
Higher Education Leadership and the Internationalization Imaginary: Where Personal Biography Meets the Socio-Historical

Marianne A. Larsen and Rashed Al-Haque

INTRODUCTION

AU2

Today, internationalization is at the forefront of most higher education institutions (HEIs) across Canada with four-fifths of all HEIs identifying internationalization as a top strategic priority (AUCC 2014). With globalization shaping the field of higher education, HEIs in Canada—and, arguably, around the world—are engaging with internationalization to foster “global connections and [build] global competencies among their students, faculty, and administrative units” (AUCC 2014, p. 3).

A burgeoning body of research literature on internationalization in higher education has emerged alongside the growing institutional and governmental interest in internationalization, which operates both to shape and to reflect the nature of internationalization in higher education. One topic, however, seems to have been neglected in the research

M.A. Larsen (✉)

The University of Western Ontario, London, ON, Canada

R. Al-Haque

The University of Western Ontario, London, ON, Canada

AU1

20 literature and that is the views of higher education leaders about their
21 personal commitments to internationalization at their own institutions.
22 This is peculiar, given that the research literature is clear on the point that
23 one of the most important catalysts in driving internationalization at the
24 institutional level is the executive head of the university/college (AUCC
25 2014; Heyl and Tullbane 2012; Kinser and Green 2009; Smithee 2012;
26 Sullivan 2011; Turner and Robson 2008).

27 Specifically, our study set out to understand how HEI leaders per-
28 ceive the relationship between their international background, and their
29 commitment to and vision of internationalization at their institutions.
30 In this chapter, we first present an overview of the existing literature
31 on higher education leadership and internationalization. Then, we pres-
32 ent the qualitative methodology of our grounded theory study, which
33 involved surveying and interviewing ten individuals in higher education
34 leadership positions on the topic of internationalization. We provide an
35 overview of our findings and, in the final section, we analyze these find-
36 ings. In light of the themes of this book, we review the commitments
37 of some of our participants to the transformative potential of the socio-
38 cultural dimensions of internationalization. We point to tensions facing
39 such leaders in reconciling their ideal, educational visions of interna-
40 tionalization with the economic exigencies facing HEIs in a global era
41 that focuses on competition and commodification. In doing so, we dem-
42 onstrate the importance of attending to the inter-relationships between
43 broader socio-historical drivers of internationalization and the personal
44 biographies of those charged with advancing internationalization agen-
45 das in their HEIs. Our findings lead us to develop a new category to
46 understand the complex individual, local, national and global dimen-
47 sions of internationalization processes that we term the *internationaliza-*
48 *tion imaginary*.

49 *Literature Review: Higher Education Leadership* 50 *and Internationalization*

51 The existing literature clearly shows that higher education leaders are one
52 of the most important catalysts in moving forward internationalization
53 agendas at the institutional level (AUCC 2014; Heyl and Tullbane
54 2012; Kinser and Green 2009; Smithee 2012; Sullivan 2011; Turner and
55 Robson 2008). As with the broader higher education literature, there is

much focus on the skills and competencies of an effective higher education leader in advancing internationalization agendas. To begin with, not seeing internationalization as relevant in our current world is the biggest obstacle to the internationalization of higher education. In other words, leaders who think globally and communicate a global vision to university community are often the most successful at internationalizing their colleges and universities (Sullivan 2011).

Because internationalization is a complex change process, leaders need to be flexible and creative in forging strong global partnerships (Rizvi 2014). Research demonstrates the need for higher education leaders to develop cross-cultural and inter-cultural skills, and self-knowledge about their competencies, in order to work with people from a variety of backgrounds (Heyl and Tullbane 2012). In particular, this entails working with a broad array of players in the HEI, including academic deans, key department chairs and faculty, as well as leaders of campus support/service units from admissions to the registrar. In this respect, successful internationalization needs to be viewed as a “team responsibility” (Simon 2014), or a set of “collective actions” (Bogotch and Maslin-Ostrowski 2010). To this end, higher education leaders need to be patient and persistent with the internationalization process, as it can take time and negotiation skills fully to integrate an international and intercultural perspective within the university (Kinser and Green 2009). Overall, the research literature tells us that the most successful HEIs with internationalization have leaders who think globally, fully support internationalization and actively work with others to promote internationalizing initiatives at their institution and abroad. However, the existing literature does not tell us about how HEI leaders perceive their role with respect to internationalization and how their vision for internationalization may be shaped by their international background.

METHODOLOGY

Our study draws on grounded theory method to contribute to existing theories about leadership in higher education internationalization in ways that are embedded in the data of this study. According to Kathy Charmaz (2005), “grounded theory methods are a set of flexible analytic guidelines that enable researchers to focus their data collection and to build inductive middle-range theories through successive levels of data analysis and conceptual

92 development” (p. 507). In this respect, we aim to use grounded theory
 93 method to generate a middle-range theory, which we term the “international-
 94 alization imaginary”. Middle-range theory is contrasted with grand theories
 95 in the social sciences, given that it is generally concerned with less abstract and
 96 more specific phenomenon, and is more grounded in the systemic analysis of
 97 empirical data (Glaser and Strauss 1967). Advocated by sociologist Robert
 98 Merton (2007), who asserted that middle-range theories “lie between the
 99 minor but necessary working hypotheses that evolve in abundance in day to
 100 day research and the all-inclusive systematic efforts to develop unified theory
 101 that will explain all the observed uniformities of social behaviour, organiza-
 102 tion and social change” (p. 448).

