but in my case I had to adapt but it’s a mixture they have to adapt too.

19. Have you implemented any measures to minimize cultural issues? (example integration period)

No this doesn’t exist, learning by doing, adapting.

20. Has the recruitment of international staff (increase in heterogeneity) affected your leadership style? If yes in what way?

I don’t, we don’t know yet there are so few foreigners, maybe in some positions for example if we get a foreign or associate dean then management could change a little bit.

21. Has the recruitment of international staff been integrated in your team building methods?

No I wouldn’t say so, we try to internationalize more some departments like in economics or international business which is mentioned in our strategic plan. It explicitly says that we aim to have more visiting staff and research it doesn’t say that we should hire them full time but we definitely think that more diversity among the cultural background of the staff should be an objective of the strategy.

22. What type of issues have occurred facing change management if any? Would you say that an international staff has affected your way of introducing new decisions?

Yes of course, in my case my management style which is very straightforward getting things done quickly, of course it affects it all, example using mail communication differs a bit from the Columbian style, who are famous for often meeting and doing things face to face, so this changes things a bit, so I would say that we have less meetings than other departments and I think this is due to my leadership style. There are certain things I also have to adapt to, and listen to their way of doing things and balance it.

23. Have the international universities undertaken any organizational changes? What kind of changes and what kind of leadership styles did they implement in the last 5 years?

I speak generally about the university yes there were some changes at higher levels, the president and vice president, there were changes in 2004 a new rector took position and he
basically took over all academic issue which the old rector didn’t do and the vice rector is now responsible for more administrative issues.
Yes absolutely they were really well accepted and this probably depends on the personality of the new rector compared to the one before, they are two completely different leadership styles. The first one very authoritarian and the new one being more democratic, He is Colombian

How did the staff react when you arrived

Well I mean when I arrived the people were already used to it I mean the head of department before was from Holland, and people here are very open and curious and very friendly towards foreigners so integration was very easy the only problem was maybe teaching, because the german style is very different from the Columbian one:
When you compare with germany where you have like massive lectures one way communication, only power point its basically a monologue of the professor, here it is very different we have smaller groups student like to participate more there is more a two way communication they are very involved, so I had to get used to that and become more active

Quantitative questions:

1. How many staff members are there in the school?
   There are 94

2. How many international staff are there in the school? How many from each country?
   In my department 3/13 in general very low percentage, most internationalized departments are international business and music, but for the overall university its 2%
   Out of 94 we are 10 more or less

3. How many students are there in the school?
   More or less 5700

4. How many international students are there in the school?
   About 50

5. How many people are involved in the decision process?
   We are 13 in the department

6. How many from with another cultural background?
   With 3 international people
8.6.2 Faculty of Economics and Business, GMU, Indonesia

Interview

Position: Head of office of International Affairs
University: Gadjah Mada University, Master of Management Program and the Faculty of Economics and Business
Location: Indonesia, Jogjakarta
Nationality: Indonesian
Cultural background: Indonesian

Leadership style & organizing change

1. What is the decision process/Who is involved in the decision process?
Decision making goes from the Dean to the Department heads to administrative and faculty staff.

2. How regularly do you meet with your staff? Has this increased in the past 5 years? If yes, what were the main reasons?
We meet once a month. And it has not changed.

3. Do you systematically discuss different propositions and opinions of colleagues before taking a decision?
The decisions are always made by the Dean and other decisions are made by the department heads, which are later discussed with the staff, making sure that everybody knows what their tasks are. But, in general everybody knows the processes.

4. What type of decisions are taken during these meetings?
Decisions are made mostly before we have meetings, but on certain issues it is important to ask the faculty staff for their consultation. It includes decisions on international partners, international students, research and resources and administration to give service to our international students.

5. Have you ever had to deal with decisions that were unpopular among your staff? And if you did how did you manage to bring it through?
I would not say so.

6. Would you say you were every time successful in obtaining the acceptance of your staff regarding your decisions?
Yes, all decisions are well understood by the staff.

7. When implementing a new decision what are the different steps taken to introduce it and pass it through the staff?
Decisions are communicated at meetings and through mail.

