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1. Introduction

As the world has been increasingly globalized, the higher education sector is being shaped and transformed by internationalization, in which academic staff’s role is central to facilitate its enactment (Childress 2010; Leask & Beelen 2009; Proctor 2015). In this context, my research addresses the practices of academic staff’s engagement and capacity building in internationalization. Specifically, the research focuses on the extent to which academic staff are engaged in internationalization, their motivations for engagement, and institutional policies and practices in engaging their academic staff. These insights will provide useful implications for institution’s capacity building strategies, particularly through professional development activities.

Academic staff’s engagement in internationalization is a significant research problem. Although academic staff play a crucial role in internationalization implementation, the achievements of internationalization is constrained by the lack of academic staff’s involvement and capacity (Beelen 2011; Childress 2010; Goedegebuure et al. 2009; Leask & Beelen 2009; Leask & Bridge 2013; Proctor 2015; Stohl 2007). Meanwhile, little research has addressed academics’ experiences in internationalization (Proctor 2015; Sanderson 2011; Svetlik & Braček Lalić 2016). Comparative studies on internationalization in higher education in general and on staff capacity building in internationalization in particular are even rarer. This drives me to carry out a comparative study between two countries, taking one university in each country as cases under study. Australia and Vietnam are two good representatives because they provide different rationales for internationalization (internationalization at ‘trade’ in Australia, as opposed to internationalization for international integration and cooperation in Vietnam) and also their position in the international higher education market (Australia as a major exporter of international education and Vietnam mainly as a receiver or exporter) (Adams, Banks & Olsen 2011; De Wit & Adams 2010; Thủ tướng Chính phủ 2012; Tran, Marginson & Nguyen 2014).

In order to conceptualize the engagement of academic staff, this research draws on Sen’s Capability Approach (Sen 1985, 1992, 1999), which is a moral framework for assessing human development. Consisting of three key concepts – functioning, capabilities, and agency, the Capability Approach emphasizes the understanding of capabilities and agency in evaluating a functioning. Seeing ‘capability’ as the opportunity or freedom a person actually has, Sen holds
that capabilities “depend on the nature of social arrangements” (Sen 1999, p. 288) and that the *agency aspect* of a person is important in assessing “what a person can do in line with his or her conception of the good” (Sen 1985, p. 206). This research views engagement as a ‘*functioning*’ and argues that academic staff’s engagement in internationalization depends on opportunities or constraints (*capabilities*) created by higher education institutions (*social arrangements*), and on academic staff’s *agency* in choice making and converting the given resources into functioning (engagement). As such, examining academics’ capabilities and agency in internationalization will reveal how engaged they are and how institutions can strengthen their capacity through professional learning. The Capability Approach is relevant for this research because it provides a conceptual lens to frame the research and interpret the factors influencing academics’ engagement.

This research will be conducted employing comparative qualitative case study inquiry based on constructivist paradigm because it suits the aims and the nature of the research. First, the qualitative case study design allows for an in-depth understanding of the cases under study with thick and vivid description of participants’ lived experience, thoughts, and feelings (Cohen, Manion & Morrison 2000; Creswell 2013). Second, the constructivist worldview acknowledges the researcher’s own experiences and background in shaping their interpretation (Creswell 2013), hence making use of my professional background as an academic. Third, apart from peculiarities, the comparative method offers the diversified characteristics of the cases, thus minimising hidden biases, assumptions, and values when the researcher applies the concepts in data analysis (Neuman 2014). As a data collection method, semi-structured interviews will be adopted to seek perceptions of academics themselves and involved stakeholders, including national policy-makers and institutional executives.

In order to understand the broader national and institutional contexts that influence academics’ engagement in internationalization, I will also examine national policy documents and institutional official documents. To this end, Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis approach (1992, 1995, 2010) for studying language in its relation to power and ideology is relevant for this study. Fairclough’s three-dimensional conceptualization of discourse suggests that discourse analysis of the national policy documents and institutional official documents can uncover the ideology and power relations that are embedded in the language use. Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis approach is, therefore, useful as an analytical framework to interpret data from official documents.
This confirmation document is structured into two main parts. The first part consists of six sections. This Introduction section is followed by Section 2 providing the statement of problem and the contextualization of the study. Section 3 presents the background of the study with the critical review of the literature. Section 4 illustrates the conceptual framework for the study. This is followed by Section 5 which outlines the research methodology and design. Ethical research considerations are discussed in Section 6, then Research plan and timetable in Section 7. Part II contains two appendixes: Appendix I – Literature Review and Appendix II – Conceptual and Theoretical Framing.

2. Statement of problem and context

Over the past several decades, globalization has been so powerful and pervasive that almost “no corner of the globe or institutional type has proven immune to the call to internationalize in some fashion” (Rumbley, Altbach & Reisberg 2012, p. 3). As a response toward globalization, internationalization has been shaping and transforming the higher education sector. It is identified as ‘one of the most powerful and pervasive forces at work within higher education around the world’ (ibid., p. 3). Despite the possible risks, internationalization process is seen to be beneficial to the development of higher education institutions. For example, students and staff become more internationally oriented; international awareness of students can increase; important contemporary learning outcomes to student experience are added; the academic community enlarges to benchmark their activities; academic quality can improve; research and knowledge production strengthens (Hénard, Diamond & Roseveare 2012; Knight 2012).

Given the benefits of internationalization to institutions in general and faculties in particular, it is largely agreed that academic staff are primary agents lying at the core of the faculty (see for example Goedegebuure et al. 2009; Leask & Beelen 2009; Leask & Bridge 2013; Proctor 2015). However, the engagement and capacity of the faculty generally and academic staff particularly in internationalization are hindered by a number of constraints, both at institutional and individual level, such as the discrepancy between the declared policy of internationalization and its implementation, academic staff’s seeing no or little benefits of internationalization to their work, and their lack of required skills and knowledge (Childress 2010; Leask & Beelen 2009; Proctor 2015). Therefore, it can be argued that the engagement of academic staff is crucial, yet the chief challenge for developing and sustaining internationalization.

For this reason, my research aims at investigating the engagement of academic staff in the internationalization process of their institutions. Specifically, my research focuses on three main
areas, which are (i) institutional strategies for internationalization, (ii) whether and how academic staff are engaged in their institution’s internationalization process and (ii) the professional development needs regarding internationalization. Drawing on an Australian university and a Vietnamese one as cases for study, this research sets out to provide comparative insights into the distinctive and similar features of these two universities in their enactment of internationalization generally and their strategies for capacity building for internationalization particularly.

Therefore, the overarching research questions are “To what extent are academic staff engaged in the internationalization of higher education and how can their engagement be enhanced?”

These main research questions are divided into the following sub-questions:

1. What is the internationalization agenda of Australian and Vietnamese universities?
2. Whether and how are academic staff engaged in the process of internationalization of their institutions?
3. What factors support or hinder their engagement?
4. What are the recommendations for academics’ professional development needs for better institutional engagement with internationalization?

This research is significant for a number of reasons. First, it addresses the academic staff’s engagement and professional development, i.e. capacity building, for internationalization– the topics that have not been much investigated in the literature. In general, the literature on internationalization of higher education is largely oriented to the national level, covering topics of mobility, mutual influence of higher education systems, knowledge transfer, cooperation and competition, and national and supranational policies (Kehm & Teichler 2007). At the institutional level, the focus over the past two decades has predominantly been on the social and academic experiences of international students, rather than on academic staff’s experiences; and on the teaching and learning more than research and other aspects of academic work (Proctor 2016; Sanderson 2011; Svetlik & Braček Lalić 2016). In this context, this research responds to the literature gap by investigating the reality of the extent to which academic staff are engaged in the internationalization of higher education and the factors underpinning their engagement. Moreover, when it comes to professional development, scholarly work focuses on what and how teachers learn from professional development, or the impact of teachers change on student outcomes (Borko 2004), particularly from the perspectives of professionals themselves within the higher education institutions. Less attention has been paid to professional development for
internationalization process. In addressing continuing professional learning needs for better enhancement of academic staff’s engagement in internationalization agenda, this research has the potential to considerably contribute to the literature of academic staff development in the internationalization of higher education.

Second, this research will explore the perceptions of academics themselves. In fact, although some scholarly attempts have been made to develop the set of knowledge and skills that academic staff should possess in teaching in an internationalized context (Leask 2005; Sanderson 2008; Teekens 2003; Van der Werf 2012), the voice of academic staff regarding their professional development needs is less heard. This means that the discourse on internationalization is insufficiently influenced by those who should be impacted most by it (Proctor 2015). Therefore, academics’ reflections will shape a more comprehensive picture of capacity building practices within institutions.

Third, it provides insights into the internationalization of higher education, which is a Western-dominated topic, in the Vietnamese context. The literature on internationalization in Vietnam centres on international influences on Vietnamese education, rationales for internationalization, and internationalization activities in contemporary contexts (Tran, Marginson & Nguyen 2014). However, research on the international dimension of Vietnamese academic staff’s activities and how institutions facilitate their staff in doing so is largely barren. Research on the academic staff’s engagement as much as their disengagement in their institution’s internationalization and their perceptions is even scarcer.

With no less importance, this research is undertaken from a comparative perspective between Australian and Vietnamese contexts, which provides more interesting and valuable insights. Drawing on two greatly different contexts – Australia and Vietnam – as the cases, this research has the potential to grasp their peculiarities. The uniqueness of the two cases uncovers the implicit and often taken-for-granted basis of our own practices and phenomena (Azarian 2011). Moreover, the insight into the other society, in this case the Australian institution, affords better understanding of my home country, in this case the Vietnamese institution (Kocka 1996). As a result of these benefits, this comparative research helps to broaden and deepen our understanding of internationalization practices in different contexts, thus the findings offer valuable implications for higher education sector worldwide.

3. Background
This research sets out on the premise of ‘internationalization’ as a broad concept, which is usually confused with ‘globalization’ due to their closely intertwined relationship (Scott 2005). As Knight (2004) puts it, ‘internationalization is changing the world of higher education, and globalization is changing the world of internationalization’ (p. 5). There has been an extensive debate about the distinction between these two concepts in the literature. Some argue that globalization is about the world order while internationalization is about organizations and institutions, such as universities (Paige 2005). This view has its merits where globalization is considered as the economic, political and societal forces pushing 21st century higher education toward greater international involvement; and internationalization is considered as a nation, sector, and institution’s response to globalization (Altbach & Knight 2007). This implies that globalization may be unalterable and inevitable in the contemporary world, but internationalization involves many choices. Others consider globalization as ‘evil’ and internationalization as ‘good’ because globalization sees higher education as tradable commodity, internationalization is claimed to be the last stand for humanistic ideas against the world of pure economic benefits (Brandenburg & De Wit 2011; Van Vught, Van Der Wende & Westerheijden 2002). However, the validity of this view is questionable, given the shift in internationalization paradigm from trade to aid, and from cooperation to competition (Altbach & Knight 2007; de Wit 2013; Knight 2010). From another viewpoint, internationalization involves as few as two units whereas globalization takes in many nations and is a dynamic process drawing the local, national and global dimensions more closely together (Marginson & van der Wende 2006).

Although the term ‘internationalization’ is variably interpreted in different higher education systems, meaning different things to different people and often not well understood by staff and students (Mak 2010), the working definition by Knight (2003) is the most widely accepted one so far. “Internationalization at the national, sector, and institutional levels is defined as the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education (Knight 2003, p. 2). This definition emphasizes that internationalization is an ongoing process that encompasses international, intercultural and global dimensions.

Over the years, internationalization has moved from being reactive to proactive, from added value to mainstream, and from the fringe of institutional interest to the very core (de Wit 2011). At the heart of the shift in paradigm of higher education internationalization is the movement from academic and social/cultural rationales to economic and political rationales; and from a
cooperative model during the 1970s and 1980s to a more competitive model during the last two decades (Altbach & Knight 2007; de Wit 2013; Knight 2010). Particularly, while in most continental Europe, the emphasis moved from aid to exchange of students and teachers as well as curriculum development, the emphasis in the UK and Australia shifted from aid to trade (de Wit 2013). In Vietnam, the rationales of higher education internationalization are humanistic and developmental, instead of commercial, i.e. on trade or competition (Tran, Marginson & Nguyen 2014). Internationalization is understood by the government as the expansion and enhancement of international cooperation in the field of education (Thủ Tướng Chính Phủ 2012). Comparatively, internationalization of Vietnam’s higher education is characterized by the focus on integration and cooperation with Asian countries and the world, and national capacity building by developing a more qualified workforce, as opposed to market-driven motivations in the Australia (de Wit 2013; Leask & Beelen 2009; Tran, Marginson & Nguyen 2014).