AU3

103 Specifically, our study was a qualitative interpretive study and in this
 104 respect was interested in the perceptions of our participants (Cohen et al.
 105 2011). The study involved two simultaneous phases; the first involved
 106 using the university websites to collect data on internationalization policies
 107 and practices at post-secondary institutions across Canada. We analyzed
 108 this documentary data to determine the extent to which Canadian uni-
 109 versities and community colleges demonstrated a commitment to interna-
 110 tionalization. In particular, we drew on Graham Elkin, Faiyaz Devjee and
 111 John Farnsworth’s (Elkin et al. 2005) model for measuring the interna-
 112 tionalization of universities to determine the extent to which the institu-
 113 tion was internationalizing and the primary activities/strategies associated
 114 with internationalization at each institution. This strategy enabled us to
 115 determine that there were 21 HEIs that had demonstrated a commitment
 116 to internationalization.¹

117 The next phase of our study involved contacting leaders of those 21
 118 institutions, including the president or principal (in the case of affiliate uni-
 119 versity colleges). A letter of information explaining the aims of the study
 120 and consent form was emailed to each of the institutions. Participants
 121 were asked to respond to four questions, either through an online survey,
 122 by phone, or in a Skype interview. These questions were:

- 123 1. What is your international background? (e.g. lived/studied/trav-
 124 elled abroad)
- 125 2. Why did you become interested in internationalization at your
 126 university?
- 127 3. What is your vision for internationalization at your university?
- 128 4. What is the relationship between your international background and
 129 your commitment to internationalization at your university?

Finally, our third data source included publicly accessible, online information about Canadian HEI leaders to supplement the data that we collected through the surveys and phone interviews.

Limitations of the Study

We recognize that there are a number of limitations to our study. It is not a correlational analysis that makes rigid claims about a leader's background and their commitment to internationalization. As a qualitative study, we are concerned with our participants' perceptions about the relationship between their international background, and commitment to and vision for internationalization at their institution. Moreover, some may question whether or not we can generalize, given the small sample of our participants. We argue that since our aim is to gain in-depth knowledge about a very specific aspect of internationalization in Canada, we are more interested in how our empirical data can contribute to the development of middle-range theory about higher education leadership and internationalization in the Canadian context. We found that the most rich and detailed information was drawn from our interview data (and not the survey data) and would, in the future, recommend that researchers carrying out a similar study collect data through interviews. Finally, we are aware of the Hawthorne Effect whereby research participants change their behaviour when they know they are being studied. This is particularly relevant when conducting research with elites who have a public image to maintain. We recognize that our participants may have used the opportunity to participate in our study to present themselves in a positive light by distancing themselves from the economic rationales associated with internationalization, and advancing a more ethical and educational vision.

Participants

Participant inclusion criteria consisted of being in a leadership position at a Canadian university or community college that had demonstrated a commitment to internationalization. Out of the 21 HEI leaders we invited to participate in our study, we collected data from 10 individuals in higher education leadership positions. This included 4 university presidents, 2 community college presidents, 2 university principals and, in 2 cases (where the president was not available), Senior International Officers (SIO), a term used to refer to the institution's lead international

165 administrator. Out of our 10 participants, 2 were female and 8 were
 166 male; 7 respondents completed the survey and 3 provided their responses
 167 through phone interviews, which lasted between 10 and 25 minutes, and
 168 were transcribed by hand. All participants who were interviewed received
 169 a copy of their interview transcripts to review before analysis took place.
 170 We have used pseudonyms for each of the participants (and their institu-
 171 tions), although participants were informed that, given the nature of the
 172 study, we could not guarantee anonymity. See Table 22.1 for an overview
 173 of the 10 participants.

t1.1 **Table 22.1** Participants, institutional affiliation and position

t1.2	<i>Name of leader</i>	<i>Name of Institution</i>	<i>Position/Title</i>
t1.3	Adam Peterson	Chase University	President
t1.4	Anand Choudhury	Winterfell University	President
t1.5	Amy Bennett	Cooper College	President
t1.6	Claire Joyce	Alamo College	President
t1.7	David Whitaker	Stark University	Principal
t1.8	Deepak Jeevan	University of Morgan Rivers	SIO
t1.9	Donald Seymore	Knights University College	Principal
t1.10	Gregory Patton	Meereen University	SIO
t1.11	Matthew Brown	Charles Watson University	President
t1.12	Philip Donovan	Van Den Berg University	President

174

Data Analysis

175 By drawing on a variety of data gathering sources and methods, we uti-
 176 lized the “multi-method triangulation approach” (Patton 2012). Multi-
 177 method triangulation occurred through the analysis and cross-verification
 178 of the different data sources: online data about internationalization poli-
 179 cies and practices at each institution, survey and interview data from
 180 our 10 participants, and further online data about Canadian HEI lead-
 181 ers and internationalization. Triangulation was deployed to cross-check
 182 data from “multiple sources to search for regularities in the research data”
 183 (O’Donoghue and Punch 2003, p. 78), thereby enhancing the concurrent
 184 validity of the study (Cohen et al. 2011). We utilized a constant compar-
 185 ative method of analysis (Glaser and Strauss 1967) to identify categories
 186 and themes generated by the documents, survey and interview data in
 187 order to provide more robust meaning to the relationship and role of
 188 higher education leadership and internationalization.

Findings

189

In this section, we present the findings from our study. We were interested in the reasons why participants claimed to be interested in internationalization at their institutions. Two themes were evident in their responses: their international background and the value/benefits of internationalization. Each of these themes is reviewed here and, then, we review our participants' visions for internationalization.