8. What decisions do you delegate to other staff members?
Certain administrative decisions

9. Is your staff organized in separate teams? If yes on what criteria did you base your team building methods?

It is only two other people

10. How would you describe your leadership style?

It is a directive leadership style with formal actions and the system allows us to discuss problems, ask for suggestions, in the end I take the decisions.

Internationalization strategy

11. When and how was internationalization first introduced in the strategic plan of the university?

Internationalization appeared in 1990 when we developed our first partnerships which were research partnerships

12. How many international partner universities do you have? How many Western and how many non Western partners? And what is mainly the nature of these partnerships?

22 partner universities fairly balanced between individualistic and collectivistic countries

13. Do you plan to develop new partnerships/study programs with other universities throughout the world?

Yes, the aim is to increase the number especially in US, and EU also are looking at Korea and China

14. What is the universities long term strategic plan towards internationalization? What are the university’s objectives?

To develop students’ learning capacity and managerial skills across of management functions, including:
- competence in utilizing and creating business opportunities
- broad, multidisciplinary perspective and vision
- international global, and multicultural perspectives
- entrepreneurial leadership
- effective operational capability
- capability in managing the company as a system
- effective utilization of all information systems and technology for managing a business, and professionalism

Heterogeneity

15. Do you believe that the development of internationalization within the university requires hiring a larger number of international staff?

She thinks it is important that students receive a cultural education and one way to do so is by having international teachers teach them so yes it would be good
16. Does your development strategy plan to employ a larger number of international staff?

Not their decision to make: Not really to her knowledge but they do already have several guest lecturers and teachers coming several teachers from abroad especially in language courses language barrier to hire a larger number of foreign staff since working environment mostly in Indonesian, but a lot of their staff has had experiences abroad and its criteria when hiring

17. Has an international recruitment strategy already been considered or implemented in the past? If yes when?

A high part of the staff has PHd from abroad all in the USA and it is a criteria when hiring the staff at least that they have a Phd degree and only very few Phd”s in Indonesia so mostly Indonesian go abroad and come back to teach in Indonesia

18. If yes did the recruitment of international staff bring about new management issues?

The culture is very Indonesian in management, which is quite authoritative approach of teaching. There have been a few cultural chocks well due to religion during Ramadan new comers are not always aware of everything, and she heard from foreign teachers that Indonesian students do not participate a lot they mostly listen and it surprised some professors.

19. Have you implemented any measures to minimize cultural issues? (example integration period)

not really any cultural issues yet so no need for it, they meet with professor before and answer his questions if any about that

20. Has the recruitment of international staff (increase in heterogeneity) affected your leadership style? If yes in what way?

Not too much recruitment of international staff

21. Has the recruitment of international staff been integrated in your team building methods?

Not really only 2 people both Indonesian

22. What type of issues have occurred facing change management if any? Would you say that an international staff has affected your way of introducing new decisions?

Not applicable

23. Have the international universities undertaken any organizational changes? What kind of changes and what kind of leadership styles did they implement in the last 5 years?

Only changes due to merger with UGM (they used to be independent) so adjustment to that but it is not culturally based
Quantitative questions:

1. How many staff members are there in the school?  
   57 administration 152 faculty staff members
2. How many international staff are there in the school? How many from each country?  
   1 foreigner and then about 90% have studied abroad at some point
3. How many students are there in the school?  
   About 2500
4. How many international students are there in the school?  
   17
5. How many people are involved in the decision process?  
   3 in total
6. How many from with another cultural background?  
   0

8.6.3 College of Management, NSYSU, Taiwan

Interview

Position: Associate dean of the department of Business Management  
University: College of management, Sun Yat Sen University  
Location: Taiwan  
Nationality: Taiwanese/Chinese  
Cultural background: bicultural parents: Japanese/ Taiwanese

Leadership style & organizing change

1. What is the decision process/Who is involved in the decision process?

So I am in charge of the department of business management, the college is actually divided into 7 departments per study program, with each its own director. And then on top there is the President of the University system and there are board committees that serve on behalf of the University that have appointed the President. We all report to Dean of the college and he receives instructions from the President. In my department there are 27 staff members and it is our responsibility to organize our own department based on the strategic guidelines set by our dean.

2. How regularly do you meet with your staff? Has this increased in the past 5 years?  
   If yes, what were the main reasons?