Internationalization, until recently, has been seen as a predominantly western phenomenon, whereas developing countries play a more reactive role. English-speaking nations and EU countries are seen as ‘providers’ of most services of international higher education while the ‘buying’ countries are Asian and Latin American middle-income countries and the poorer nations of the developing world due to their lack of capacity to meet growing demand (Altbach & Knight 2007). Specifically, Australia is seen as the provider of international education and Vietnam as the receiver or importer in the market. Indeed, since the 1980s, Australian universities have undoubtedly been very successful in attracting large numbers of international students to study in Australia and in exporting their programmes to other countries, predominantly Asia, with unmet demand (Leask & Beelen 2009). In Vietnam, ‘advanced program’ is a typical example of importing curriculum from prestigious universities in the world top 200 with little adaptation to the economic, political and cultural context of Vietnam. Also, outbound mobility of student and staff obviously outweighs the inbound mobility due to the “status of education in Vietnam, problems of inflexibility and bureaucracy and lack of courses delivered in English” (Tran, Marginson & Nguyen 2014, p. 143).

Besides a number of risks are associated with internationalization processes such as commodification and commercialization of education programs, increase in the number of foreign degree mills and low quality providers, etc., internationalization brings undeniable benefits to higher education (Knight 2012). Top benefits include more internationally oriented students and staff, increased international awareness of students, improved academic quality, strengthened research and knowledge production, innovation in curriculum, teaching and
research; enhanced internationalization of the curriculum, enhanced international cooperation and solidarity, enhanced prestige for the institution (ibid.). Arguing in the same line, Hénard, Diamond and Roseveare (2012, p. 9) add that internationalization is beneficial to higher education institutions insofar as it increases national and international visibility and leverage institutional strengths through strategic partnerships, and mobilise internal intellectual resources. In terms of academic work, internationalization enlarges the academic community to benchmark their activities, develop stronger research groups, and add important contemporary learning outcomes to student experience. These impacts suggest that internationalization should be positively embraced by both the institution and faculty. Unsurprisingly, it is largely concurred by scholars that engaging academic staff purposefully in internationalization enactment is crucial for its success and sustainability (Leask & Beelen 2009; Stohl 2007).

Meanwhile, internationalization achievements are claimed to be slowed down by the lack of involvement and expertise of academic staff in internationalization and related issues (Beelen 2011; Leask & Beelen 2009). This is attributed to a number of barriers that impede the engagement of academic staff. At the institutional level, the institution’s management of international education (Leask & Beelen 2009) and the variable understandings of internationalization (Proctor 2015) lead to the discrepancy between the declared policy and its implementation. At faculty level, the lack of motivation among academic staff to engage with internationalization is a common obstacle (Leask & Beelen 2009; Stohl 2007). Childress (2010) states that faculty are generally resistant to change, particularly when they do not see the benefits of internationalizing their teaching, research and service. Moreover, even staff who are interested in engaging in the development and delivery of international education may lack the skills to add a meaningful international dimension to their courses (Leask & Beelen 2009).

The engagement of faculty in internationalization can be enhanced “if an environment is created that ensures that professional development, scholarship and public service in the international setting are valued” (NASULGC 1993, p. 6). For example, staff who travel abroad to conduct research should have their work acknowledged by the university, and those who engage in professional development and public service abroad should be supported in their efforts. Besides, academics’ engagement can be enhanced by improving their skills, knowledge and competence. There is widespread recognition in the literature that professional development has an important role to play in enhancing teacher’s work by equipping academics with necessary skills (see for example Borko 2004; Ferman 2002; Ganser 2000). In turn, the insights, experiences and knowledge of the academics themselves are one valuable source for informing the design of
creative and effective professional development programs (Ferman 2002). Therefore, teachers’ perspectives are important for the assessment of professional learning needs.

Having said that, the extent to which academic staff are engaged in the internationalization of higher education has not been much investigated (Sanderson 2011; Van der Werf 2012). The internationalization of the research and other aspects of academic work are also missing in earlier studies into faculty engagement with internationalization (Proctor 2015). Therefore, a more comprehensive picture academic staff’s engagement with the internationalization of higher education is needed. Also, prior research on teacher professional development and learning in international higher education are mainly concerned with professional learning for the internationalization of curriculum (Leask & Beelen 2009; Leask & Bridge 2013) and of the academic “Self” (Sanderson 2008, 2011). What needs more research is what and how teachers learn from professional development, or the impact of teachers change on student outcomes (Borko 2004), particularly the need to understand more about continuing professional learning from the perspective of professionals themselves from within the higher education institutions.

In brief, this study will fill in the gap in the literature with a more comprehensive picture of academic staff’s engagement with the internationalization of higher education. Different international dimensions in academics’ work in Australian and Vietnamese case universities will be investigated to explore the similarities and differences, given the distinctive rationales for internationalization at the national level as discussed above. The voice of academics from within the institutions under study will also contribute to the assessment of professional development needs for better enhancement of their engagement with their institutions’ internationalization strategies.

4. Conceptual framing


4.1. Sen’s Capability Approach

Sen’s Capability Approach is a popular theory in social science because it provides a general normative framework that can be used for the assessment of human development (Unterhalter, Vaughan & Walker 2007), and for the evaluation of individual well-being, social arrangements and the design of policies and proposals about social change in society (Robeyns 2011). In this
research, the evaluation of academic staff’s engagement can be made through the understanding of the conditions shaped by the institution’s structures and relations, including both opportunities and obstacles, and how academic staff respond to these conditions.

Three central concepts in the Capability Approach include functionings, capabilities and agency. Functionings are defined as “the various things a person may value doing or being” (Sen 1999, p. 75). They are valuable states and activities that make up people's well-being, i.e. these beings and doings together constitute what makes a life valuable (Alkire & Deneulin 2009). Functionings can be potential or achieved, and potential functioning is understood as capabilities (Robeyns 2011). In other words, capabilities are understood based on the concept of functioning. As such, capabilities of a person are defined as “the alternative combinations of functionings that are feasible for her to achieve” (Sen 1999, p. 75). They are “the substantive freedoms he or she enjoys to lead the kind of life he or she has reason to value” (Sen 1999, p. 87). Therefore, capabilities refer to our real opportunities or freedoms to promote or achieve valuable functionings, i.e. to be and do the things that a person wants to be and do, selected from various good possibilities (Alkire 2002). One can say that the difference between a capability and functioning is between an opportunity to achieve and the actual achievement, between potential and outcome (Walker 2006b; Walker & Unterhalter 2007), between the effectively possible and the realized, or between freedom/valuable options and achievements (Robeyns 2005).

Having the requisite set of capabilities, a person exercises his or her agency to make choices from a range of options and alternatives (Walker 2005). Agency is, therefore, one’s ability to pursue goals that one values and that are important for the life an individual wishes to lead. In other words, it is the person’s ability to act on what they value and have reason to value (Alkire 2002). ‘Agent’ is used in contrast with the concept of ‘patient’, seeing people as active participations in development, rather than passive spectators (Walker & Unterhalter 2007).

The Capability Approach is relevant to this research in a number of ways. Firstly, it emphasizes the focus on capabilities and not just functionings of academic staff, necessitating the investigation of whether academic staff are provided with opportunities or freedoms that enable them to make choices in understanding and engaging in internationalization. Particularly, capabilities are the doings and beings that people value. A lack of interest in internationalization may be because they do not see the relevance to their students. Therefore, it can be said that the engagement of academic staff also depends on whether they see this as a valuable goal. Secondly, the Capability Approach argues that social arrangements should aim to expand people’s capabilities – their freedom to promote or achieve ‘functioning’ which are important to
The belief of the Capability Approach that functionings or behaviours of individuals are significantly shaped by the social contexts attaches academic staff’s engagement to their institutions’ arrangements. The evaluation of the extent of academic staff’s engagement can be facilitated by the analysis of the conditions shaped by their higher education institutions’ policies and practices, including professional development activities. In turn, the evaluation of academic staff’s capabilities would bring further understanding of their institution’s strategies for internationalization. This would provide useful recommendations for more efficient human development initiatives in internationalization, of which professional development is an important part.

Thirdly, the focus on agency in the Capability Approach brings up two issues in my research: the role of higher education institutions in expanding the agency for academic staff, and the role of academic staff as responsible and active agents in the internationalization agenda. Given the conditions by the institutions, it depends on academic staff’s individual capacity to convert these conditions into engagement or disengagement, whichever they value. As such, it is necessary to consider the differences in people’s ability to convert resources into valued outcomes (Robeyns 2005; Walker 2005, 2006b), in this case, into engagement or disengagement. The consideration of academic’s individual differences enables the exploration of why they choose to engage or disengage and how engaged they are in internationalization.

From the Capability Approach’s perspective, this research argues that the engagement of academic staff in their institution’s internationalization agenda depends on the conditions shaped by their institutions, the choices they make and their agency in making their choices. The following diagram illustrates the conceptualization of academic staff’s engagement in internationalization underpinned by the Capability Approach.
The diagram shows that the engagement of academic staff in internationalization (functioning) is determined by both capabilities and individual agency. The institutional conditions and arrangements, including leadership, resources, funding, professional development activities, etc. may create or reduce the opportunities (capabilities) for academic staff in the internationalization agenda. These capabilities give academics options, based on which they make decision to (dis)engage with the internationalization process. Also, these institutional policies and practices may expand or constrain academic staff’s agency. Agency is reflected in (i) the choice-making of academic staff – they may or may not take the opportunities into action and (ii) the ability to convert these resources into action. Consequently, the engagement level and scope depends on how academic staff themselves exercise their agency. As such, investigating academic staff’s engagement in internationalization calls for the understanding of both their capabilities and agency within the discourse of institutional policies and practices. In turn, the findings about underpinning drivers for academic staff’s engagement inform the institutions of effective policies and practices to engage their staff in the internationalization agenda, including capacity building through professional development activities.

4. 2. Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis

As discussed above, it is crucial to explore how institutional policies and practices influence academic staff’s engagement in internationalization, which can be partly captured when
examining both national and institutional official documents. To this end, my research employs Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis (1992, 1995, 2010) as an analytical framework to interpret the data in form of official documents. In general, Fairclough’s model of Critical Discourse Analysis is both a theory and method for studying language in its relation to power and ideology. Using the term ‘discourse’, Fairclough (2010) claims that language use is imbricated in and determined by social relations and processes. This is represented in the imprint of ideological processes and structures in the forms and content of texts; and in the imbrication of language use in the exercise, reproduction and negotiation of power relations.

Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis approach offers to uncover the connections “between properties of texts and social processes and relations (ideologies, power relations) which are generally not obvious to people who produce and interpret those texts” (Fairclough 2010, p. 131). In his earlier work (1992), he conceptualizes ‘discourse’ as a complex of three dimensions: text, discursive practice, and social practice. His updated model (2010) terms these three dimensions as (i) a language text (spoken or written), (ii) discourse practice, and (iii) sociocultural practice. Text is understood as the language product of discursive processes and can be analyzed through vocabulary, grammar, cohesion, and text structure. Discourse practice involves processes of text production and interpretation and can be examined under three categories: force of utterances, coherence, and intertextuality of texts. In the third dimension, discourse is embedded in sociocultural practice at a number of levels: the immediate situation, the wider institution, and at a societal level. Corresponding to the three dimensions of discourse, discourse analysis is also three-dimensional, involving linguistic description of the language text, interpretation of the relationship between the discursive processes and the texts, and explanation of the relationship between the discursive processes and the social processes. His approach is illustrated in the diagram below.
Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis approach is useful for this research so far as it provides theoretical grounds for data collection and data analysis methods. The relation of language to ideology and power suggests that documents offer a rich source of data. Discourse analysis of the language used in documents contributes to the understanding of the social relations and processes represented in them, thus suggesting the benefits of examining the official documents (both national policy documents and institutional official documents). Using Critical Discourse Analysis approach to analyse national and institutional documents has the potential to provide background knowledge of underpinning factors influencing staff’s engagement in internationalization in Australia and Vietnam in general, and in two case-study institutions in particular.

In short, this study adopts the combination of Sen’s Capability Approach and Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis model as a framework guiding the research methodology. The application of these two theories will be discussed further in the following section about Research Methodology and Design.

5. Research Methodology and Design
With a view to discovering what the engagement of academics in internationalization is like within Australian and Vietnamese institutional contexts, this research employs qualitative comparative case study approach based on constructivist paradigm.