Participants' International Backgrounds

196

The data shows that all of the respondents have an international background. Six were born outside of Canada. All had travelled abroad to a variety of countries representing every major region in the world. While some of this travel was for personal reasons, most involved international travel for conferences, research and editorial collaboration. Indeed, it appeared that international collaborations played a significant role in the academic work these leaders had been involved in.

Half of the respondents spoke a language other than English, and just over half (6) had studied abroad (including coming to Canada as international students). Half of the participants had international teaching experiences including teaching international students, teaching in an international school and travelling abroad with students. One SIO had experience of consultancy work in approximately 20 countries and, similarly, the President of Cooper College said that her experience working on a project with the Panamanian government stimulated her interest in internationalization. Overall, our participants defined themselves as "international" and, as David Whitaker of Stark University put it, "see most things through an international lens".

Given that all of our participants had international backgrounds, it is unsurprising that they directly linked their interest in internationalization to their personal backgrounds. The vast majority noted that it was their international background that stimulated their interest in internationalization. For example, Deepak Jeevan, (University of Morgan Rivers) saw a direct relationship between his international background, success through international collaborations, and his involvement and leadership in internationalization at his institution.

Similarly, Gregory Patton (Meeren University) noted that his interest stemmed from his 35-year career in the fields of global and international education. In his interview, he reflected on the relationship between his international education background and internationalization work:

227 Well I guess it's critical. Everything that I've done throughout my career has
 228 been focused, to some degree on internationalization of education broadly,
 229 from K-12 through to higher education. So my interest in that has stemmed
 230 from my interest in global issues from ... when I started teaching at a high
 231 school. And so it's just extended and grown from that point. So everything
 232 that I do now has built upon that initial interest and that's become more
 233 developed and more enhanced as my career has progressed. AU4

234 Both Jeevan and Patton are SIOs at their institutions, a position requiring
 235 not only a clear commitment to internationalization, but also an under-
 236 standing of its many dimensions.

237 A number of the university presidents also spoke about the relationship
 238 between their international backgrounds and commitment to internation-
 239 alization. Adam Peterson, President of Chase University, spoke about a
 240 defining formative experience participating in a summer program that
 241 brought together 11-year-old children from around the world. His expla-
 242 nation about how this early experience influenced his later commitment to
 243 internationalization is worth quoting at length:

244 [It] also quickly made me aware of the differences and what is interest-
 245 ing about the differences of people who come from different cultural back-
 246 grounds. So that was a very formative experience for me as a human being
 247 and it no doubt had a big impact on expanding my sense of my universe,
 248 from being a Canadian or even a West Coast Canadian to being a citizen of
 249 the world. And I suspect that that has had a big impact on my openness to
 250 and enthusiasm for bringing international initiatives and perspectives being
 251 brought into the university and indeed encouraging students and others to
 252 look outside University as part of their education and research missions. The
 253 whole purpose of the village was to try to encourage kids who would hope-
 254 fully fulfill leadership positions, to think or internationally, and to be more
 255 open to global perspective and foster global understandings. And I think in AU5
 256 my own case, it clearly worked.

257 Similarly, Anand Choudhary, President of Winterfell University, noted
 258 the direct relationship between his international background and com-
 259 mitment to internationalization. South Asian-born Choudhary moved to
 260 Canada to study engineering after studying in North Africa. On his survey
 261 he wrote, "I am a product of my own life and educational experiences.
 262 My thoughts have been shaped by the international experience that I have
 263 had. Thus my belief in and commitment to internationalization have been

influenced by my own experience”. As Philip Donovan explained in his interview with us, it was Choudhary’s commitment to internationalization that helped to secure his appointment as Winterfell’s president. Indeed, we can say that all of our respondents perceived that there was a relationship between their international backgrounds and their commitment to internationalization.

Benefits/Value of Internationalization

Respondents also spoke about the specific benefits of internationalization. All of the respondents believed there was great value in internationalization or, as Peterson put it, “huge benefits”. A small minority (3) saw the value of internationalization in terms of revenue generation. Specifically, the 2 community college presidents were the only respondents who spoke openly about the economic reasons for their interest in internationalization. They noted the need for revenue generation through increased enrolment of international students. One university president (Brown) also claimed that internationalization was a means to increase revenues, but cautioned this was marginal to understanding his commitment to internationalization. This pragmatic approach to internationalization also aligned with 2 other respondents who noted the importance of global rankings for their university and need for brand recognition through internationalization. For instance, Whitaker, the SIO of Stark University, sought to enhance the university’s international “brand recognition” through various internationalization initiatives.

However, above all, respondents spoke about the socio-cultural and educational benefits of internationalization for faculty, students and international partners. The vast majority (8) indicated that they valued internationalization for the many benefits that came with increasing numbers of international students on Canadian campuses, as well as enhancing international opportunities/experience for domestic students and faculty. They spoke about the value of providing opportunities for faculty and students to travel abroad for studying, conferences, research partnerships, and so on. Choudhary reiterated Winterfell’s official commitment to ensure that all students have a significant international learning experience. A few respondents also spoke/wrote about the value of internationalizing the curriculum so that faculty could “bring the world to their classroom”. Indeed, most of the respondents noted that internationalization initiatives provided inter-cultural learning opportunities for members of their institutions

301 and the benefits of such “cross-cultural pollination”, which, according to
 302 Donavan, “forces one to question one’s own cultural assumptions and to
 303 interrogate them in ways but hopefully persuade one to consider how they
 304 can be improved”.