We have meetings once every month. And I try to take care of that everybody does what needs to be done and take care of any problems if they come up. We discuss things also quite informally, the professors are highly educated and have expertise in many subjects and therefore some things are not always dependent on me. And really no change has been made.

3. Do you systematically discuss different propositions and opinions of colleagues before taking a decision?
Yes it is important to have the opinion of the other professors and listen to them to know what is best for the team, but in the end I always make the final decisions which I am supposed to take and other are made by the Dean or President.

4. What type of decisions are taken during these meetings?

Well we discuss all curricular issues, budgeting and other issues related to the students, number of students, and also different college projects. And also international partners.

5. Have you ever had to deal with decisions that were unpopular among your staff? And if you did how did you manage to bring it through?

Sometimes there are some disagreements but in that case it is important to listen to what they have to say and explain the decision processes that are taken and if there is still problems higher authority comes in.

6. Would you say you were every time successful in obtaining the acceptance of your staff regarding your decisions?

Yes. Sometimes we had to make some changes from the first decision but in general it was ok. They are hard workers and have always listened to me and I always try to look after the best interest of all.

7. When implementing a new decision what are the different steps taken to introduce it and pass it through the staff?

We try to take decisions at the meetings, and every time a new decision is taken a note is passed to all the staff we use e-mail for this and we keep it written in meeting reports we also then transfer our decision to the dean who will review and accept or refuse our decision.

8. What decisions do you delegate to other staff members?

We take decisions on matters that we know and discuss. I take decisions and consider their suggestions and I take decisions on the budgets and then the staff reviews it to see if any changes they think might be needed. And then allows for certain decisions of given proposal and we discuss with the staff and I take a decision.

9. Is your staff organized in separate teams? If yes on what criteria did you base your team building methods?

Yes it is more organized in by position you have professors, associate professors and assistant professors.

10. How would you describe your leadership style?

Autocratic leadership style is performed. But it is important to listen and ask for the opinions on specific matters.

Internationalization strategy

11. When and how was internationalization first introduced in the strategic plan of the university?

It was introduced in 1996 that it when we started creating partnerships with other universities.
12. How many international partner universities do you have? How many Western and how many non Western partners? And what is mainly the nature of these partnerships?

We have 35 partner universities in 15 different countries most of them are in the USA and in Europe. There are different sorts of partnerships, student exchange, study abroad staff exchange and research programs and also joint degrees

13. Do you plan to develop new partnerships/study programs with other universities throughout the world?
Yes we want to increase the number of partner universities in the world but still in Europe and USA also.

14. What is the universities long term strategic plan towards internationalization? What are the university’s objectives?

The strategy is put together by the office of international affairs, however we discuss with them and we firmly believe that international vision is one of the essential criteria that future business leaders must possess in the newly emerging global society. For years, a variety of pioneering international programs has been developed and expanded to provide students opportunities to gain cross-cultural experiences and to enrich them with international perspectives. We need to continue in this direction and develop more partnerships especially in research. We aim to be one of the best academic institutions of its kind in the global Chinese community

Heterogeneity

15. Do you believe that the development of internationalization within the university requires hiring a larger number of international staff?

Yes, we invite a lot of teachers from other countries to our university to teach some classes to our students and we believe that this is very important for them to receive quality education in an international environment.

16. Does your development strategy plan to employ a larger number of international staff?

Yes we will continue to invite many teachers from other countries until today there are 25 teachers coming every year

17. Has an international recruitment strategy already been considered or implemented in the past? If yes when?

We were one of the first universities in Taiwan to invite teachers from other countries.

18. If yes did the recruitment of international staff bring about new management issues?

Yes we have to organize how the teachers will come and one classes they will teach. But we enjoy having these professors from other countries coming very much.

19. Have you implemented any measures to minimize cultural issues? (example integration period)
For visiting teachers we organize everything for them, but we don’t have an integration period but we introduce them to everybody.

20. Has the recruitment of international staff (increase in heterogeneity) affected your leadership style? If yes in what way?

Yes, I use the same tactics and listen to our foreigner guests.

21. Has the recruitment of international staff been integrated in your team building methods?

Visiting staff can give advice to other professors and share research together

22. What type of issues have occurred facing change management if any? Would you say that an international staff has affected your way of introducing new decisions?