5.1. Qualitative approach

This study adopts qualitative inquiry, which allows an inductive, interpretive and holistic exploration of a complex research problem, thus is best suited to explore a research problem in which the variables are not known and not easily measured (Creswell 2013). In qualitative research, social reality is constructed with a focus on interactive processes, instead of simply measuring objective facts (Neuman 2006). For this reason, it is relevant to the investigation of organisational functioning, relationships between individuals and groups, and social environments (NHMRC 2007). Aiming at providing a complex and detailed comparative analysis of academic staff’s engagement in the internationalization process in two distinctive settings – Australia and Vietnam, my research addresses a complicated research problem that cannot be simply measured through close-ended questionnaires like in quantitative approach. Instead, the knowledge of academic staff’s engagement and capacity building in internationalization is best constructed through an understanding of participants’ perspectives and an interpretation of their meanings. The talking with participants, both academics and institutions’ leaders, makes sure that their voices will be directly heard and that the interactions between them will be captured. Also, as qualitative studies are not bound by tight cause-and-effect relationship, they offer opportunities for identifying the complex interactions of factors under study (Creswell 2013). Besides, constructivist research seeks the understanding of specific contexts in which people live and work, ‘leading the researcher to look for the complexity of views rather than narrow the meanings into a few categories or ideas” (Creswell 2013, p. 24). This allows for more insightful and interpretive conclusions about the extent of and the underpinning driving factors for academic staff’s engagement in internationalization, as well as implications for professional development needs.

5.2. Case study design

Among five qualitative approaches including narrative research, phenomenological research, grounded theory research, ethnographic research, and case study (Creswell 2009; Creswell 2013), this study employs case study approach as it holds relevant characteristics for my study. Overall, case study provides unique examples of real people in real situations, thus enabling thick understanding of ideas more clearly than simply by presenting them with abstract theories.
or principles (Cohen, Manion & Morrison 2000). Creswell (2013) defines case study as “a qualitative approach in which the investigator explores a real-life, contemporary bounded system (a case) or multiple bounded systems (cases) over time, through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information (e.g. observations, interviews, audio-visual material, and documents and reports), and reports a case description and case themes” (p. 97). As case study offers an in-depth understanding of a research problem, this approach enables a detailed picture of not only how engaged academic staff are in internationalization, but also why they are engaged to such extent. These findings can be gained through different sources of information, in which interviews allow the discovery of real-life experience in the contemporary institutional contexts. In my research, personal accounts and perceptions from academics and leaders together offer a thick and vivid description of participants’ lived experience of, thoughts about and feelings for a situation (Cohen, Manion & Morrison 2000). As such, the reality, and enablers and inhibitors of academic staff’s engagement can be holistically understood.

As for the unit of analysis, case study might involve multiple cases (a multisite study) or a single case (a within-site study) (Creswell 2013). My research is based on case-study comparative approach, looking at two different cases – one Australian and one Vietnamese university, with an aim to provide an in-depth comparison between two different systems without the wish to make broad generalization (Neuman 2006). Creswell (2013) and Stake (1994) categorize case studies according to the size of the bounded case, consisting of single instrumental case study, the collective or multiple case study, and the intrinsic case study. My research falls on the second category – collective case study, in which one issue (academic staff’s engagement) is selected but multiple cases (Australian and Vietnamese universities) are examined to illustrate the issue. The collective case study illustrates a more holistic account with different perspectives on the issue. Thus, the data collected from the Australian and Vietnamese universities potentially make up a more detailed, varied, and extensive database for the research.

As discussed in section 4 on conceptual framing and further addressed in Appendix II, academic staff’s engagement is viewed through the lens of the Capability Approach, with a focus on whether institutional contexts create conditions or hinder academic staff’s opportunities and freedom to make choice, and whether academics are able to exercise their agency in choice making and acting upon their choice. In order to understand and justify for the reality of how engaged academic staff are, in-depth exploration of institutional contexts and individual perceptions are necessary. The deep understanding of the reality within the boundaries of institutions can be best obtained through case study research design.
Further, as mentioned in the previous section, a comparative perspective is employed to seek similarities and differences between the Australian and Vietnamese cases, thus embracing the diversity (Neuman 2006). Having said that, this research does not aim to generalize one case to another because the contexts of cases differ (Creswell 2013). Rather, it draws on the boundaries around the cases and highlights the peculiarities of the two cases under study, which in turn helps to identify the correlation between the engagement of academic staff and institutional arrangements.

5.3. Selection of cases

This research involves collective and multi-sited cases, focusing on one issue (academic staff’s engagement) in two different settings (one Vietnamese university and one Australian university). The selection of institutions as cases for this study is based on two main criteria. First, given the general contrasts in internationalization in Vietnam and Australia discussed in Appendix I, it is now necessary to select one university in each country that has been undergoing strong internationalization process. There is no need to target any specific discipline, as the research focuses on the internationalization process in general. Thus, the selection of universities in this criterion only depends on institution’s active enactment of the internationalization. The second criterion is that these universities must be accessible for the researcher, which depends on the researcher’s professional and academic network at the chosen research site as much as the willingness of the potential participants.

These criteria lead me to Deakin University in Australia and Foreign Trade University in Vietnam. On the Australia side, Deakin University is chosen for its excellence in international education and diversity of international dimensions. Deakin University received the Premier's Award for International Education Provider of the Year 2014 (Deakin University 2017a). Deakin has been awarded the Victorian International Education Awards twice in 2014 and 2016 for Excellence in International Education (Deakin University 2017a; The Pie News 2016). Also in 2016, Deakin received an International Education Association of Australia (IEAA)’s Excellence Award for Innovation in Education for its online series “International Students in Cars Getting Coffee” (IEAA 2016). The University is among the top 2% of universities worldwide, and is home to thousands of international students, making up 17% of the total students (Times Higher Education World University Rankings 2017). Deakin's commitment to international education was recognised for a variety of aspects, among which are the development of a global citizen program that provides international students with additional opportunities to expand their engagement in the local community and boost qualities sought by potential employer, and its
strong reputation in international teaching and research in a range of fields (Deakin University 2017a). The University’s international partnerships, particularly in India and China have reinforced its international profile. In its LIVE the Future Agenda 2020 (LIVE stands for Learning, Ideas, Value, and Experience), Deakin University aims at being listed among Top 3 in Victoria regarding research capacity by 2020, reflected in a strategic international research footprint (i.e. the number of co-authored international publications, significant international partnerships, and international HDR fulltime student load); and at increasing international students numbers so as to improve profitability and productivity measures (Deakin University 2017b). Another reason for selecting Deakin University is that this is my host institution, which offers convenience in travelling and easier accessibility.

Selecting a case university in Vietnam is not as straightforward because the concept ‘internationalization’ per se is not explicitly used in the language of public documents, as well as the ad hoc, inconsistent and fragmented picture of internationalization (Tran, Marginson & Nguyen 2014). However, Foreign Trade University is one of the universities that are undertaking strong internationalization agenda, compared to other Vietnamese universities.

Internationalization at Foreign Trade University includes both dimensions – internationalization at home and internationalization abroad. In terms of internationalization at home, Foreign Trade University is strong at providing joint programs and advanced programs, in partnership with universities in different countries around the world, including the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, Denmark, France, Japan, and Taiwan (Foreign Trade University 2015). Particularly, the university hosts two advanced programs out of 35 advanced programs implemented across the nation, which is the most developed initiative towards the internationalization of curriculum in Vietnamese higher education sector (Tran, Marginson & Nguyen 2014). Regarding internationalization abroad, there are training projects for staff mobility which send academic staff abroad for professional learning, from several weeks to several months. Students in joint programs and advanced programs have a chance to go to the host institutions in their last year and gain double degree (Foreign Trade University 2016).

Another distinctive feature of Foreign Trade University is that the institution is financially autonomous from the state budget, although its academic activities remain being informed by the national framework (Nhan Dan News 2015). It would be interesting to explore how the institution takes advantage of its certain freedom in taking initiatives. With no less importance, Foreign Trade University is my home university where I have been working as a lecturer for 10 years, which brings about convenience and easier accessibility in data collection.
5.4. Data collection

My study employs two main methods of data collection, namely official documents and interviews.

Documents

In case study research, documents are useful in uncovering meaning, developing understanding, and discovering insights relevant to the research problem (Merriam 1998). Documents is powerful as primary data in the sense that they require no transcription and are ready for use (Cresswell & Clark 2006) despite the necessity of translation, available at low cost, and being factual (Lincoln & Guba 1985), which provides more objective insights into the realities.

In this research, documents will be collected from both national level and institutional level. National policy documents include Australia’s National Strategy for International Education 2025 and Vietnam’s National Strategy for Higher Education 2020. Institutional official documents include strategic plans, guidelines, institutional reports, and other official documents from both universities. Examples of institutional documents are Deakin University’s LIVE the future 2020 and Foreign Trade University’s guidelines of ‘advanced’ program. These documents can be accessed through websites or from leaders or staff in charge. It is expected that national policy documents will provide a wider picture of how internationalization is positioned in higher education sector, while institutional documents reveal how these national visions are translated into strategic plans by higher education institutions. Information regarding institutional strategies for internationalization enactment and their motivations, along with the initiatives to increase staff capabilities and agency for internationalization can be partly found in these institutional documents.

Interviews

The research employs one-to-one interviewing as a method of data collection. Tuckman (1972) describes that research interview provides access to what is inside a person’s head, making it possible to measure what a person knows, what a person (dis)likes, and what a person thinks. For this reason, interviews may be used as the principal means of collecting data that directly addresses the research objectives (Cohen, Manion & Morrison 2000).

Interviewees in this research should be those who are able to provide information regarding the engagement of academic staff and recommendations for capacity building in internationalization.
The first group of targeted interviewees are policy-makers in the field of internationalization. These participants can reveal their ideologies and intentions behind the national policies of internationalization, which explains the similar and different macro-level rationales for internationalization in Australia and Vietnam. One policy-maker from each country, for example from Vietnam’s Ministry of Education and Training and Australian’s Department of Education and Training will be invited to participate in the interview.

Besides, this research also needs background knowledge of institution’s strategies for internationalization as well as their policies and initiatives in increasing academic staff’s engagement in their internationalization. Therefore, voices of institutional leaders also need to be heard. Executives in charge of international education and human development should have a direct role to play in managing or implementing these policies, thus holding good insights into the international education and cooperation activities taking place in their institutions. They are also knowledgeable about the ground-level activities that academics are involved in, and have more frequent contact with them. This research targets at three institutional executives.

It is important to seek perceptions of academic staff themselves about (i) whether or not they take any part in the internationalization process and what internationalization activities they take part in, (ii) their motivations for participation, and (iii) their professional development needs. They should be academics from different faculties to ensure the variety in sampling, and have been joining the institution for a sufficient period of time. For these criteria, 10 academics from each university, among which one or two academics are chosen from each faculty/school, and they should have been working for the institutions for at least two years to ensure they have sufficient ‘lived experience’ within the institutions.

Semi-structured interviewing is the most suitable type in this research, since it provides the interviewer and interviewee with some guidance on what to talk about but at the same time ensures the flexibility that allows for the discovery or elaboration of information that is important but may not have previously been thought of (Gill et al. 2008). Before interviews with leaders and academics are conducted, pilot testing is carried out to refine data collection plans and develop relevant lines of questions (Yin 2009).

5. Outline of data analysis
Data analysis in this research includes two phases. The first phase involves the analysis of national and institutional official documents, and the second phase analyses empirical data from interviews.

In the first phase, documents are analysed using critical discourse analysis method. This phase aims at constructing background knowledge about the context of internationalization and capacity building at both national and institutional levels. National policy documents and institutional official documents will be analysed based on the three-dimensional Critical Discourse Analysis model developed by Fairclough (1992, 1995, 2010). The first dimension is the linguistic *description* of the language text through vocabulary, grammar, cohesion, and text structure. The second dimension is the *interpretation* of the relationship between the discursive processes and the texts, showing how the text is produced and interpreted through three categories: force of utterances (what sort of speech act), coherence, and intertextuality of texts. The third dimension involves the *explanation* of the relationship between the discursive processes and the social/sociocultural processes. The second and third dimensions will uncover the meanings embedded in the discourse of these documents, including ideology and power. The data analysis in these dimensions aims at constructing knowledge about whether and how institutions (referred to as social arrangements in the Capability Approach) create opportunities (as called ‘capabilities’ in the Capability Approach) for academic staff and build their capacity (as called agency) to engage in internationalization.

Once the underpinning social relations and processes shaping the background context that influences academic staff’s engagement has been captured through these documents, the research comes to the second phase in which empirical data from interviews will be analysed. This phase follows the first three steps in the process described by Creswell (2013), which consists of (i) organizing the data, (ii) reading and memoing, (iii) describing, classifying and interpreting, and (iv) representing and visualizing the data. Initially, after semi-structured interviews with academics, institutional leaders and policy-makers have been conducted, they will be transcribed. Interview transcription will then be stored in my personal computer. Next, all the database will be scanned to identify major organizing ideas before being coded with the assistance of NVIVO software with an aim to condense all data to key themes and topics that can shed light on the research questions (The Open University 2017).