305 Finally, the majority (6) of participants also noted the value of inter-
 306 national research collaboration/partnerships. For example, Donald
 307 Seymore, Principal of Knight’s University College, claimed that mutu-
 308 ally beneficial partnerships enabled the expansion of opportunities for
 309 student and faculty learning. Similarly, Jeevan explained the benefits of
 310 international research collaboration, which motivated his commitment to
 311 internationalization:

312 I see a great value in internationalization through research collabora-
 313 tions, exchange of students and faculty members, attraction and retention
 314 of international students ... I believe in fostering mutually beneficial and
 315 trusting partnerships with all partners including international partners, sup-
 316 porting international students for academic success while they on our cam-
 317 pus, supporting our students when travelling to international locations for
 318 experiential learning, and supporting our faculty members in developing
 319 partnerships. These beliefs got me involved in internationalization.

320 It is interesting to note Jeevan’s emphasis on supporting “mutually benefi-
 321 cial” and trusting partnerships involved in international research collabora-
 322 tion. This contrasts with the view of University of Toronto President
 323 Meric Gertler (2013), who explained in his inauguration speech how
 324 becoming international would benefit his university. To emphasize his
 325 focus on the benefits of internationalization for his own university, we
 326 have italicized certain words in the quotation below:

327 *We* as a university must think ever more strategically about how to lever-
 328 age and strengthen *our* international partnerships and reach. ... Indeed, *we*
 329 can use our global networks to enrich and deepen *our relationships* locally.
 330 *We* are fortunate to have international partner institutions in every major
 331 region of the world. ... At a time when we are keen to expand *our role* as a
 332 city-building institution at home, it makes particularly good sense for *us* to
 333 leverage *our partnerships* with other great universities in other great world
 334 cities. Many of these institutions are engaging in their own city-building
 335 efforts, and can offer *us* entrée to their local projects, practices and partner-
 336 ships. Not only does this provide access to fantastic research opportuni-
 337 ties for *our* faculty and students, and encourage *our students* to become

global citizens, but it also allows us to bring this experience and expertise to Toronto. Building on this logic, it makes sense for *us* to focus *our resources* on these institutional partnerships, allowing *us* to deepen and develop these relationships to foster not just student mobility and faculty exchanges, but also joint research projects, joint conferences, joint teaching and, yes, perhaps even joint degrees.

Internationalization Visions

Over half our respondents embraced comprehensive visions for internationalization at their institutions. They expressed a desire to create campuses that were “truly global” or “truly an international centre”. As Patton explained, “[i]n general the vision is to get to a point where internationalization is no longer a term that is used because it becomes what post-secondary education is all about: broadening one’s understanding of the world that we live in”. Others spoke about the need for the university to reorient itself outwards to the world. Central to this goal was the construction of global citizens knowledgeable about the world around them and skilled in cross-cultural understanding. As Peterson noted, “students graduate and increasingly their knowledge should encompass global understanding, in order for them to be active and fulfilled citizens”. His vision of internationalization was to “foster a culture that is much more interesting and diverse, help to, within the university, promote understanding of people from different backgrounds”.

Peterson and a number of other respondents spoke about the responsibilities of the university community as global citizens to address both local and global issues of concern. For example, Choudhary said we need a better understanding of the complex problems facing our planet and participation in the political process: “We need creative solutions, which is easier said than done. This needs multi-dimensional thinking. And our education system, in my view, is challenged in educating our future citizens who are able to think that way” (Mayne 2009, p. 2).

Donovan also embraced a broad, transformative model of internationalization. In his interview with us, Donovan spoke positively about AUCC recent initiatives on the ethics of internationalization, and his involvement with the Canadian Bureau of International Education (CBIE) on developing an “academically defensible and ethically sound approach” to internationalization. Donovan saw his role on the CBIE board in terms of “cultivating international connections in a very, ethically sound way”. His

375 commitment to an ethical and transformational vision of internationaliza-
376 tion is captured in his words here:

377 I feel very powerfully the human and social implications of education and
378 the potential that education has for the improvement of people's minds and
379 the situation everywhere in the world. So I see education as the most admi-
380 rable activity that one can be engaged in terms of international development
381 and whatever contribution one wants to make to the future of the planet. AU6

382 *Discussion/Analysis*

383 We clearly see from our data how HEI leaders perceive the relationship
384 between their international backgrounds, educational experiences, key
385 formative moments in their lives and their commitment to internation-
386 alization. This demonstrates the ways in which leadership emerges from
387 personal values and a sense of what is important to the individual (Lowney
388 2010). Indeed, personal examples and experiences give a leader more
389 credibility in front of others and reinforce leaders as more than just using
390 rhetoric to advance their agendas; in this respect, they can be viewed as
391 strategic. Using life stories to inspire others and contextualize the insti-
392 tutions' visions to support processes of change is one way leaders can
393 lead their institutions (George et al. 2007). For example, in accepting
394 an honorary degree from Western University, the president of a Western
395 Canadian university made reference to the "profound influence" her great-
396 grand aunt in Sri Lanka had on her during her childhood (Samarasekera
397 2013). And Choudhary has on numerous occasions referred to his experi-
398 ences as an international student, which have informed his commitment
399 to internationalization.

400 We can think of these examples (and others in our study) as reflecting an
401 HEI leader's 'investment' in internationalization. This idea of *investment*
402 derives from the work of Bonnie Norton and Kathleen Toohey (2011), who
403 argued that investment in language learning is closely linked with invest-
404 ment in the learners' social/cultural identities, both of which transform
405 over time and space. Thus, we can posit that HEI leaders whose social/
406 cultural identities are shaped by their international experiences are more
407 *invested* in internationalization. This personal investment allows them both
408 to promote and to capitalize on current trends to internationalize HEIs,
409 which subsequently results in further identity transformation over time.