I think it is important to work together and know what is happening and to provide a well organized environment for employees

23. Have the international universities undertaken any organizational changes? What kind of changes and what kind of leadership styles did they implement in the last 5 years?

Yes the organization of the college is new before we had organization between undergraduate and graduate programs, and now as I explained earlier we have different departments organized per study programs only it is better in order to have curricular program that are better organized.

Quantitative questions:

1. How many staff members are there in the school?
   There are 80 academic staff members

2. How many international staff are there in the school? How many from each country?
   There are 25 visiting teacher from other countries and also many of the professors have studied in other countries especially in the USA actually 85% of our professors have received their highest degree from the united states.

3. How many students are there in the school?
   2294 students

4. How many international students are there in the school?
   67 incoming and 96 outgoing

5. How many people are involved in the decision process?
   All professors 14

6. How many from with another cultural background?
   Most of them have studied in the USA
8.6.4 Faculty of Economy, CU, Thailand

Interview

Position: Deputy Director of the office of international affairs Faculty of Economy
University: Chulalongkorn University
Location: Thailand
Nationality: Thai
Cultural background: Thai

Leadership style & organizing change

1. What is the decision process/Who is involved in the decision process?

Ok, in our office we are 12 people working, there is a director who depends from the director of the university. Well main decisions are taken by the director of the department, but in other cases there are different procedures. For each department there is a decision committee who examines proposals and accepts or rejects proposals. Other decisions have to get the agreement of the ministry of University affairs.

2. How regularly do you meet with your staff? Has this increased in the past 5 years? If yes, what were the main reasons?

We have meetings with the entire staff every two weeks. I have worked here for 2 years now and I was a student here before and I went to Europe for 2 years to do a Masters. But, I think meetings are the same.

3. Do you systematically discuss different propositions and opinions of colleagues before taking a decision?

Most decisions are discussed by committee and I try to speak with the staff to have their opinion so that I can explain to the committee. We consider and represent what is decided by the Director because he knows what is best.

4. What type of decisions are taken during these meetings?

In the office of international affairs we are responsible for the coordination of the international programs so we have to take care of the student exchange programs but also conduct partner agreements after approval from the ministry of university affairs about partnerships and agreements with other universities

5. Have you ever had to deal with decisions that were unpopular among your staff? And if you did how did you manage to bring it through?

Everybody knows what there is to do and is engaged in their work. And I give employees support. In cases where there is a disagreement we talk about it to understand to give good will.

6. Would you say you were every time successful in obtaining the acceptance of your staff regarding your decisions?

Yes as I said disagreements are not common and again if there is we talk about it to make it better and make sure that we are on the same plane.
7. When implementing a new decision what are the different steps taken to introduce it and pass it through the staff?

Ok, well most decisions are introduced at the meetings where we also discuss tasks in regard to the decisions and a note is sent to the staff through mail after the meetings where all decisions taken are written down.

8. What decisions do you delegate to other staff members?

Well everybody’s tasks are defined so some for example are responsible for the administration others for relations with the university for example.

9. Is your staff organized in separate teams? If yes on what criteria did you base your team building methods?

Yes they are divided in three teams one is responsible for relations with partners, another one for everything related to student exchange programs and another makes sure the administration of all courses is valued.

10. How would you describe your leadership style?

Well it is an authoritarian leadership because we believe that hierarchy works here, but we care and listen to the employees. Everybody is content in this way.

Internationalization strategy

11. When and how was internationalization first introduced in the strategic plan of the university?

It was introduced in 1994, that’s when the office was created and we created the first partnerships

12. How many international partner universities do you have? How many Western and how many non Western partners? And what is mainly the nature of these partnerships?

We have 31 partner universities for which they are mostly with western countries with the main in Europe. Most partnerships are for student exchange but we allows have a few research and staff development partnerships.

13. Do you plan to develop new partnerships/study programs with other universities throughout the world?

Yes of course we are planning to develop our partnerships in Europe and china, Australia but also japan for example.

14. What is the universities long term strategic plan towards internationalization? What are the university’s objectives?