The coding process itself will go through three cycles, namely *open coding, axial coding and selective coding* (Neuman 2014) and be informed by the conceptual framework through the lens of the Capability Approach. In the *open coding* cycle, raw data will initially be arranged into
preliminary themes according to the pre-determined topics related to the key concepts in the
Capability Approach, including institutional arrangements, academic staff’s capabilities,
academic staff’s agency and academic staff’s engagement. At the same time, this coding process
will be open to creating additional themes that emerge from the data or changing the initial
themes. In the axial coding cycle, each initial coded theme will be examined to find relationships
and linkages between concepts. Categories are divided into sub-themes or combined into more
general categories. After the major themes have been well-developed and several core
generalizations have been identified, the coding process will go through the selective coding
cycle in which previous codes will be further reviewed, reorganized and elaborated. The
connections between categories and sub-categories will then be interpreted. The interrelation
among the key concepts in the Capability Approach directs the interpretation of data to centre on
how institutional arrangement, capabilities, and agency influence academics’ (dis)engagement in
their institution’s internationalization agenda, from which the professional development needs
for academic staff will also be identified.

As this is a comparative study, after the analysis of the Australian case and the Vietnamese case
individually, cross-case comparison will be made to identify similarities and differences between
the Australian case and the Vietnamese one. The interpretation of data will then be discussed
further in regard to the research questions. Here, the analysis reaches the last step in Cresswell’s
process (2013), in which data interpretation is presented in written form.

6. Ethical Research considerations

My research involves interviews concerning interpersonal interaction and produce information
about the human condition, thus there are ethical considerations mainly related to informed
consent and confidentiality (Cohen, Manion & Morrison 2000; Creswell 2013). Before the
interview, participants will be informed of the purpose and the overall content of the interview in
plain language, so that they can make their decision to participate on a voluntary basis. On the
actual interview session, Plain Language Statement and Consent Form will be given to
participants for their signature before the interview starts and to allow them to withdraw if they
no longer wish to participate in the interview.

It is the researcher’s responsibility to protect the identity of participants when disseminating
information and storing material (NHMRC 2007). Accordingly, participants will be kept
anonymous, with their answers being assigned a specific code to make sure their identities are
confidential; hence, participants are protected from any possible harms. Respondents in my
research are adult academic staff and leaders, thus it is identified as low-risk research. Application for ethical clearance will be submitted and obtained from Deakin University before the interviewing commences.

Another ethical issue to be considered is that I am in the role of an insider researcher to the research sites at Foreign Trade University, where I worked for 10 years prior to embarking on this research, and Deakin University, where I am now a student. The insider role was useful because of the easier access to the research site and participants, and less travelling involved (Mercer 2007). However, this may cause risks of biased interpretations, pressure on participants, and participants worry about my knowing too much about them. To reduce the risk of biased interpretation, I will report participants’ voices, experiences and perspectives in the most honest manner. Also, I will explain to participants that their participation is entirely on a voluntary basis, and their decision to opt out does not affect the relationship with the researcher. Regarding the participants’ concern about personal judgement, I will spend time establishing their trust and ensure that judgement will be made entirely for academic purposes, not for personal purposes.

All interviews will be audio-recorded with a digital MP3 recorder. Audio files and transcripts, together with official documents collected, will be stored safely in my password protected computer at my Deakin work station, and their hard copies of transcripts will be kept in a locked cabinet. Data will be used by the researcher only during the whole period of the research, then kept for another five years following the final publication of the research outcomes and printed materials will be secured in sealed envelope with the destruction date on it.

Lastly, I will allow for the verification of the accuracy or completeness of each interview transcript by the participants before analysis is complete. A brief summary of research findings may be sent to them if they are interested.

7. Research plan and timetable

<p>| February 2017 | Commencement and discussion with supervisors |
| November 2017 | Submission of confirmation document and public presentation |
| November - January 2017 | Application for ethics clearance |
| January – March 2018 | Official documents collection and analysis |
| March – May 2018 | Data collection in Vietnam |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month Range</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May – July 2018</td>
<td>Transcription of data about Vietnam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August - October</td>
<td>Data collection in Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Transcription of data about Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November –</td>
<td>Australian data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January – July</td>
<td>Completion of data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Update of literature review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Findings and Discussion writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2019</td>
<td>Final chapters completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2019</td>
<td>Full draft submission to supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2019</td>
<td>Full draft submission to panel of examiners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2019</td>
<td>Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2020</td>
<td>Submission of thesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART II: APPENDIXES

APPENDIX 1 - LITERATURE REVIEW

My research aims at investigating academic staff’s engagement in internationalization and capacity building for internationalization. Specifically, my study focuses on the internationalization strategies adopted by a Vietnamese and an Australian university, the engagement of academic staff within these two institutions, and the assessment of professional development needs for academics to enhance their engagement. Therefore, this section reviews the relevant literature that contextualizes the discourse of these aspects in my research. It begins by providing a critical review of higher education internationalization as a concept and its strategies across different parts of the world, including Vietnamese and Australian contexts. This part helps to set the scene for the institutional internationalization strategies between the two countries. It then discusses the significance of academic staff’s engagement and defines what it means by professional development, which helps to shape the context for investigating how professional development contributes to enhancing academics’ engagement.

1. Concept of Internationalization

Internationalization is not a new term. In fact, the concept ‘internationalization’ has been used for centuries in politics and governmental relations. The term gained its popularity in the field of higher education since 1970s before taking over from the previous term ‘international education’ in the 1990s (de Wit 2013; Knight 2003). Over the years, internationalization has moved from a reactive to a pro-active strategic issue, from added value to mainstream, from the fringe of institutional interest to the very core (de Wit 2013), and from ad hoc and marginalized to central in the higher education sector (Knight 2012). During the last two decades, internationalization has been one of the most powerful and pervasive forces within higher education across the world (Rumbley, Altbach & Reisberg 2012).

Although the term ‘internationalization’ is variably interpreted in different HE systems, meaning different things to different people, and often not well understood by staff and students (Mak 2010), the working definition by Knight (2003) is seen as a widely accepted one so far.

Internationalization at the national, sector, and institutional levels is defined as the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education (p. 2).
There are three main points that are worth noting in Knight’s definition. First, it emphasizes that internationalization is an ongoing and continuing process. Second, three key concepts encompassed in knight’s definition—international, intercultural, and global dimensions that are intentionally used as a triad – show the richness in the breadth and depth of internationalization. Thirdly, since this working definition uses general terms, it is generic enough to be relevant for various levels in the field of post-secondary education, including the national, higher education sector and the institutional levels (Knight 2003; 2004); and sufficiently broad to encompass all activities of a contemporary university (Beelen & Jones 2015).

This definition suggests that internationalization of higher education is closely connected to globalization and these two terms are often juxtaposed. The distinction between internationalization from globalization is necessary for better understanding the concept of internationalization due to the possible confusion between them. Despite numerous efforts to differentiate the two terms, the distinction cannot be regarded as categorical because they overlap and are intertwined in all kinds of ways (Scott 2005). The following section briefly reviews different lenses of viewing internationalization in comparison with globalization.

If globalization is defined as ‘the reality shaped by an increasingly integrated world economy, new information and communications technology, the emergence of an international knowledge network, the role of the English language, and other forces beyond the control of academic institutions’, internationalization is seen as ‘the variety of policies and programs that universities and governments implement to respond to globalization’ (Altbach, Reisberg & Rumbley 2009, p. 7). In this sense, globalization is considered as the economic, political and societal forces pushing 21st century higher education toward greater international involvement; and internationalization is considered as a nation, sector, and institution’s response to globalization (Altbach & Knight 2007). Therefore, globalization may be unalterable and inevitable in the contemporary world, but internationalization involves many choices. Similarly, Paige (2005) puts it simply that “whereas globalization is about the world order, internationalization is about organizations and institutions, such as universities” (p. 101).

Arguing in the same line, Enders (2004) highlights the linkage between globalization, information technology advances, cross-border capital flow, international student and labour mobility. However, he argues that such terms as globalization, internationalization, regionalization and denationalization are often used interchangeably to imply international activities and to widen higher education outreach.
From another perspective (Van Vught, Van Der Wende & Westerheijden 2002), internationalization is claimed to be ‘closer to the well-established tradition of international cooperation and mobility and to the core values of quality and excellence, while globalization refers more to competition, pushing the concept of higher education as a tradable commodity and challenging the concept of higher education as a public good’ (p. 117). Brandenburg and De Wit (2011) note that this distinction implies that there is a strong inclination that internationalization is identified as ‘good’ and globalization as ‘evil’. As they put it, while globalization sees higher education as tradable commodity, internationalization is claimed to be the last stand for humanistic ideas against the world of pure economic benefits. This claim seems to be relevant to the Australian context during the ‘aid’ phase of internationalization and the current context of Vietnam, where internationalization is taken as a tool for integration and cooperation with Asian countries and the world, and capacity building by developing a more qualified workforce (Nguyen 2009; Tran, Marginson & Nguyen 2014).

From a slightly different lens, Marginson and van der Wende (2006) identify internationalization as any relationship across borders between nations, or between single institutions situated within different national systems while globalization as the processes of world-wide engagement and convergence associated with the growing role of global systems that criss-cross many national borders. To put it in another way, internationalization involves as few as two units whereas globalization takes in many nations and is a dynamic process drawing the local, national and global dimensions more closely together, which is reflected in the term ‘glonacal’ coined by Marginson and Rhoades (2002). By ‘glonacal’, the authors argues that three intersecting dimensions and forces of globalization – global, national and local – exist simultaneously. Another distinction argued by these authors is that globalization is more transformative than internationalization, because globalization impacts the economic, cultural and political core of nations and reshapes the environment and the daily practices of people working in higher education. Meanwhile internationalization takes place in the borderlands between nations and leaves the heart of those nations largely untouched. However, as internationalization nowadays is strongly transforming the higher education systems, the values of these claims should be re-examined. Another notable viewpoint is that globalization leads to integration between national systems while internationalization results in interconnection (Beerkens 2004). For these reasons, globalization cannot be regarded simply as a higher form of internationalization.
In short, the relationship between globalization and internationalization is very complex — it is neither simple nor formulaic. The overall picture of globalization and different components of internationalization is further elaborated in Knight’s diagram below:

Source: Knight (2012)

As can be seen from the figure, globalization is the catalyst of internationalization while internationalization is the reactor to globalization, and between them, the element of agency comes into play. In its turn, internationalization encompasses two pillars that are evolving – Internationalization at home and internationalization abroad. *Internationalization at home* (IaH) or campus-based internationalization refers to any internationally related activity with the exception of outbound student and staff mobility. Campus-based strategies can include “the intercultural and international dimension in the teaching/learning process, research, extracurricular activities, relationships with local cultural and ethnic community groups, and integration of foreign students and scholars into campus life and activities” (Knight 2012, p. 34). By contrast, *internationalization abroad* or cross-border education indicates the mobility of people, programs, providers, projects, services, knowledge, ideas and policy across national boundaries. However, this way of distinction is critiqued to be problematic, as it suggests that *internationalization abroad* does not develop international understanding and intercultural skills,
and that curriculum is not directly included in internationalization at home (Beelen & Jones 2015, p. 61).

The recent literature has paid more attention to the concept of ‘comprehensive internationalization’, which has increasingly become more common in use, beginning to be popularized in 2002 in the United States. While higher internationalization is not a new concept, comprehensive internationalization is ‘relatively new term and is in part a response to the greater complexity and dimensions associated with an evolving notion of internationalization’ (Hudzik 2015, p. 7). It is defined as…

… commitment confirmed through action to infuse international and comparative perspectives throughout the teaching, research and service missions of higher education. It shapes institutional ethos and values and touches the entire higher education enterprise. It is essential that it be embraced by institutional leadership, governance, faculty, students, and all academic service and support units. It is an institutional imperative, not just a desirable possibility (Hudzik 2011, p. 6).

Although comprehensive internationalization is a new label, one cannot see much difference when comparing it with the generally accepted definition of internationalization by Knight (2003). This is because, as emphasized by de Wit (2013), comprehensive internationalization is a ‘tautology’: internationalization is not without being comprehensive. However, the term comprehensive internationalization should be seen as a wake-up call rather than a mere introduction of a new concept. Hudzik (2013) adds that the word ‘comprehensive’ is meant not only to call attention to the disparity between the intent of earlier definitions of internationalization, but also to “flag the important changes in scale, scope and inter-connected behaviours that a 21st century global environment is pressing upon higher education” (p. 50). Some considers the concept of ‘comprehensive internationalization’ as an extension of Knight’s broad-based definition (Beelen & Jones 2015). If ‘comprehensive internationalization’ is a term discussed in the US, ‘mainstream internationalization’ is more popular in Europe and “deep internationalization” in Australia. All these terms show that a wider and deeper meaning to internationalization is being signalled in different parts of the world. However, the reality shows that few institutions have reached true comprehensiveness and institutions will differ in pursuing it depending on their types, missions and starting points (ibid.).