410 If we examine our data more closely, we find that a small minority of our
411 participants privileged an instrumental view of internationalization, while

the majority championed a broader, more idealistic and ethical approach towards internationalization. To interrogate these findings, we turn to the work of Joseph Stier. According to Stier (2004), internationalization is “entangled with commercial, pragmatic and ideological motives” (p. 86). He referred to these as three ideologies: *instrumentalism*, *educationalism*, and *idealism*. According to the instrumental ideology, higher education is a means to maximize profits, ensure economic growth and sustainable growth, or transmit the desired ideologies of transnational actors. Steir argued that this approach tends to be advanced by administrators. Internationalization from the educationalist perspective focused on producing the conditions for engaging with difference, which may contribute to personal growth and actualization. This ideology holds to the intrinsic value of learning. Finally, the idealist ideology posits that: “through international cooperation, higher education can contribute to the creation of a more democratic, fair and equal world” (Stier 2004, p. 88).

A minority of our participants viewed internationalization as a means to generate revenue via higher international student recruitment, and seek to promote greater domestic student mobility in order to enhance their global competencies. For example, both presidents of community colleges noted that international student recruitment was for “revenue generation”, given declining domestic enrolment. Others emphasized the importance of effectively implementing institutional internationalization strategies and meeting internationalization targets. David Whitaker explained that his interest in internationalization at Stark University was, to some degree, influenced by the desire to improve the university’s “brand recognition overseas”.

Others articulated an educational approach to internationalization, emphasizing the inter-cultural learning opportunities provided for faculty and students. Phrases such as “create global awareness and cross-cultural understanding” (Patton) and “promote understanding of people from different backgrounds” (Peterson) are examples of this approach. And, finally, some of our participants embraced an idealist approach to internationalization. They considered internationalization as a means to develop “meaningful, respectful, and mutually-beneficial partnerships” (Seymore) and “advance the cause of equity and prosperity everywhere” (Donavan). As such, internationalization becomes a way to “look at issues from different cultural and linguistic points of view”; it “promotes a greater sense of what citizenship is about”, and of “one’s responsibilities to others” (Peterson). Our findings contradict Stier’s (2004) assertion that administrators do not align themselves with the idealist or educationalist ideologies

452 of internationalization. This may be the case because our participants do
453 not want to be viewed as publicly aligning themselves with the narrower,
454 more instrumental rationales for internationalization but, rather, prefer to
455 be seen as embracing a more idealistic approach.

456 Finally, some leaders seem to straddle between the ideologies and offer
457 a vision that is instrumental, educational and ideal. Choudhary is one such
458 example. Drawing from his own life as inspiration, Choudhary's vision for
459 internationalization mirrors his own life experiences as an international stu-
460 dent, having been educated in four different countries, presented at various
461 international conferences and having held visiting professorship positions
462 outside Canada. Irrefutably, Choudhary's experiences have clearly shaped
463 his commitment to and vision for internationalization at his institution.
464 Three of his quotations reflect the tensions and contradictions inherent
465 in the processes associated with internationalization. First, in an interview
466 with Choudhary entitled "Are we educating global citizens", he claimed
467 that the role of the academy is to teach, and that means accepting "the
468 noble cause of educating our future citizens". Second, in an article he
469 authored on the "Importance of Internationalization", he claimed that:
470 "international and domestic students benefit from the enriched educational
471 experience of being exposed to a broader diversity of global perspectives
472 and cultures" (Choudhary 2013). And, finally, his response to our survey
473 question, "What is your vision for internationalization at your university?"
474 comprised a simple sentence: "all Winterfell graduates will have a signifi-
475 cant international learning experience", which directly echoes the vision set
476 out in the university's official, target-setting internationalization strategy.

477 These three quotations suggest that some HEI leaders may embrace
478 multiple understandings and rationales for supporting internationalization.
479 Without knowing exactly what Choudhary considers the "benefits" (in the
480 second quotation) of internationalization, we can posit that his claims
481 about the importance of internationalization could reflect an instrumen-
482 tal approach (benefit by enhancing future job prospects abroad through
483 building social capital), an educational approach (benefit by developing
484 inter-cultural competencies and other aspects of individual learning), or
485 an idealist approach (benefit by developing greater mutual understanding,
486 respect, tolerance and a commitment to social change).

487 As such, it is evident that a leader's vision can be broad, global and ide-
488 alistic in its outlook, can be instrumental and focused on the pragmatics of
489 internationalization implementation, and can be somewhere in the middle
490 where the perspectives merge. Choudhary's vision for internationalization is

informed by his personal experiences, official university internationalization policy, and the pragmatics of leading an HEI in Canada in the twenty-first century. In such a way, he illustrates the overlapping and interconnected nature of the three ideologies of internationalization, and the need to consider both personal biography and broader political and socio-economic changes that influence the work that goes on in universities today.

Overall, there is much more emphasis in the research literature on the economic/commercial and political rationales of universities to internationalize. As Stier (2004) argued, the instrumental ideology shapes how the other ideologies take form. As noted above, only a handful of respondents spoke openly about the economic reasons for their interest in internationalization. Above all, the majority of our respondents spoke passionately about socio-cultural, ethical and educational motivations underpinning their commitments to internationalization. They referred to their desires for internationalization to construct global citizens, knowledgeable about the world around them, able to engage with difference and able to use their knowledge and skills to address global problems.