Well of course we want to increase the number of exchange students, and develop new partnerships because as you can see our strategic plan states these objectives.
- emphasizing cooperative activities, academic exchanges with international institutions, and academic services to international communities in order to create role for Chulalongkorn University
- Foreign professors are continually invited to teach and give lectures, serve as thesis and dissertation advisors as well as academic consultants to provide added opportunity for both students, researchers and faculty members to expand their knowledge and develop their skills.
- International Affairs was set up to develop and prepare academic readiness among personnel and students so as to enable them to keep abreast of academic development, and to communicate effectively on an international level

**Heterogeneity**

15. **Do you believe that the development of internationalization within the university requires hiring a larger number of international staff?**

We already invite a lot of foreign professors to the university, but of course hiring international staff is important to provide students with a good education.

16. **Does your development strategy plan to employ a larger number of international staff?**

As for now not really if you mean hiring them full time but as I said above what is written in the strategy plans to increase the number of teacher exchange partnerships so that they can come and study in our university

17. **Has an international recruitment strategy already been considered or implemented in the past? If yes when?**

Well again we have not planned to hire them but in the past we already invited professors from other countries.

18. **If yes did the recruitment of international staff bring about new management issues?**

We have visiting professors from other countries and most like it here. We know that Westerners have different approaches and we welcome innovative ideas. One of the professors I worked with in Europe was here last semester and is already planning to come back.

19. **Have you implemented any measures to minimize cultural issues? (example integration period)**

For our students there is an integration week but for the teachers you just provide them with many services and take them to visit.

20. **Has the recruitment of international staff (increase in heterogeneity) affected your leadership style? If yes in what way?**

I have learned much from working in Europe, but things work here quite differently. We all respect the Thai values and they seem to be working quite well.

21. **Has the recruitment of international staff been integrated in your team building methods?**
I don’t recall.

22. What type of issues have occurred facing change management if any? Would you say that an international staff has affected your way of introducing new decisions?

Again only very few staff members come from abroad so it hasn’t affected at all

23. Have the international universities undertaken any organizational changes? What kind of changes and what kind of leadership styles did they implement in the last 5 years?

Have not seen any changes.

Quantitative questions:

1. How many staff members are there in the school?
   academic staff now totals 65 persons

2. How many international staff are there in the school? How many from each country?
   2 but we have 25 visiting professors coming every year

3. How many students are there in the school?
   The total number of students is 1,397

4. How many international students are there in the school?
   65

5. How many people are involved in the decision process?
   12

6. How many from with another cultural background?
   0

8.7 Appendix 7: Pilot Interview

Interview

Position: Employee at JIBS in Sweden
Cultural background: Collectivistic culture (China)

Adaptability

1. How long have you been in Sweden?
   In total 5 years. In 2006 started at Jonkoping this position. This is now my 4th year at JIBS.

2. Do you speak Swedish?
To some extent, I have taken Swedish courses and I meet occasionally with my Swedish colleagues. Like have fika. However, my Swedish is not good enough to teach in Swedish, but the students can ask me questions in Swedish and I mostly answer in English.

3. What would you say is the biggest difference between the Swedish culture and your own in the working environment? What cultural difference did you have the hardest time getting used to in the working environment?

Yes, I do find some difference in the working environment between China and Sweden. First of all in Sweden is everything is so structured and you always need to follow the rules. And all the rules are written clearly, you can easily find the rules and everyone is supposed to follow the rules and no one will try to break the rules. So to speak it is institutionalized, you need to do things legitimately and within the organization everybody needs to do certain things in order to follow the rules.

In China however, even though we have some kind of guidelines, rules but they are not strict to be followed. There is always some kind of flexibility. You can always step a little forward or back. And play around the rules to give the people a little bit more freedom. So, its more reading between the lines, then following the rules in many cases.

4. Did you experience a culture shock when you first moved here? Were any of the following your reactions associated with culture shock? (antagonistic/opposed towards new environment, sense of disorientation, feeling of rejection, upset stomach and headaches, homesickness (desire to go back home), missing friends and family, believing in a loss of status and influence, withdrawal, perceiving members of host culture to be insensitive)

I would say not really. I find Swedish people very nice, friendly, open and they are always ready to help people. I have not find it a problem to adapt to the Swedish society. However, I did find it sometimes difficult to be real friends with Swedish people. They always smile at me and treat me really kind, but I could not make any real good friends.