2. Rationales for Internationalization of higher education: a changing landscape

The rationales driving internationalization are core to understanding its strategies in a country or at an institution, and are reflected in the policies and the development as well as implementation
of programs. They “reflect core values that a higher education system holds regarding the
contribution that international, intercultural and global elements make to the role of higher
education in society” (Knight 2010, p. 209). As remarked by de Wit (2013), rationales for
internationalization are different by country/region, and they lead to different approaches and
policies; vice versa, each approach to internationalization depends on a country or an
institution’s rationales. Similarly, Hudzik (2011) emphasizes “not only is internationalization a
means rather than an end, but the ends may vary from institution to institution and the particular
approach to internationalization chosen is dependent on the ends being pursued” (p. 8). Besides,
higher education internationalization concept is not static because individual and institutional
experiences and priorities evolve over time with new behaviours, actions, and approaches
(Hudzik 2015). Therefore, rationales underpinning internationalization also undergo fundamental
changes when time elapses. Much has been written about this movement and this section
analyzes the most prominent arguments discussed in the literature.

Traditionally, rationales for internationalization of higher education have been presented in four
macro categories (De Wit 1995; Knight & de Wit 1997; Knight & de Wit 1999):

- Social/cultural: National cultural identity, Intercultural understanding, Citizenship
development, Social and community development
- Political: Foreign Policy, National Security, Technical Assistance, Peace and Mutual
Understanding, National Identity, Regional Identity
- Economic: Economic Growth and Competitiveness, Labor Market, Financial Incentives
- Academic rationales: Extension of Academic Horizon, Institution Building, Profile and
Status, Enhancement of Quality, International Academic Standards, International
Dimension to Research and Teaching

Many of these categories and sub-categories are commented by Hudzik (2015) to be both the
means and ends of internationalization. However, this is not to say that internationalization is an
end in itself. Instead, as mentioned above, internationalization is seen as means to an end
(Hudzik 2011).

Later on, a ‘more nuanced set of motives’ are proposed, being categorised into two levels –
institutional and national as opposed to the traditional macro framework in the 1990s (Knight
2012). At the institutional level, international branding and profile, income generation, student
and staff development, strategic alliances, and knowledge production are the emerging
rationales. At the national level, these include human resources development, strategic alliances, commercial trade, nation building, and social cultural development.

Similar to Knight, the OECD also group the benefits of internationalization to institutional and government as motivations for their internationalization. Hénard, Diamond and Roseveare (2012, p. 9) indicate that

Internationalization enables higher education institutions to: increase national and international visibility; leverage institutional strengths through strategic partnerships; enlarge the academic community within which to benchmark their activities; mobilise internal intellectual resources; add important, contemporary learning outcomes to student experience; develop stronger research groups.

Internationalization enables governments to: develop national university systems within a broader, global framework; produce a skilled workforce with global awareness and multi-cultural competencies; use public higher education funds to promote national participation in the global knowledge economy; benefit from trade in education services.

At the heart of the shift in paradigm of higher education internationalization is the movement from academic and social/cultural rationales to economic and political rationales and from cooperation to competition (Altbach & Knight 2007; de Wit 2013; Knight 2010). With the explosion of the knowledge economy in the era of globalization, the competition between nations has been escalated, hence increasing the importance of higher education as a political and economic actor (Knight 2010). Therefore, a shift in paradigm primarily from a more cooperative model to a more competitive model can be observed. Over the last 40 years, internationalization has taken several forms and accents. In the 1970s and 1980s, internationalization in many countries was primarily focused on the development cooperation and aid through scholarship programs, technical assistance and capacity building projects. In the last two decades there has been a gradual and discernible shift from development cooperation to academic partnerships, and more recently to commercial competition. An IAU worldwide survey on internationalization shows that the top rationale at the national level is “to increase competitiveness (scientific, technological, and economic)” while “to promote international cooperation and solidarity” was ranked fourth (Knight 2010). Notably, twice as many respondents ranked “competitiveness” as number one rationale compared to those ranking “international cooperation” as number one rationale. Particularly, while in most continental Europe, the emphasis moved from aid to exchange of students and teachers as well as curriculum development, the emphasis in the UK and Australia shifted from aid to trade (de Wit 2013). The Colombo Plan starting in 1951
broadening Australia’s relationship with Asia can be cited as a typical example of internationalization as aid (Adams, Banks & Olsen 2011). In this process, Australia represents an aid provider, while South and Southeast Asian countries, including Vietnam represents an aid recipient.

Another new dimension in the landscape of higher education internationalization is what Knight (2014) refers to as the shift from ‘soft power’ to ‘knowledge diplomacy’ when it comes to the role of international higher education as a political actor. She explains that soft power, popularly understood as the ability to influence others and to achieve national self-interest through attraction and persuasion in contrast with hard power such as coercion, military force or economic sanction, is associated with the concept of ‘public diplomacy’. Over the past decade, international higher education is usually referred to as a tool of soft power. Common examples of soft power in higher education include Fulbright programs, British council activities, German Academic Exchange initiatives and Erasmus projects. However, given higher education’s long tradition of scholarly collaborations and academic mobility along with today’s innovations of research are policy networks, international education hubs, joint programs, Knight challenges the relevance of attaching ‘soft power’ to the premise of international higher education.

Alternatively, she suggests thinking about knowledge diplomacy because international higher education contributes significantly to building and strengthening international relations among countries and regions through the generation, diffusion and exchange of knowledge.

From an institutional comprehensive internationalization perspective, Hudzik (2013, 2015) categorizes four primary contemporary rationales driving higher education institutions toward more comprehensive commitments to internationalize in the 21st century context: the core mission drivers, the customer service drivers, the social responsibility drivers, the globalization drivers as illustrated in the figure below.
The core mission of higher education is creation of knowledge through research, transmission of knowledge to learners and the translation of knowledge into action for society’s benefits. In the globalized world, the business of higher education is conducted across borders in the flow of students, scholars, and ideas and in the formation of cross-border partnerships and other forms of collaboration. Second, students/graduates, local communities and businesses and employers at home are going global. Third, the social responsibilities of higher education have expanding global dimensions, thus having a role to play in fostering global relationships, peace and justice, enhancing people’s position in the global economy, and improving cross-cultural understanding. Lastly, the emergence of a global higher education system, under the impact of globalization, leads to increased cross-border higher education trade and competition, collaboration, and stratification, which drives higher education institutions to be more strategically engaged abroad than before.

Generally, the rationales driving internationalization vary between institutions, government departments, stakeholders, and countries. This contributes to the complexity of the international dimension of education. Moreover, there can be conflict and tension between motivations for internationalization, typically between the motivation to meet national competitiveness needs and to pursue cooperation and peace through mutual understanding (Hudzik 2015). Therefore, leadership within institutions has to play the role of mediating these conflicts, and it is of much importance for an actor to be very clear in articulating its motivations as policies, programs, strategies (Knight 2004).
In brief, this section has discussed the shift in rationales for internationalization in the world. The shift can be observed in the emergence of ‘a nuanced set of motives’ to replace the four macro traditional rationales, and in the movement from cooperation to competition, from ‘soft power’ to ‘knowledge diplomacy’. The four groups of rationales for institutional comprehensive internationalization, which are the core mission drivers, the customer service drivers, the social responsibility drivers, the globalization drivers has also been discussed. Again, rationales for internationalization are different by country/region, and they lead to different approaches and policies. Therefore, the following section will present the distinctive characteristics in the internationalization approaches in different parts of the world.

3. Internationalization approaches in different parts of the world

Like higher education, its internationalization is still largely embedded in institutional, national and regional cultures and systems (de Wit 2013). Therefore, internationalization strategies are filtered and contextualized by the specific internal context of higher education institutions. There are different accents and approaches of internationalization among different governments and institutions.

If the shift in rationales for internationalization is from academic and social/cultural into political and economic motivations, the former are identified as ‘old’ forms of internationalization while the latter are associated with ‘new’ forms of internationalization (Stensaker et al. 2008). Countries such as the US, the UK, Australia and New Zealand could be said to take the lead in the ‘new’ internationalization while other countries, including Vietnam, are positioned in the ‘old’ form (Green, Eckel & Barblan 2002). Also, internationalization, until recently, has been seen as a predominantly western phenomenon, whereas developing countries play only a reactive role. English-speaking nations and EU countries are seen as ‘providers’ of most services of international higher education while the ‘buying’ countries are Asian and Latin American middle-income countries and the poorer nations of the developing world because they lack capacity to meet growing demand (Altbach & Knight 2007). However, emerging economies and the higher education community in other parts of the world alter the landscape of internationalization. For example, China has now become a key player in the global education market - not only as a top source of outbound mobility students, but also as a top destination for inbound mobility, ranking the world’s sixth largest destination country for transnational education (Australian Education International 2006). Therefore, these other emerging views have to be incorporated to rethink this western, neo-liberal concept (de Wit 2013). The following section surveys the striking features of the internationalization approach in several regions in the
world – the US, Europe and Asia, before comparing and contrasting higher education internationalization in Australia and Vietnam as the cases under study of this research.

In the United States

Internationalization in the United States has been made explicit from about 2003 forward in the use of the term ‘comprehensive internationalization’, which labels a more robust approach to institutional internationalization (Hudzik 2011). US higher education has been characterized as a latecomer to contemporary internationalization compared to other higher education systems. Over the long history, the US higher education system is driven and characterized by the inward-looking orientation, which leads to the isolationism among American institutions. This is because “Americans saw themselves as ‘the best’ and took pride in the belief that everyone else really yearned to follow the American example” (ibid., p. 14). The post-World War II period projected inward strengths outward, and the US moved away from simplistic isolationism as a geopolitical strategy. However, the US still sees itself as being best and took comfort in inwardly derived strengths. Therefore, the author claims that internationalization of education in the US is not a two way exchange, in which the US would involve in teaching, not much in learning. Having said that, the USA, together with the UK and Australia, is still considered the leading nations in international higher education by their inflow of international students and their offshore activities, with the USA ranking first in terms of receiving international students pursuing a full degree (de Wit 2013).

In Europe

Internationalization has undergone some significant changes in focus in Europe in the past 20 years (Teichler 2004). European Union has actively pursued academic internationalization for more than two decades as part of the move to economic and political integration (Altbach & Knight 2007). Starting from funded programs such as Erasmus to provide large numbers of EU university students with academic experiences in another member country, the scope of European regional integrations expanded with Bologna process that harmonizes entire academic systems to ensure compatible degree structures, transferable credits and equal academic qualifications throughout the EU. Bologna process draws more than 40 countries into a ‘European higher education area’. The Erasmus Program is said to mark the most direct and concrete way the phenomenon of internationalization in Europe (Van Vught, Van Der Wende & Westerheijden 2002). Hence, Erasmus Program inaugurating in 1987, followed by the Bologna
Declaration of 1999 and the Lisbon Strategy of 2000, are the supra-national reform initiatives that drive the regionalization in Europe, also referred to as Europeanization.

The Bologna process and Lisbon Strategy bring two dimensions of internationalization together – cooperation and competition. On the one hand, both processes emphasize that there should be more cooperation resulting in “a Europe of Knowledge”; on the other hand, this cooperation is required in order to cope with the competition from the US, Japan and increasingly China and other emerging economies (de Wit 2013). Not only within the EU, Europe’s international programs are expanding to other regions, especially in Latin America and the Asia-Pacific through regional and institutional linkages and scholarship programs (Altbach & Knight 2007).

In the UK as well as in Australia, as mentioned earlier, internationalization shifted from aid to trade (de Wit 2013). Universities in these countries are forced to charge full fees to international students, but against all expectations, there has been a substantial increase in the number of international students who believe that high costs equal to good value. The UK remains the most favoured destination for international students after the USA. Besides a continued desire to recruit more international students to study in the UK, a major feature over the last few years has been the rapid expansion of transnational education by UK universities, which is projected to grow far more significantly and more rapidly than domestic provision (Worton 2012).

In Asia

Many Asian societies have treated internationalization as Westernization, modernization or Americanization since the 19th century and have tried to internationalize themselves by primarily following the Anglo-Saxon models (Mok 2007). Mok also observes that major internationalization strategies of East Asia universities include corporatizing and marketizing universities, international benchmarking and stratifying universities, internationalizing the curricular and the student learning. However, by doing so, Asian countries need to be aware of the danger of new imperialism or re-colonization in education, even in the period of post-colonialism.

4. Internationalization of higher education in Australia and Vietnam

The Australian context

In Australia, internationalization in higher education has undergone significant changes over the past 60 years. It is argued that Australian international education has gone through three phases,
from ‘aid’ to ‘trade’ to the more balanced and sustainable internationalization (Adams, Banks & Olsen 2011; De Wit & Adams 2010; Sushi 2008). The first phase focusing on ‘aid’ started from the 1950s to the mid-1980s. The second phase with the focus on ‘trade’ was from 1987 to the early 2000s; and the third phase of the more balanced internationalization commenced in the mid-2000s.