How, then, can we make sense of the tensions between more instrumental approaches to internationalization and broader ideal and educational visions expressed by our participants? We turn to the work of sociologist C. Wright Mills (1959) to analyze our findings. We take from Mills' seminal work, the idea of the *sociological imagination* that enables us to "grasp history and biography and the relations between the two within society" and so "understand the larger historical scene in terms of its meaning for the inner life and the external career of a variety of individuals" (p. 5). It is this relationship between personal experience and wider socio-historical trends and forces in society that we see through our study. We argue that, to understand the rationales and motivations behind internationalization in HEIs, we need to attend to the broader historical, economic and political forces and factors that underpin this phenomenon, as well as the personal biographies of those charged with leading their HEIs.

Drawing on the empirical data in our study, we call this the *internationalization imaginary* and contend that it is constituted and shaped by individual, local, national and global influences. This internationalization imaginary contributes to HEI leaders' investments in internationalization, and gives certain practices (including claims about internationalization) legitimacy. The idea of an internationalization imaginary relates to the notion of the *social imaginary*. Drawing on the work of Charles Taylor, a Canadian philosopher, Robert Lingard and Fazal Rizvi (2010) explained

530 how the social imaginary involves a complex, incomplete, unstructured and
531 contingent combination of the empirical and the affective. It is constituted
532 by implicit common understandings that make everyday practices possible
533 and legitimate. The social imaginary is an enabling concept that helps us
534 understand the ways that people act to make sense of the world around
535 them. Through this collective sense of imagination, according to Taylor, “a
536 society is created, given coherence and identity, but also subjected to social
537 change, both mundane and radical” (Lingard and Rizvi 2010, p. 9).

538 In *Globalizing Education Policy*, Lingard and Rizvi (2010) argued
539 against the historical inevitability of the neoliberal social imaginary driving
540 globalization, and challenge readers to consider a new global imaginary.
541 They explained that attempts to understand policy in the age of global-
542 ization cannot overlook how our social imaginary is reshaped by both
543 local and global processes. This connects to our conception of the inter-
544 nationalization imaginary, which is constituted and reshaped by not only
545 by global processes, but also by national and local processes right down to
546 the level of individual biography.

547 The point here is the need to consider the relationship between
548 broader socio-historical, economic and political factors underpinning
549 internationalization processes today and the individual HEI leaders’ per-
550 sonal investments in internationalization informed by their international
551 backgrounds. Canadian HEIs exist within a complex of local, provin-
552 cial, national and international forces and factors that heavily influence
553 how their institutions engage with internationalization. For example,
554 Canada’s recent *International Education Strategy* clearly emphasizes that
555 international education should be connected to job creation, economic
556 growth and Canada’s future prosperity (Government of Canada 2014).
557 Hence, there is tremendous pressure on HEIs to consider the revenue
558 generation potential of private research partnerships and increasing the
559 numbers of full-fee paying international students, as well as their role in
560 preparing students for work in the global marketplace. These pressures
561 are particularly salient, given declining provincial government funding of
562 higher education (OCUFA 2015) and corresponding declining federal
563 support for basic research in HEIs (CAUT 2013).

564 In his interview with us, Donovan spoke to the complexities of nego-
565 tiating the tensions between these challenges and his vision of the trans-
566 formative potential of internationalization for his university. He referred
567 to the report of the Advisory Panel on Canada’s International Education
568 strategy, submitted “to the federal government in 2012” (Minister of

International Trade, http://www.international.gc.ca/education/assets/pdfs/ies_report_rapport_sei-eng.pdf (2012) which, according to Donovan, demonstrates a view of internationalization through “an exclusively economic lens”. This perspective of internationalization has been embraced by the Canadian federal government, which has identified international education as being “at the very heart of [Canada’s] current and future prosperity” (Government of Canada 2014).

AU7

Various participants were aware about the economic dimensions associated with internationalization and how these may shape not so much their views and visions about internationalization, but the actual work that is done in their institutions to carry out internationalization policies. The pressures associated with government cutbacks to higher education and the need to compete in global rankings rub up against more idealistic visions of internationalization.

Moreover, the sense that internationalization is inevitable is driven by these kinds of pressures. Some of our respondents considered their commitment to internationalization in light of it being an inevitable, global phenomenon. A number noted that globalization is a feature of today’s world, and therefore HEIs have no choice but to internationalize. Choudhary, in an interview for *Winterfell News*, explained the need to educate students to become global citizens stemming from the fact that “[t]he planet has truly become a global village in every sense of the world. It is complex, diverse, and beautiful, but it is also in distress, with population growth, environmental degradation and political conflict” (Mayne 2009, p. 2).

Given the inevitability of internationalization, some of the HEI leaders felt they had no choice but to be interested in internationalization. As Dr. Peterson explained, “you can’t really be a university president, probably anywhere in Canada ... without being interested in internationalization”. Likewise, Matthew Brown, President of Charles Watson University, concluded that: “the forces driving us towards increased global awareness, engagement, and competency are powerful”. So, there was a clear recognition amongst the participants of the influence of broader forces and factors driving internationalization, and the need to be committed to and publicly to promote an internationalization agenda.

These findings speak to the fact that higher education leaders’ visions for internationalization exist within a complex assemblage of other practices, policies and processes that are not easily reconciled with their own more idealistic and educational ideologies. This assemblage constitutes

608 what we call the internationalization imaginary, which operates in ways
609 to shape and be shaped by personal, local, national and global influences.
610 Moreover, our findings illustrate the challenges that particular HEI lead-
611 ers may face in reconciling broader socially just visions of international-
612 ization with the pressures confronting higher education arising from the
613 neoliberal drive towards privatization, competition and the commodifica-
614 tion of higher education.