When it comes to working time and rules in the organization it is quite ok, and I did not have any culture shock. People are supposed to follow rules, and that is quite universal. But, in personal life I have some cases to share with you. When we go the conferences, I find my self where my Swedish colleagues switch to speaking Swedish, so sometimes I feel left out when I can not understand. But, I think it is part of human nature that people prefer to speak their own language. As I usually travel with my colleagues to China I realize that it is important to speak constantly English, even though they do not the same. I try to respect them so we get to know each other in a better way.

5. How long did it take you to adapt to this new culture?

Not long.

Communication

6. Describe your working environment (daily schedule, how many colleagues, their nationalities)

I work with around 7/8 people. Mostly Swedish, one from Iceland, but has lived most of his life in Sweden. So, you can say I work mostly with Swedish people, when it comes
to writing papers or research. But, when I go courses or seminar, I always find colleagues from different countries and that is very nice. And that is what I expected from JIBS before I came here. Because they emphasized themselves as international Business School, having people coming from all over the world. One thing I really liked also is that they marketed: working language to be English. Comparing to other Swedish institutions this was an advantage of JIBS.

7. Did you ever find yourself in a situation here at the University when you had to work on a team that did not get along. What happened? What role did you take? What was the result?

Yes, sometimes. I would just pursue doing what I believe it is the best thing for the project or group to do it successfully otherwise it is a never ending discussion. However when decisions made by others in many cases I disagree with certain decisions made, but in order to help the process going on I keep silent to keep the personal harmony.

8. Tell me about a time when you had to adjust to a colleague's working style in order to complete a project or achieve your objectives. What kind of obstacles or difficulties did you face? How did you deal with them? And did you receive any help to adapt faster?

Yes. For example in China, we never say no strait forward. Even though we can’t do something we will go around and try to do this instead of saying directly no to the request. But, people here rather prefer a yes or no. So, people here got sometimes annoyed with my Chinese manner of behavior. So, now I have learned a little bit, how to deal with this difference and to say no if I think I can not handle it. But in the beginning I believed that no is not something that is appropriate and will hurt people, so to keep harmony, but now I know that it is better to say yes or no. But as I am a minority here I would like to adapt to them to make things easier working here otherwise it would be very difficult for me to deal with a lot of people. Instead of changing all of them to adapt, it is easier for me to change and adapt.

But when we go on business abroad to China, I let my colleagues know that now we are in China and we have to adapt to the Chinese culture. So, for certain things they also learn that they need to adapt to the Chinese culture. Especially when we travel to China, even if they would like to say no to some negotiation, I explain to them that it would be better to come up with other suggestion or another solutions rather than just saying no. So, we have some kind of agreement, although we don’t talk about it, but we have some kind of agreement but we have learned thought the process that when we are in Sweden we adapt to the Swedish culture and when we are in China we adapt to the Chinese culture. I feel also that Swedish do adapt to Chinese culture as much as I do to the Swedish in certain situations.

People are different all over the world. An example of the logic that is viewed from a cultural perspective is of two of my foreign friends that are used to use knife and fork, so when they went to China they used the chop sticks in both hands instead of putting them in one hand. And that is the base if we follow the same logic. And that is the same for China, what we do in China we try we base on that thinking that is logic and in the foreign country we do the same thing and suddenly realize they don’t use chop sick s. So, in China we try to keep silent and try to respect people and follow Chinese culture and when we go to foreign country we try to do the same thing based on logic.
9. How would you qualify the relationship between other staff members and yourself? Did you come across any cultural differences/misunderstandings with other staff members or managers?

As explained in the previous question is an example.

Decision making

10. How would you describe the decision process during staff meetings? Is it different than the one in your home country? How?

First of all, for research we have different projects that we do for the government and Swedish education department and we get scholarship or funding to do these projects so we always get informed by email. But when we go to these meetings for these projects I am more like a listener. I don’t really find a lot of chances to speak and express myself, and that is probably part of my personality and that I am probably influenced by the Chinese culture. Because in China usually the boss has the right to say something until he says now it is your turn to say something and then you speak or not. In Sweden everybody is so eager to speak, and there is no time for me to say something. Second, I am not so eager to speak, because I am so influenced by the Chinese culture, to give the chance to other people to speak. That is for research.

11. If different what is the biggest challenge you had to overcome in order to work in this university?

Already explained.

12. Are all the decisions made during these meetings or are you simply asked an opinion? How is this in your country of origin?