In the ‘aid’ phase, the rationales underpinning internationalization of higher education are based on a philosophy of aid or assistance (Adams, Banks & Olsen 2011). Typically, the Colombo Plan for Cooperative Development in South and Southeast Asia initiated in 1950 and launched in 1951 contributed to a broadening of Australia’s relationships with South and Southeast Asia. The Plan resulted in international students coming to Australia as part of the country’s bilateral aid program. Private international students paying up to a third of the notional real fee (subsidized students) and the remainder of the fee coming via the aid program (De Wit & Adams 2010).

The transition from ‘aid’ to ‘trade’ took place in the late 1980s, driven partly by concerns about the effectiveness of the sponsored overseas student program but more particularly due to the recognition of the commercial possibilities in providing higher education services (Harman 2005). The feature of the ‘trade’ phase was the substantial growth in international students across all sectors following the introduction of the ‘Overseas Student Policy’ in 1985, which established Australia as a strong player in the international higher education market (De Wit & Adams 2010; Marginson 1995). The Policy introduced the implementation of full-fee programs, allowing full-fee paying international students to be admitted to Australia universities. The internationalization activities during this period are mainly driven by market-based rationales. By the mid-1990s, most Australian universities had begun to formalize their international strategies and to bring them within the overall university strategic framework. In this context, the non-commercial components of internationalization began to receive greater attention, in particular the development of cooperative linkages and networks, internationalization of the curriculum, and student mobility (De Wit & Adams 2010). Research into national policy and evaluation shows that Australia has achieved considerable success with the expansion of export education, but criticizes that the internationalization of courses and capture of the benefits for domestic students have gain limited achievements (Harman 2005).

The last decade is considered to be the ‘third phase’ of Australian international education, characterized by broader aspects of internationalization and a focus on a sustainable international student program (De Wit & Adams 2010; Sushi 2008). Some of the main areas in the contemporary emphasis are quality, positive student learning outcomes, employability and social
outcomes, skilled migration outcomes, increased international collaboration and research links, and outbound mobility. Universities have developed significant programs in student and staff mobility, institutional collaboration, and research. International education in Australia universities has become multidimensional and has been increasingly encouraged and supported by government attitudes and policies. An appropriate definition of this third phase might be as follows: “international education in Australia is centered on trade in educational services, both on shore in Australia and transnationally, with rigorous government intervention in terms of consumer protection and quality assurance” (De Wit & Adams 2010, p. 230). In the Internationalization Index launched at the Going Global conference in the UK in 2010, Australia came second overall as ‘having the most open environments to international collaboration and ambitious internationalization policies’ (Sharma 2010). At present, Australia is the third largest exporter of higher education services to other countries, after the US and the UK. Today, many Australian universities consider internationalization as critical to success with economic imperatives to sell educational products and services in the world marketplace (Leask & Beelen 2009).

A 2015 report by Deloitte Access Economics, *Growth and Opportunity in Australian International Education*, commissioned by Austrade, identifies new and emerging global trends (Deloitte Access Economics 2015). Growth is expected to continue to come from China and India, with the Philippines and Thailand also offering strong potential. The report also sees China, India, Indonesia, Vietnam, South Korea, Malaysia and Hong Kong as important markets to pursue. Recognizing these challenges and opportunities, the Australian Government has launched the National Strategy for International Education 2025 with an aim to make Australia’s international education sector to be more adaptive, innovative and globally engaged, thus strengthening its internationally recognized education system, increase global partnerships and drive collaboration with local communities and international partners (Australian Government 2015).

In large, international education has extraordinarily contributed to Australia and changed the way the world perceive this country, thus expanding both its intellectual capital and international influence (Adams, Banks & Olsen 2011). Internationalization of higher education has played an important role in Australia’s recent economic, cultural and strategic development. Moreover, Australian alumni have aided the development of public diplomacy and helped bring social economic developments to their home countries.
The Vietnamese context

The internationalization of higher education policy and practices in Vietnam has varied over different historical periods. In general, it has closely been shaped by the historical, economic and political conditions of the country (Tran, Marginson & Nguyen 2014). Throughout the history, the dominance of the West on higher education in Vietnam can be easily observed, both in the colonial and postcolonial periods. In the colonial periods before 1975, Vietnam’s higher education was strongly influenced by the dominating and colonizing countries, mostly China, France and also by the former Soviet Union and Eastern Block nations (ibid.). After full independence in 1975, the country issued Open Door policy and undertook Economic Reform in 1986 (Doi Moi), marking the transition from the centralized economy to the socialist market-driven economy as well as the change in relationships and cooperation with foreign countries (Nguyen & Tran 2017). This policy ended the long-lasting closed-door period, thus being essential for Vietnam’s economic survival and leading to necessary political and social changes (Pham 2011). This is seen as the milestone for the start of a more deliberate and proactive internationalization of higher education in Vietnam – during the past 20 years, Vietnam has broadened the concept and scope of its internationalization strategies (Tran, Marginson & Nguyen 2014).

The first regulation that mentioned the expansion of internationalization of higher education was Decree No. 06/2000/ND-CP in 2000 on investment cooperation with foreign countries in medical care, education and training and scientific research, followed by Decree No. 18/2001/ND-CP issued in 2001 regarding the establishment and cooperation of foreign educational and cultural institutions in Vietnam. These decrees resulted in the numerous forms of transnational education in Vietnam emerged including branch campus, articulation agreement, franchising, partnership programs, dual and joint degree programs (Le 2016).

Later on, internationalization is listed as one of the eight initiatives in the Strategy for Education Development for Vietnam 2011-2020 that is fundamental for the development of Vietnamese education. Here internationalization is understood as the expansion and enhancement of international cooperation in the field of education (Thủ Tướng Chính Phủ 2012). The targets for internationalization indicated in the Strategy are largely concerned with the development of academic and research capacity for Vietnamese universities, with a view to enabling tertiary education in Vietnam to catch up with regional and international developments.
By large, the most important feature in the Vietnamese context is that despite the strong Western dominance on Vietnam higher education, unlike them, the rationales of Vietnamese higher education internationalization are humanistic and developmental, instead of commercial, i.e. on trade or competition (Tran, Marginson & Nguyen 2014). Internationalization of Vietnam’s higher education is characterized by the focus on integration and cooperation with Asian countries and the world, and capacity building by developing a more qualified workforce, as opposed to market-driven motivations in the West, especially in English-speaking countries. Internationalization is now promoted as a fundamental tool for enhancing quality of higher education institutions, keeping pace with regional and international developments and human capacity building for the nation (ibid.).

The primary dimension of internationalization in contemporary Vietnamese education is student and staff mobility, particularly outbound flows. Other major aspects of the internationalization of education include international cooperation and internationalization of curriculum. However, Vietnam mainly plays a role of a recipient and importer in this target (Tran, Marginson & Nguyen 2014). For example, in terms of student and staff mobility, outbound mobility obviously outweighs the inbound mobility due to the “status of education in Vietnam, problems of inflexibility and bureaucracy and lack of courses delivered in English” (ibid., p. 143). In internationalizing the curriculum, ‘advanced program’ is a typical example of importing curriculum from prestigious universities in the world top 200 with little adaptation to the economic, political and cultural of the Vietnamese context (MOET 2008). However, in the case of international cooperation, positive developments can be observed because Vietnam has moved from being a mere importer to a partner cooperation through the establishment of joint programs and foreign universities’ campuses in Vietnam, with RMIT being the first fully foreign-owned university in 2000 (Dang 2011).

Although internationalization has been increasingly emphasized in the national policy discourse, the implementation at the institutional level across the nation is fragmented, inconsistent and ad hoc (Tran, Marginson & Nguyen 2014). Specifically, while internationalization is seen as fundamental for overall quality enhancement at the sector level, universities seem to have little motivation to internationalize. Moreover, internationalization activities are mainly within the international education departments with a focus on cooperative programs, targeting a small proportion of the student population (Phan & Tran 2015). Therefore, a focus on motivating and building upon the capacity of existing faculty rather than just being a recipient and importer of
other countries is highly recommended for better achievements in Vietnam’s internationalization process.

5. Academic staff’s engagement in higher education internationalization

Scholars, practitioners, and professional bodies in international education might not agree on what internationalization means, but they concur that the involvement of faculty is crucial to its success (Leask & Beelen 2009; Proctor 2015). With the emergence of knowledge economy, faculty lies at the heart of the generation, application, and dissemination of knowledge; and with the adoption of comprehensive strategies for internationalization, active faculty engagement is highly encouraged (Proctor 2015). Importantly, faculty directly impacts the teaching, research and service missions of higher education institutions (Childress 2010). Therefore, as Stohl (2007) and Childress (2010) put it, faculty are key forces in institutional internationalization, thus successful internationalization efforts are dependent on faculty engagement.

To the core of the faculty are its members - academic staff - whose role is critical to the institution’s internationalization process though does not receive needed attention (Van der Werf 2012). Significantly, internationalization at home, as termed in Europe, or internationalization of curriculum as in Australia requires academic staff to be engaged in international education, and their teaching to be informed by international research, experience and understanding (Leask & Beelen 2009). This is because only academics can design curricula to develop interculturally competent graduates for life as global citizens and professionals; they are responsible for making the classroom a site of intense international and intercultural learning experiences for all home students (Leask & Beelen 2009). In the process of designing the curriculum, they are the primary architects who define its formal aspects by selecting content, designing and managing teaching, learning and assessment arrangements (Leask & Bridge 2013). Besides, academic staff is the heart of the knowledge economy since they understand the academic value inherent in gathering information from all over the world and generating innovation on a world scale (Leask & Beelen 2009).

Moreover, in the current discourse, institutions have increasingly made bold statements about the skills, knowledge and attitudes their graduates will bring to their lives and work in a globalized, interconnected world. Subsequently, the role of academics, especially teaching staff needs to be brought to the fore. Issues such as whether the academic workforce has internationalized in the same way as the student body, and how academic staff are responding educationally to various opportunities and challenges arising from internationalization are important (Goedegebuure et al.
Another reason is that a comprehensive internationalization strategy has to incorporate different levels from leadership to faculty - without active engagement of the faculty, a more comprehensive internationalization will be impossible in almost any meaningful form (Hudzik 2013). Therefore, above all, academics are the primary agents for the internationalization process.

Given the critical role of faculty in general and academic staff in particular, it is critical that academic staff’s engagement needs to be enhanced to ensure a more comprehensive internationalization within institutions. It is considered urgent that new and effective ways to engage academic staff purposefully by capturing their interest in and commitment to internationalization need to be found (Leask & Beelen 2009; Stohl 2007). In this discourse, it is agreed that leadership is an important element that enables academic staff’s engagement in internationalization (Hudzik 2013, 2015; Proctor 2015).

In Australia, with the increasing emphasis on internationalization of the curriculum as part of its approach to internationalization in higher education, an Internationalization of the Curriculum SIG in the newly-formed International Education Association of Australia (IEAA) was founded in 2005. A key objective of this group is to increase the engagement of academic staff in the internationalization agenda of higher education institutions through professional development activities that includes international conversation and dialogue with academics in other parts of the world having similar issues of interest (Leask & Beelen 2009). In Vietnam, one of the government’s engagement strategies is by enhancing the capacity of academics through outbound mobility. The government has sent and will continue to send thousands of academics overseas for their PhD training funded by state budget through Project 322 since 2010 until 2014, followed by Project 911 until 2020 with an aim to enhance the capacity of teaching, research and management for higher education sector (Thủ Tướng Chính Phủ 2010). However, there are critical issues to this policy such as brain drain, lack of the necessary financial and human resources, the absence of strategic policies at Ministry of Education and Training and Vietnamese universities to effectively make use of the foreign-trained personnel (Tran, Marginson & Nguyen 2014).

However, the engagement and capacity of the faculty generally and academic staff particularly with internationalization efforts are hindered by a number of constraints, either at institutional or individual level. Barriers at the institutional level may include (i) the institution’s management of international education (Leask & Beelen 2009) such as the lack of financial resources, the clash between institution and disciplinary priorities, and restrictive tenure and promotion policies
(Childress 2010); and (ii) the variable understandings of internationalization (Proctor 2015). This usually leads to the discrepancy between the declared policy and its implementation. Also, very few universities have explicitly recognized the international dimension in their decisions about teaching, research, and service beyond asking whether an individual academic has a reputation internationally in research; therefore, very few indicate that they participate in international education activities beyond attending international conferences (Stohl 2007).

At faculty level, the lack of motivation among academic staff to engage with internationalization is a common obstacle – they have no particular interest in international education (Leask & Beelen 2009; Stohl 2007). One significant reason is that faculty are, in general, resistant to change and do not see the benefits of infusing international perspectives in their teaching, research and service (Childress 2010). Moreover, even staff who are interested in engaging in the development and delivery of international education may lack the skills to add a meaningful international dimension to their courses (Leask & Beelen 2009). For example, those who have not lived, worked or travelled overseas or have no significant interactions with people from different cultures may lack the knowledge and skills to integrate international and intercultural perspectives into their teaching and research (Childress 2010).