615 CONCLUSION

616 We set out in our study to investigate how HEI leaders perceive the rela-
617 tionship between their personal biographies and their commitments and
618 visions for internationalization at their respective institutions. We found
619 that they believe there is a relationship between their own international
620 backgrounds and their commitments to internationalization. We argue
621 that the research literature on higher education internationalization—
622 especially that which focuses on the motivations, rationales and/or driv-
623 ers of this phenomenon—needs to attend to the personal biographies
624 of those charged with leading their institutions, as well as the broader
625 socio-historical, economic and political forces and factors driving inter-
626 nationalization in our global age. Having an international background is
627 no guarantee that an HEI leader will be committed to internationaliza-
628 tion. However, HEI leaders who value internationalization often draw
629 on their own personal—and, at times, international—experiences, in
630 order to demonstrate their investment in internationalization. Whether
631 it was an opportunity to study abroad as an international student or
632 engaging with internationalization locally by interacting with people
633 from diverse backgrounds, leaders in our study see a clear link between
634 their international background(s), experiences and their commitment to
635 internationalization.

636 While our participants tended to either privilege the broader educa-
637 tional and idealist view or the instrumental values of internationalization,
638 all believed in the potential benefits internationalization can bring to their
639 institutions. Some even embraced all three rationales that underpin inter-
640 nationalization. This approach points to some of the complexities and
641 tensions associated with enacting leadership in higher education inter-
642 nationalization. Our analysis reveals that leadership in higher education
643 internationalization is a contentious process that incorporates not only
644 the leader's vision, but also their education background, lived experiences,

official university policy/strategy and, arguably, local, national, and global forces. Echoing the words of Peterson, “there is no way to be president ... and not be interested in internationalization. We are so immersed in international relationships of one kind or another.” Quotations such as this and others we have presented in this chapter are indicative of the “internationalization imaginary”, a theoretical concept constituted and reshaped by not only by global processes, but also by national and local processes right down to the level of the individual and their personal story.

As the researchers, we appreciate the messiness and complexities associated with understanding leadership in higher education internationalization, and thus critique much of the existing literature, reviewed above, that frames effective leadership as an ordered checklist of skills and competencies.

As such, our study opens the doors for future, more elaborate studies in the areas of higher education leadership and internationalization. Using this study as a springboard, we encourage other researchers to examine leadership in new and critical ways that challenge the ordered narratives around what an “effective” or “good” leader ought to be. We challenge other researchers to explore ways in which leaders at HEIs are invested in internationalization policies at their universities, to examine leadership through a values lens that privileges personal backgrounds over a checklist of individual skills and capabilities, and uncover the tensions embedded within the leadership practices involved in steering higher education internationalization. Moreover, the ways in which higher education leaders’ personal biographies intersect and, sometimes, clash with broader socio-historical and economic-political drivers in the production of internationalization agendas also demands further study. Only then will we be able fully to appreciate the complexities and contradictions that inform what it means to lead a higher education institution in an age of globalization and internationalization.

NOTE

1. Elkin et al.’s (2005) model for measuring internationalization includes the following dimensions: commitment to and prevalence of international students (undergraduate and postgraduate); support for international students; student and staff exchange programs; staff interactions in international context; internationally focused programs of study; attendance at international conferences; international research collaboration; internationally recognized research activity; overseas curriculum and overseas trained staff.

REFERENCES

- 684 AUCC (Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada). (2014). *Canada's*
 685 *universities in the world—AUCC internationalization survey*. Retrieved from
 686 [http://www.aucc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/internationalization-](http://www.aucc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/internationalization-survey-2014.pdf)
 687 [survey-2014.pdf](http://www.aucc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/internationalization-survey-2014.pdf)
- 688 Bogotch, I., & Maslin-Ostrowski, P. (2010). Internationalizing educational lead-
 689 ership: How a university department jumps the curve from local to interna-
 690 tional. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46, 210–240.
- 691 CAUT (Canadian Association of University Teachers) (2013). Federal funding of
 692 basic research. *CAUT Education Review*, 13(1), 1–6.
- 693 Choudhary, A. (2013). Importance of internationalization. *Alumni Gazette*.
 694 Winter.
- 695 Charmaz, K. (2005). Grounded theory in the 21st century. In N. K. Denzin &
 696 Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 507–535).
 697 Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 698 Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through*
 699 *qualitative analysis*. London: Sage.
- 700 Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education*
 701 (7th ed.). London: Routledge.
- 702 Elkin, G., Devjee, F., & Farnsworth, J. (2005). Visualising the “internationaliza-
 703 tion” of universities. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 19(4),
 704 318–329.
- 705 George, B., Sims, P., McLean, A. N., & Mayer, D. (2007). Discovering your
 706 authentic leadership. *Harvard Business Review*, 85(2), 129–138.
- 707 Gertler, M. (2013). *Address on the occasion of his installation as the 16th President*
 708 *of the University of Toronto*. Retrieved from [http://www.president.utoronto.](http://www.president.utoronto.ca/installation-address)
 709 [ca/installation-address](http://www.president.utoronto.ca/installation-address)
- 710 Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for*
 711 *qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- 712 Government of Canada. Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada, (2014).
 713 *Canada's international education strategy: Harnessing our knowledge advan-*
 714 *tage to drive innovation and prosperity*. Retrieved from [http://international.](http://international.gc.ca/global-markets-marches-mondiaux/assets/pdfs/overview-apercu-eng.pdf)
 715 [gc.ca/global-markets-marches-mondiaux/assets/pdfs/overview-apercu-eng.](http://international.gc.ca/global-markets-marches-mondiaux/assets/pdfs/overview-apercu-eng.pdf)
 716 [pdf](http://international.gc.ca/global-markets-marches-mondiaux/assets/pdfs/overview-apercu-eng.pdf)
- 717 Heyl, J. D., & Tullbane, J. (2012). Leadership in international higher education. In
 718 D. K. Deardorff, H. de Wit, J. D. Hely & T. Adams. (Eds.), *The Sage handbook*
 719 *of international higher education* (pp. 113–130). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 720 Kinser, K., & Green, M. (2009). *The power of partnerships: A transatlantic dia-*
 721 *logue*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- 722 Lingard, R., & Rizvi, F. (2010). *Globalizing education policy*. New York: Routledge.
- 723 Lowney, C. (2010). *Heroic leadership: Best practices from a 450-year-old company*
 724 *that changed the world*. Chicago, IL: Loyola Press.