Very seldom the opinion in the meeting is asked. I guess they assume that is part of my personality that I don’t speak so I don’t have an opinion, probably. In China, if the boss needs to get some answers from the team he will point you out and ask: Would you like to ask your opinion, otherwise I would never dear to speak. So, you can say that the followers rely more on the leader in China.

However I do give my opinion sometimes and it is taken into account. Even though I speak little they do always give me feedback and acknowledgment for my opinion.

13. Would you say that both leaders and followers attempt to involve themselves in decision making process here in Sweden?

Yes, as explained in question 10.

14. Would you say that in your country of origin the followers rely more on the leader to involve the group?

Yes, as explained in question 12. Another example, is when you travel in a group in China everybody is following the leader and always travel in a group, and the leader will guarantee everybody is following the team. In Sweden is very different, when traveling and suddenly they would walk in different directions and don’t communicate with each other. So, me coming from the Chinese cultures I always stay somewhere in the center to locate everybody where they are.
15. Would you say that the success of the group is subordinate to your individual achievement or vice versa? Explicate please.

Personally I think the group is much more important than individual person. For me as part of the group, can get good results even though I could pursue and maximize my individual interests from the project. I think it is better that the group gets a better future and will probably get a better offer next time, then I can get a bigger peace of the cake next time. I am a person that is looking for a long term, I am not short term person. Based on my interpretation, my colleagues do have more individual interest out of the project, but in many cases it fits very well with the whole group, so you don’t see any conflicts. It seldom happens.

16. Describe a recent unpopular decision you made. How was it received? How did you handle it?

So, far I have not made any decisions, so I can not say.

17. Are there some decisions that are not discussed at all during these meetings, and only passed through to you later on? If yes how are they passed through (by who)?

Yes, sometimes. But they always inform me through the mail and I am always informed me what has happened during the meetings. So, I have always full transparency of the meeting. And mostly informed by different colleagues.

18. How is the relationship between you and the higher management staff (hierarchical or egalitarian)? Would you feel free to express your own opinions with them? And do you get the feeling that your opinions are taken into account?

In most of the cases I feel pretty equal. But when it comes to decision making in quicker moments, I do feel some kind of difference because of the Chinese difference. I believe that there should be some kind of hierarchy that he/she should be making decisions. Sometimes I am a little bored with a lot of discussions and treating everyone the same, of course that is fine, but at the same time it makes the process much longer and in many cases is never ending. In some cases I prefer to have somebody acting up higher to decide.

Integrity of teaching methods

19. What are the differences between the teaching methods in Sweden and the ones in your home country, were you familiar with the teaching methods of Sweden before coming here?

For teaching that is also different. In china, the teacher is the one that gives you the instructions and you usually wait for the instructions to tell you what to do and how to behave and what kind of assignments you need to perform in terms of teaching. In Sweden, after few years I realized you need to take a more active role, you need to approach people to get teaching assignments and tell and explain people what you are good at and they will give things to you, and not simply sit in your office people basically believe you don’t need anything and you don’t want anything. So, that is very different of Chinese culture and way of dealing and working. Because of that I got a very high teaching assistance/desistence, as a PHD student we need to teach at least 25% of the contract. But, because of course of the cultural difference,
misunderstanding, for the first two years I did not ask for any teaching assignments. I always waited until it was given to me.

20. How did you integrate these new methods? Were you given a formation?

Now, I take more a positively active role, more proactive role, and have learned how to approach people and express my attitude. So, I am still trying to adapt to the culture difference and to do the right thing.

I have tried different methods to deal with the multicultural class environment. Compare to the other teachers I am doing the same as other teachers and follow the rules and I would like to have a better personal relationship with the students. And I encourage students to talk about the things to tell me to improve the things and explain what is not good about the course or structure, as long as it is objective, but not just say something like I don’t like the teacher and I don’t like his/her addressing.

So, I am learning. I have realized the differences also between cultures and subjectivity and objectivity of students as well, so I have developed seminars in a different way that it is not too boring. Now I have noticed that encouragement of students to speak makes the seminars more interesting. So, now I tell them even though the full mark for the seminar is 10 points, however if you can outperform others (team performance) I will give you bonus and get 11/12 points. And student liked it and encouraged them to speak and argue against each other creating a nice atmosphere.