The literature on internationalization of higher education is largely oriented to the national and institutional level with little attention for the program level: research, the curriculum, and the teaching and learning process, which should be more at the core of internationalization (de Wit 2013). At the grass-root level, the academic experiences of international students attract more attention than those of academic staff (Sanderson 2011). The emphasis on academics’ experiences has been on the knowledge and skills that academic staff should possess in teaching in an internationalized context. Teekens (2003) provides a Profile of an Ideal Lecturer teaching in an intercultural setting through eight clusters of requirements: using a non-native language of instruction, dealing with cultural differences, recognizing different teaching and learning styles, having insight into the cultural implications of using media and technology, having knowledge into academic discipline and diploma recognition, having knowledge of foreign education systems, having knowledge of the international labour market, and having capability to provide vision and leadership to promote intercultural learning.

Based on this Profile, Sanderson (2008) combines authenticity and cosmopolitanism to construct a conceptual framework for the internationalization of the academic self. Criticizing Teeken’s Profile for not distinguishing between the different tasks that a lecturer may have, Van der Werf (2012) uses an “International Competences Matrix”, which originally developed by Hanze
University Groningen, University of Applied Sciences in collaboration with the Office for Personnel and Organization. The Matrix describes different tasks performed by teachers in an internationalized environment, including teaching in national language and English, academic counselling of domestic students and international students, curriculum development for domestic classroom and international classroom, supervising international work placements, international study periods and final projects, maintaining international relation with partner institutions, doing research in national, regional and international context. Corresponding to these tasks are eight categories of competences - Intercultural competences in an international context (personal), Didactic or research competences in an international context (professional), Competences related to different educational systems and teaching and learning styles, Competences connected with the personal academic discipline in an international context, Competences connected with the international labour market and working environment of the professional field, English Language Proficiency: understanding (listening and reading), English Language Proficiency: speaking (interaction and production), English Language Proficiency: writing. Leask (2005) also identifies four competences for academic staff in international education – being experts in the field, being skilled teachers and managers of the learning environment, being efficient intercultural learners, and demonstrating particular personal attitudes and attributes such as being approachable, encouraging, passionate, etc.

Above are the knowledge, skills and competences that are expected from an internationalized academic staff suggested in the existing scholarly research. However, the reality of the extent to which academic staff engage with the internationalization of higher education has not been much investigated. The internationalization of the research and other aspects of academic work are also missing in earlier studies into faculty engagement with internationalization (Proctor 2015). Therefore, a more comprehensive picture academic staff’s engagement with the internationalization of higher education is much needed.

6. Professional development in internationalization

As said above, academics’ engagement in the process of internationalization can be facilitated by enhancing their skills, knowledge and competence. Arguably, this can be significantly realized through professional development activities. In fact, quality professional development for teachers has never been more important than it is today due to the intensified challenges they face (Ganser 2000), which proves even more proactive in the higher education sector as institutions undergo the internationalization process.
First, there is a need to conceptualize what professional development for academics means. Professional development, in a broad sense, refers to the development of a person in his or her professional role (Villegas-Reimers 2003). More specifically, it is casted as “the development of capabilities that occurs as a consequence of situated social practice” (Knight, Tait & Yorke 2006, p. 320). For teachers, professional development can be achieved as a result of gaining increased experience and examining their teaching systematically (Glatthorn 1995). Professional development is, therefore, argued to be broader in scope than career development, which is defined as the growth in teacher’s professional career cycle, and also broader than staff development because staff development is only one of the systematic interventions that can be used for teacher development (Glatthorn 1995).

Professional development is commonly understood to be synonymous as professional learning. Webster-Wright (2009) explains that this is based on the assumption that well-designed professional development programs will lead to professional learning and improvements in practice. However, he critiques that this assumption is mistaken because learning may or may not occur through activities such as mandatory professional development or staff training. Instead, he has re-conceptualized professional development, emphasizing a shift in focus from ‘development’ to ‘learning’. In particular, he argues that professional development should be reframed into continuing professional learning, which implies the shift of emphasis from passive development to active learning; and professional learning should be considered as a holistic experience instead of a combination of interrelated factors. Similarly, Villegas-Reimers (2003) sees professional development as a long-term process, in which teachers learn over time and are treated as active learners, and this process takes place within a particular context. King (2004) echoes these scholars in saying that continuing professional development needs to be considered as a normal part of professional life for all academic staff, since the concept of ongoing development or learning is part of all our working lives whether or not we are formally required to evidence it.

During the 1990s, educational professional development was considered a marginal activity in most universities, but now as governments take teaching quality and its enhancement very seriously, it is “edging towards the centre” (Knight, Tait & Yorke 2006, p. 319). For years, the only form of professional development available to teachers was staff development or in-service training, predominantly short-term workshops (Ganser 2000). However, today, professional learning activities take various forms, including formal and informal, accredited and non-accredited, collaborative or individual (Tran & Le 2017). Examples of formal PD activities
include attending workshops and professional meetings, mentoring, etc. while informal experiences include reading professional publications, informal conversations, watching television documentaries, etc. (Ganser 2000). Knight, Tait and Yorke (2006) also combines the idea of intentional and non-intentional with formal and non-formal, to offer four mixed forms including intentional formal learning (i.e. learning that follows a curriculum), non-intentional formal learning (i.e. reflection, self-directed reading groups, mentoring), non-intentional and non-formal learning (i.e. learning by being and doing in an activity system), and intentional non-formal learning (i.e. learning from the hidden curriculum). Within higher education, professional learning may also involve digital resources and online interactions (Curwood et al. 2015).

There is widespread recognition in the literature that professional development has an important role to play in enhancing teacher’s work, both inside and outside classroom (see for example Borko 2004; Ferman 2002; Ganser 2000). Borko (2004) and Ferman (2002) assert that professional development has been proved to lead to improvements in instructional practices and an increase in teachers' knowledge, which subsequently results in effective university teaching. Specifically, professional development activities provide teachers with opportunities to deepen their understanding of academic disciplines and pedagogical principles; and enable teachers to gain new knowledge necessary, for example, to integrate rapidly changing educational technology into their teaching or to use brain research to meet the needs of children from increasingly diverse backgrounds (Ganser 2000).

Importantly, effective professional development activities must be closely associated with teaching and learning practices in the everyday professional context. As Corcoran (1995) stresses, the focus of professional development must be on the central issues of teaching and learning as experienced by teachers daily. Therefore, in order to assess the professional learning needs of an institution, teachers’ perspectives need to be taken into account. Indeed, the insights, experiences and knowledge of the academics themselves are one valuable source for informing the design of creative and effective professional development programs (Ferman 2002).

Prior research on teacher professional development and learning in international higher education are mainly concerned with professional learning for the internationalization of curriculum (Leask & Beelen 2009; Leask & Bridge 2013) and of the academic “Self” (Sanderson 2008, 2011). What needs more research is what and how teachers learn from professional development, or the impact of teachers change on student outcomes (Borko 2004), particularly the need to understand more about continuing professional learning from the perspective of professionals themselves from within the higher education institutions.
7. Conclusion

In summary, this appendix has discussed the issues in the literature that help to outline the context and background of my research. The brief overview of the concept of internationalization and the shift in its rationales as long as the striking features in the internationalization agenda in different parts of the world have been discussed. These parts have set the scene for the research since the research sets out in the premise of internationalization era. These parts are then followed by the discussion in more details about the Vietnamese and Australian contexts, which together facilitate the understanding of the research problem raised in Research Question 1 about the internationalization agenda of Vietnamese and Australian universities. The issues of academic staff’s engagement and professional development for internationalization addressed in Research Questions 2, 3 and 4 are also supported by the literature review in the later parts.
My research centers on investigating academic staff’s engagement in internationalization of higher education. As discussed in the Appendix I, two of the major impeding factors for academic staff’s engagement are that they do not see the value of engaging and are short of necessary knowledge and skills. This research, hence, focuses on understanding the conditions as well as obstacles that arises from the institution’s structures and relations, and how academic staff respond to these conditions. This will be considered through the lens of Sen’s Capability Approach (Sen 1985, 1992, 1999), which is primarily and mainly an evaluative framework that focuses on the information that we need in order to make judgments about individual well-being and social policies, etc. (Robeyns 2011). In this appendix, I draw on the Capability Approach, beginning by outlining the key features in the Capability Approach, then discussing how the Capability Approach is relevant to this research as a theoretical and conceptual framework which informs the methodology and method of this research.

In addition, apart from empirical data from interviews, the research analyses official documents, including national policy documents and institutional official documents. These documents provide background knowledge about underpinning rationales for internationalization and capacity building for internationalization, at both national and institutional levels. To this end, the research adopts Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis approach (1992, 2010) as an analytical framework to explore the hidden meanings of the language in these documents.

1. Sen’s Capability Approach

1.1. Key concepts in the Capability Approach

Introduced by the economist and philosopher Amartya Sen in the 1980s (Sen 1985, 1992, 1999), the Capability Approach has significantly been further developed by the philosopher Martha Nussbaum (2011) and a growing number of other scholars. The Capability Approach provides a general normative framework that can be used for the assessment of human development (Unterhalter, Vaughan & Walker 2007), and for the evaluation of individual well-being, social arrangements and the design of policies and proposals about social change in society (Robeyns 2011). In particular, the Capability Approach is about freedom and the development of an environment suitable for human flourishing (Walker 2005).

The Capability Approach contains three central concepts: *functionings, capabilities and agency*. They are closely connected and together formulate the core ideas in the Capability Approach.
Functionings and capabilities

Functionings are defined as “the various things a person may value doing or being” (Sen 1999, p. 75). They are valuable states and activities that make up people’s well-being, i.e. these beings and doings together constitute what makes a life valuable (Alkire & Deneulin 2009). In other words, functionings are the practical realization of one’s chosen way of life. The valued functionings vary from elementary activities and states such as being adequately nourished and being free from avoidable diseases, to very complex ones such as being able to take part in the life of the community states and having self-respect (Sen 1999). Examples of functionings as states (beings) include being well-nourished, being undernourished, being illiterate, etc.; and examples of functionings as activities (doings) are travelling, caring for a child, voting in an election, etc. (Robeyns 2005). Functionings describe what a person is able to do or be as a result of having goods and income. For example, when a person’s need for food (goods) is met, they enjoy the functioning of being well-nourished (Unterhalter, Vaughan & Walker 2007). Categorically, functionings can be potential or achieved, in which potential functionings are understood as capabilities (Robeyns 2005).

Capabilities of a person are “the alternative combinations of functionings that are feasible for her to achieve” (Sen 1999, p. 75). They are “the substantive freedoms he or she enjoys to lead the kind of life he or she has reason to value” (Sen 1999, p. 87). Therefore, capabilities refer to our real opportunities or freedoms to promote or achieve valuable functionings, i.e. to be and do the things that a person wants to be and do, selected from various good possibilities (Alkire 2002). In other words, capabilities are the freedoms to achieve various lifestyles that we value after (Walker 2005). These valuable options or alternatives do not exist only formally but are also effectively available to the agent because they are in the sense of real opportunities (Robeyns 2011). The notion of capabilities in Nussbaum’s approach, however, pays more attention to people’s skills and personality traits (Robeyns 2005). Importantly, capabilities refer to what people are actually and effectively able to be and do, rather than to what resources they have access to or how much income and other social goods they have (Walker 2006a). In this sense, developing people’s capabilities to choose a life that they have reason to value is emphasized in the Capability Approach. All capabilities together comprise a person’s capability set. It is worth noting that Sen has always refused to give a list of capabilities as he thinks the lists are used for different purposes and each purpose might need its own list (Robeyns 2005).

From the definitions of functionings and capabilities, the distinction between them should be highlighted. While functionings are achieved outcomes, capabilities are the potential to achieve
these functionings (Walker & Unterhalter 2007). Put in another way, a capability is a potential functioning. One can say that the difference between a capability and functioning is between an opportunity to achieve and the actual achievement, between potential and outcome (Walker 2006b; Walker & Unterhalter 2007), between the effectively possible and the realized, or between freedom/valueable options from which one can choose and achievements (Robeyns 2005). Some examples are the capability for mobility and actually moving around, the capability to be literate compared to actually reading, or the capability to be well-educated versus acting and being a well-educated person (Walker 2006b).