- Mayne, P. (2009, July 9). Are we educating global citizens? *Winterfell News*. 725
- Merton, R. K. (2007). *On sociological theories of the middle range*. In C. Calhoun, 726
J. Gerteis, J. Moody, S. Pfaff, & I. Virk (Eds.), *Classical sociological theory* 727
(pp. 448–459). Walden, MS: Blackswell. 728
- Mills, C. W. (1959). *The sociological imagination*. London: Oxford University 729
Press. 730
- Minister of International Trade. (2012). *International education: A key driver of* 731
Canada's future prosperity. Advisory panel on Canada's international education 732
strategy. Retrieved from [http://www.international.gc.ca/education/assets/](http://www.international.gc.ca/education/assets/pdfs/ies_report_rapport_sci-eng.pdf) 733
[pdfs/ies_report_rapport_sci-eng.pdf](http://www.international.gc.ca/education/assets/pdfs/ies_report_rapport_sci-eng.pdf) 734
- Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (2011). Identity, language learning, and social change. 735
Language Teaching, 44(4), 412–446. 736
- O'Donoghue, T., & Punch, K. (2003). *Qualitative educational research in action:* 737
Doing and reflecting. London, England: Routledge. 738
- OCUFA (Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations). (2015). 739
Strong universities for a strong Ontario. Retrieved from [http://ocufa.on.ca/](http://ocufa.on.ca/assets/2015-OCUFA-Pre-budget-submission-FINAL.pdf) 740
[assets/2015-OCUFA-Pre-budget-submission-FINAL.pdf](http://ocufa.on.ca/assets/2015-OCUFA-Pre-budget-submission-FINAL.pdf) 741
- Patton, M. Q. (2012). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). 742
Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 743
- Rizvi, F. (2014). *International partnerships: An Indian perspective*. In L. E. 744
Rumbley, R. M. Helms, P. M. Peterson, & P. G. Altbach (Eds.), *Global* 745
opportunities and challenges for higher education leaders: Briefs on key themes 746
(pp. 151–154). Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense. 747
- Samarasekera, I.V. (2013). *Honorary degree, Western University Speech*. Retrieved 748
from [http://uofa.ualberta.ca/-/media/ualberta/president/speeches-and-int](http://uofa.ualberta.ca/-/media/ualberta/president/speeches-and-interviews/2013/14june13westernhdfinal.pdf) 749
[erviews/2013/14june13westernhdfinal.pdf](http://uofa.ualberta.ca/-/media/ualberta/president/speeches-and-interviews/2013/14june13westernhdfinal.pdf) 750
- Simon, L. A. K. (2014). A presidential perspective on global engagement. In L. E. 751
Rumbley, R. M. Helms, P. M. Peterson, & P. G. Altbach (Eds.), *Global oppor-* 752
tunities and challenges for higher education leaders: Briefs on key themes 753
(pp. 11–14). Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense. 754
- Smithee, M. B. (2012). Finding leadership for the internationalization of U.S. 755
higher education. *Journal of International Education and Leadership*, 2(1), 756
1–24. 757
- Stier, J. (2004). Taking a critical stance toward internationalization ideologies in 758
higher education: Idealism, instrumentalism and educationalism. *Globalisation,* 759
Societies and Education, 2(1), 1–28. 760
- Sullivan, J. (2011). *Global leadership in higher education administration:* 761
Perspectives on internationalization by university presidents, vice- presidents and 762
deans. Doctoral dissertation. Retrieved from [http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/](http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/3370/) 763
[etd/3370/](http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/3370/) 764
- Turner, Y., & Robson, S. (2008). *Internationalizing the university*. London, UK: 765
Continuum. 766

Author Queries

Chapter No.: 22 0002757036

Queries	Details Required	Author's Response
AU1	Please provide the email address for the corresponding author and check whether affiliation is appropriate.	
AU2	Please check whether the identified section levels are correct.	
AU3	It is unclear what is advocated by sociologist Robert Merton. Please insert.	
AU4	Please check with the original and confirm the amendment of in to and in this quote.	
AU5	Please check this sentence against the original. Is there any text missing?	
AU6	To make grammatical sense, this should read "engaged in in terms...". Please check with original.	
AU7	Please check amendments to punctuation in this interviewee's text.	
AU8	Reference "Charmaz (2006)" is not cited in text but given in list. Please check and confirm.	