I also use more movies, flash and different kind of media to present my ideas in class then I used to before and encourage students to use different media, then just power point.

I have realized that competition and rewards work much better here. Even though we do use rewards in China in class, but teachers in China did not use much of it as the students are more reluctant.

21. How would you qualify the relationship between the students and teacher? Is it any different from what you have been used to in your home country?

In China, students seldom complain and are supposed to be quite. The teacher is the representative of authority, no matter what the teacher says it is supposed to be true, and the students are not supposed to be questioning you. In Sweden, in JIBS students will question you if they understand you or feel some kind of contradictory.

22. What are your beliefs, attitudes, values and assumptions on teaching?

I do for sure see things differently now. My certain beliefs and values on teaching methods have definitely changed in a way now that I have lived and worked here in Sweden that would not have happened if I only stayed in China. But, I would say that my beliefs and values are still rather collectivistic then individualistic.

23. Do you believe that a teacher should also cultivate in students a strong sense of moral authority and instruct them of the moral rules of conduct/behavior besides teaching knowledge?
Yes I used to believe that this was very important before, and still to a certain extent I think it is important to teach students to have respect for teachers and when they critique it should be rather relevant and objective as I said before.

24. **How would you qualify the relationship between the students and yourself? Did you come across any cultural differences/misunderstandings in class?**

Recently I have experienced a lot of healthy and non-healthy situations. First of all the students in Sweden are much more active compare to students in China. Students in China they usually keep quite and listen. And another difference, Chinese students always work hard no matter what the teacher says, they try to perform their assignments on time in a good way. But here I see a lot of variety. I sometimes also see good international and Swedish students, but also bad students, that don’t come to class and don’t deliver their assignments on time, don’t read the website and instructions and always find excuse and then complain. In lot of cases it is because they don’t listen and I believe that it has been discussed in class but if they don’t come and then fail they complain that the course is not organized in a good way. So it is the problem of the students.

I dealt with this by following the rules, if they complain I would like to organize a meeting to find a way how we can approve and talk about the problems.

25. **Was your integrity ever challenged in class? Discuss please. How did you handle it?**

Yes, I have been questioned, not only during the lectures and I felt in the beginning quite uncomfortable with it, because it was a little different then in the Chinese culture. I would try to consider their critique on the academic topic and consider it and try to replay and respond to the questions.

At first it was hard, but later on I learned and even appreciate it, because the students are creative and they has good questions, and it helped me with my research. Because I realized there could be various of problems. I have never thought about it, because in China nobody questioned me, but here they do, so I realized maybe I should do research in a slightly different way. So instead of blaming the students I really appreciate it as long as they are talking about academic topics in very serious way. In that point I would say the students here are very open and creative and they know how to ask the right questions and they don’t just take it for granted, they want just believe the teachers, they have their own brains and know how to use it.

26. **Is there one particular tough class that you have had to get cooperation from? What were the obstacles? How did you handle the situation? How multicultural was the class? What were the reactions of the group students? What was the end result?**

As explained earlier in question 24 and 25.

27. **When comparing the student-teacher power distance, in Sweden and your home country which one would you say is bigger? (examples)**

In China as explained earlier in question 24.

28. **Which study system would you say is tougher and why?**
From my perspective, not the students perspective. It is tougher to have good grades and at the same time to learn a lot of stuff in Sweden, because we use here different methods and they are supposed to be more proactive and they need to come up with more solutions and solve practical cases in that way it is tougher in Sweden to get good results. In China it is tougher to finish the course, because there are more assignments and a lot of requirements. But it is easier to follow the course as long as you do the simple things. You don’t need to be smart as long as you work hard. It is more important that you have a good memory and remember what the teacher says then you just have to repeat exact the same thing the teacher has said in your paper. So it is here more difficult in my opinion because you have to be smart, hard working and creative at the same time, especially to get bonuses in my class.
8.8 Appendix 8: Global Education Digest Statistics (2006)

Mobile students studying in a given country as percentage of total enrolment in that country (inbound mobility ratio), 2004

- Other host countries
- Major host country (with >1% of world total)
- 1999

Coverage: See Figure 13.
Notes: 1. Data refer to 2003.
2. Data refer to 2002.
Fiji is not presented because its mobile students are at the multinational University of the South Pacific.