In Sen’s Capability Approach, the achieved functionings do not matter as much as the real opportunities (freedoms) that one has to achieve those functionings (Walker 2006b). Evaluating only functionings or outcomes can give too little information about how well people are doing (Walker & Unterhalter 2007). This is because in some cases, the same functionings have been achieved but there are very different stories behind these equal outcomes. An example is given by Unterhalter, Vaughan and Walker (2007) about two girls failing the mathematics exam, which is the similar phenomenon. However, the reasons why they fail are different. One girl attends a well-equipped school with qualified and motivated teachers but decide to spend less time studying mathematics; the other girl is motivated to learn but has little time to prepare for the examinations due to family commitment. Obviously, their capabilities are different, as one has more opportunity but does not act on it and the other has less favourable conditions despite wanting to achieve. Hence, investigating the capabilities would reveal much more information. This research project argues that their opportunities are central to the evaluation of academic staff’s engagement (functioning).

**Agency**

At the boundary of functionings and capabilities lies the matter of choice (Walker 2005). Having the requisite set of capabilities, a person exercises his or her agency to make choices from a range of options and alternatives. By ‘agent’, Sen means ‘someone who acts and brings about change, and whose achievements are to be judged in terms of her own values and objectives, whether or not we assess them in terms of some external criteria as well’ (Sen 1999, p. 19). ‘Agent’ is used in contrast with the concept of ‘patient’, seeing people as active participations in development, rather than passive spectators (Walker & Unterhalter 2007). Agency is, therefore, one’s ability to pursue goals that one values and that are important for the life an individual wishes to lead. In other words, it is the person’s ability to act on what they value and have reason to value (Alkire 2002). The focus on agency suggests that each person is a dignified and
responsible human being who shapes her or his own life in the light of goals that matter, rather than simply being shaped or instructed how to think (Pham 2015; Walker 2006b). Agentic self can resist or avoid strong social suggestion by locating a position and role within social practice that is consistent with his/her subjectivity and identity (Billett 2010). Being an agent involves both the capacity to choose between options and being able actually to do what one chooses. Because agency is central to Sen’s ideas of the freedom to make choices, a lack of agency or a constrained agency means disadvantage (Walker 2005, 2006a, 2006b). This perspective emphasizes that besides paying attention to opportunities, the research needs to evaluate the capacity of individual academic staff themselves in making choice between options and in acting upon the given opportunities or constraints.

There are two concepts related to agency: agency freedom (agency opportunities) and agency achievement (agency outcomes). His concept of agency freedom means the ‘freedoms to bring about the achievements one values and which one attempts to produce’ (Sen 1992, p. 57). More freedom makes more agency alternatives available. It should be noted that the idea of freedom in the Capability Approach is different from the freedom in liberalism as something that people hold theoretically or legally but in reality they cannot reach (Pham 2015). The increase in choice per se does not necessarily lead to a meaningful increase in freedom unless the increase in choice options comprises the options that one values (Alkire 2005). Moreover, freedom in the CA does not depend on the person’s control, whereas in liberalism freedom tends to refer to something that one can control. Agency achievement refers to “a person’s success in pursuit of the totality of her considered goals and objectives”, whether or not they are connected with her own well-being (Sen 1992, p. 56). This means that agency also includes others’ goals and a deep commitment to actions that do not necessarily benefit the agent themselves.

1.2. Operationalizing the Capability Approach to understand academic staff’s engagement in internationalization

Having discussed the key concepts of the Capability Approach, this section continues to justify why the Capability Approach is useful as a theoretical framework and present a diagram showing the conceptual framework for my research. Again, the research aims to gain insights into the extent to which academic staff are (dis)engaged in the internationalization agenda of their institutions and the underpinning factors that facilitate or hinder their engagement. From the Capability Approach’s perspective, the research considers academic staff’s engagement as an achieved functioning and looks into the factors and conditions that lead to or impede that functioning, i.e. conditions of possibility to enact.
The relevance of the Capability Approach

The Capability Approach is relevant to this research because, firstly, it focuses on capabilities and not just functionings. The approach holds that it is ultimately important that people have the freedom or valuable opportunities (capabilities) to lead the kind of lives they want to lead, to do what they want to do and be the person they want to be (Robeyns 2005). With this focus, the claim is that development initiatives should be evaluated based on an analysis of changes in the capabilities of individuals or groups (Sen 1999). As such, the evaluation of capabilities should centre on the material and non-material circumstances that shape people’s opportunity sets, and the circumstances that influence the choices that people make from the capability set (Robeyns 2005). The focus on expanding capabilities makes the Capability Approach useful for this research since it emphasizes the necessity of investigating whether academic staff are provided the opportunities or freedoms that enable them to make choices in understanding and engaging in internationalization. It is also worth noting that capabilities are the doings and beings that people value. This means that activities or states that people do not value could not be called capabilities and that a lack of interest in internationalization may be because they do not see the relevance to their students (Pham 2015). Therefore, it can be said that the engagement of academic staff also depends on whether they see this as a valuable goal.

This leads to the second premise of the Capability Approach that makes it relevant for my research. The Capability Approach argues that social arrangements should aim to expand people’s capabilities – their freedom to promote or achieve ‘functioning’ which are important to them (Alkire & Deneulin 2009; Unterhalter, Vaughan & Walker 2007). Therefore, it calls for a focus on how social context sets the conditions for individual freedoms. The capabilities that a person actually has “depend on the nature of social arrangements, which can be crucial for individual freedoms” (Sen 1999, p. 288). As a result, social arrangements should be primarily evaluated according to the extent of freedom people have to achieve functionings they value (Alkire 2002). As Robeyns (2005) puts it, “the Capability Approach not only advocates an evaluation of people’s capability sets, but insists also that we need to scrutinize the context in which economic production and social interactions take place, and whether the circumstances in which people choose from their opportunity sets are enabling and just” (p99). ‘A person’s capability to achieve functionings that he or she has reason to value provides a general approach to the evaluation of social arrangements’ (Sen 1992, p. 5).

The belief of the Capability Approach that functionings or behaviours of individuals are significantly shaped by the social contexts places academic staff’s engagement in the context of
their institutions’ arrangements. The evaluation of the extent of academic staff’s engagement can be facilitated by the analysis of the conditions shaped by their higher education institutions’ policies and practices, including professional development activities. In turn, the evaluation of academic staff’s capabilities would bring further understanding their institution’s strategies for internationalization. This would provide useful recommendations for more efficient human development initiatives in internationalization, in which professional development is central.

Thirdly, the Capability Approach is agency-focused. The betterment of a person’s life is brought out through a strengthening of human agency because actions to achieve well-being are based on the ability of a person to make reasoned choices. Therefore, the crucial role of social opportunities is to expand the realm of human agency. The focus on agency brings up two issues in my research: the role of higher education institutions in expanding the agency for academic staff, and the role of academic staff as responsible and active agent in the internationalization agenda. Being an agent involves both the capacity to choose between options and being able actually to do what one chooses. Robeyns (2011) highlights that two people with identical capability sets, they are likely to end up with different types and levels of achieved functionings. In the context of my research, academic staff exercise their agency in both choosing how much to engage in the internationalization, and turning their decision into action. Here, the question is whether academic staff see the value of engaging with their institutions’ internationalization agenda. If they do not see the significance and relevance of engaging, they may choose not to engage, supposing that they are not forced to. Equally importantly, given the conditions by the institutions, it depends on academic staff’s individual capacity to convert these conditions into engagement or disengagement, whichever they value and has reason to value. Sen (1992) indicates that people are deeply diverse in internal characteristics (e.g. age, gender, general abilities, etc.) and external circumstances (e.g. social backgrounds, ownership of assets, etc.) As such, it is necessary to consider the differences in people’s ability to convert resources into valued outcomes (Robeyns 2005; Walker 2005, 2006b), which emphasizes the consideration of individual differences in explaining why they choose to engage or disengage and how engaged they are in internationalization.

Despite its usefulness as discussed, there are challenges in using the Capability Approach in evaluating academic staff’s engagement in internationalization. The concerns in the literature are mainly related to the measurability of capabilities and functionings (Robeyns 2011; Unterhalter, Vaughan & Walker 2007) and the lack of empirical and operational specifications and guide (Agee & Crocker 2013; Alkire 2005). Therefore, by operationalizing the Capability Approach,
this research faces the challenge of lacking guiding tools and measurements when assessing capabilities that academic staff are provided by the institutions. However, this research has a potential to significantly contribute to the Capability Approach’s empirical literature.

**Academic staff’s engagement in internationalization of higher education through the lens of the Capability Approach**

Arguably, the engagement of academic staff in their institution’s internationalization agenda depends on the conditions shaped by their institutions, the choices they make and their agency in making their choices. The following diagram illustrates the conceptualization of academic staff’s engagement in internationalization underpinned by the Capability Approach.

**Conceptual framework of academic staff’s engagement in HE internationalization based on the Capability Approach**

As seen from the diagram, the engagement of academic staff in internationalization (functioning) is determined by both capabilities and individual agency. The institutional conditions and arrangements, which are policies and practices within the institutions, including leadership, resources, funding, professional development activities, etc. may create or reduce the opportunities (capabilities) for academic staff in the internationalization agenda. These capabilities give academics options, based on which they make decision to (dis)engage with the internationalization process. At the same time, these institutional policies and practices may
expand or constrain academic staff’s agency. Agency is reflected in (i) the choice-making of academic staff – they may or may not take the opportunities into action because the choice is theirs and (ii) the ability to act upon their engagement which depends on the ability to convert these resources. Consequently, the engagement level and scope depends on how academic staff themselves exercise their agency in making choice and converting the resources into action. As such, investigating academic staff’s engagement in internationalization necessitates insights into the combination of various underpinning drivers. In turn, the findings about underpinning drivers for academic staff’s engagement inform the institutions of better policies and practices to engage their staff in the internationalization agenda, including capacity building through professional development activities.

2. Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis

Fairclough (1992, 1995, 2010) proposes a model of Critical Discourse Analysis as both a theory and method for studying language in its relation to power and ideology. Using the term ‘discourse’, Fairclough (2010) claims that language use is imbricated in and is determined by social relations and processes. This is represented in the imprint of ideological processes and structures in the forms and content of texts. In his words, “language is a material form of ideology, and language is invested by ideology” (p59). Ideologies are understood as significations/constructions of reality, which are the physical world, social relations, and social identities (Fairclough 1992, p. 87). Ideologies is located in both language structures (i.e. orders of discourse) which constitute the outcome of past events and the conditions for current events, and in language events (i.e. discursive events)themselves as they reproduce and transform their conditioning structures (1992, 1995, 2010).

The use of language is also imbricated in the exercise, reproduction and negotiation of power relations (Fairclough 2010, p. 129). Viewing hegemony as power, Fairclough defines hegemony as “leadership as much as domination across economic, political, cultural and ideological domains of a society” (Fairclough 1992, p. 92). However, hegemony is about constructing alliances and integrating rather than dominating subordinate classes (1995). He argues for the dual relationship between discourse and hegemony: on the one hand, hegemonic practice and struggle takes place in discourse; on the other hand discourse is itself a sphere of cultural hegemony and the hegemony of a class or group lies in its capacity to shape discursive practices and orders of discourse (Fairclough 2010, p. 129). Therefore, discourse analysis takes into consideration not only power relations in discourse but also “how power relations and power
struggle shape and transform the discourse practices of a society or institution” (Fairclough 1992, p. 36).

Holding these theoretical positions, Fairclough develops a critical approach to discourse analysis, which discovers the connections “between properties of texts and social processes and relations (ideologies, power relations) which are generally not obvious to people who produce and interpret those texts” (Fairclough 2010, p. 131). In his earlier work (1992), he conceptualizes ‘discourse’ as a complex of three dimensions: text, discursive practice, and social practice. His updated approach (2010) terms these three dimensions as (i) a language text (spoken or written), (ii) discourse practice, (iii) sociocultural practice. Text is understood as the language product of discursive processes and can be analyzed through vocabulary, grammar, cohesion, and text structure. Discourse practice involves processes of text production and interpretation and can be examined under three categories: force of utterances, coherence, and intertextuality of texts. In the third dimension, discourse is embedded in sociocultural practice at a number of levels: the immediate situation, the wider institution, and at a societal level.

Correspondingly, discourse analysis is also three-dimensional, involving linguistic description of the language text, interpretation of the relationship between the discursive processes and the texts, and explanation of the relationship between the discursive processes and the social processes. Below is the diagram which illustrates his approach.

**Critical Discourse Analysis approach (Fairclough 2010 p133)**
Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis approach is useful for this research in so far as it provides theoretical grounds for data collection and data analysis methods. The relation between language and ideology and power suggests that documents, in form of written texts, have much to offer as a rich source of data. Discourse analysis of documents contributes to the understanding of the discourse practice and sociocultural practice represented in them. Therefore, it suggests that the examination of official documents (both national policy documents and institutional official documents) using Critical Discourse Analysis approach provides background picture of capacity building for internationalization in Australia and Vietnam in general, and in two case-study institutions in particular.

In short, this research employs Sen’s Capability Approach in combination with Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis approach in framing the research problem and guiding the research methodology. The application of these theories will be discussed further in Methodology section in Part I.
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