Stakeholders' views of South Korea's higher education internationalization policy

Young Ha Cho · John D. Palmer

Abstract The study investigated the stakeholders' perceptions of South Korea's higher education internationalization policy. Based on the research framework that defines four policy values—propriety, effectiveness, diversity, and engagement, the convergence model was employed with a concurrent mixed method sampling strategy to analyze the stakeholders' perceptions. According to the findings, the stakeholders perceived that the government's internationalization policy to date has contributed to the international competitiveness of Korean universities by and large in a quantitative manner. Their views however signaled that the government should consider the quality and identity of Korean higher education institutions when designing and implementing internationalization policy. Based on the implications that the findings have in the policy context, this study suggested two points for future policy research into Korean higher education internationalization: (1) develop a glonacal definition of world-classness for Korean universities and (2) build up a mixture model of centralization and decentralization for the government-university relations, which encourages internal self-governance of Korean universities.

Keywords Internationalization · Policy · Higher education · Stakeholders · South Korea

Introduction

Internationalization policy at the higher education level aims to promote an internal transformation that strives for global competition and cooperation (van der Wende 2001). In the policy process, national governments throughout the world have strategically

Y. H. Cho (✉)
The Graduate School of Education, Kyung Hee University, 1 Hoegi-dong,
Dondaemun-gu, Seoul, South Korea
e-mail: youcho@khu.ac.kr

J. D. Palmer
Department of Educational Studies, Colgate University, 13 Oak Drive, Hamilton, NY 13346, USA
e-mail: jpalmer@colgate.edu

considered altering several of the following policy plans: purpose, licensing, accreditation, funding, curriculum, teaching, research, and regulation (Knight 2004; Teichler 2004) in order to make their universities world-class.

These policy patterns have obviously emerged in East Asian higher education. Since the early 1990s, these government and institutional leaders have focused on the use of the market force, development planning and strategic management, and increased competition in order to gain international recognition as world class universities (Mok and Welch 2003). Indeed, the governments are mostly concerned with matching international competition and research intensity with higher education policies that focus on corporatization, marketization, international benchmarking, and university stratification (Deem et al. 2008; Mok 2007); whereas, university officials have pursued institutional linkages with the international academic community (Hawkins 2008; Wang 2008).

Korean higher education is no exception. The growing impacts of globalization have continued to press the Korean government to transform its higher education system (Byun and Kim 2011; Mok et al. 2003). In response, the government has zealously been developing and implementing internationalization policies with the main goal of establishing Korea as an academic center in East Asian higher education; a place where top scholars throughout the world research and teach (Gress and Ilon 2009; McNeill 2008; Mok et al. 2003).

Mok (2007) then asked: what route should East Asian universities pursue in developing their internationalization policy?[1] Should they follow policy learning, policy borrowing, internationalization, or recolonization? (Steiner-Khamsi 2010). Mok's inquiries stem from the dominant assumption that western countries have long led the global discourse on internationalization due to their strong position in the higher education market and the growing global acceptance of English as the power language (van der Wende 2001; Wang 2008). Therefore, to a certain degree, Mok is advocating for peripheral (i.e., non-western) institutions to be both explored and included in the global discourses. Such views could lead to balanced and unbiased perceptions reflected in the current understanding of internationalization of higher education (Stromquist 2007).

In this respect, Korean higher education, like other East Asian competitors, has made several strides toward catching up with the western front-runners. However, there remains relatively little research on Korean higher education policy negotiations and implementations (Byun and Kim 2011; Hien 2010; Shin 2009). Additionally, the Korean case is instructive for East Asian governments that specifically seek a strong and close relationship with their higher education systems (Kim and Lee 2006). In that, Korean universities strive to fit into considerable alterations and reorganizations along with the government policies and seek to be autonomous in responding to the global market at the same time.

Taking these main points into consideration, our study pursued stakeholders' perceptions of internationalization policy of Korean higher education. We believe that the stakeholder's perception is significant due to the fact that the decision-making processes in higher education institutions are predominantly influenced by a triangular exercise of stakeholder groups involving governance, administrations, and faculty. Moreover, stakeholders are the actors who may gain or lose the most from the university's activities (Benneworth and Jongbloed 2010). Hence, their perception can be seen as an indicator that the university utilizes to foresee environmental threats and opportunities (Burrows 1999). These perceptions are also useful to evaluate policy impacts upon interested groups of Korean higher education.

---

[1] There is a controversy about whether Korean higher education is a replica of American model (Kim 2010).

In the context of higher education policy, stakeholders are individuals or groups involving government, employers, students, academic and administrative staff, institutional managers, prospective students and their parents, and taxpayers who believe that higher education institutions and polices are accountable to them and therefore behave accordingly (Jongbloed et al. 2008). In other words, a stakeholder depends on the basis of what is at "stake" and "what counts" (Mitchell et al. 1997 p. 856). Therefore, the primary research question that guided this study is directly related to the stakeholder's perception of internationalization policy: How do identified stakeholders perceive the direction, process, and outcomes of internationalization policy for Korean higher education?

Policy context for internationalization

Initial internationalization policy in the 1990s focused on the rapid expansion of Korean higher education system by loosening university establishment and student quota policies. The aim was to intensify the competitiveness of Korean universities (Kim 2008b). However, these universities have continued to be rated as less competitive than many western institutions particularly in terms of peer-reviewed article publication and citation indexed in the Thomson-Reuters ISI database (McNeill 2009). According to the 2010 report of the London Times World University Rankings, only four Korean universities were ranked in the top two-hundred.[2]

To improve the international rankings of Korean universities, a former member of the National Assembly and the current Head Minister of The Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (MEST), Ju-Ho Lee (2005) demanded that the government policy should seriously contemplate and manage the escalating number of foreign professors and students, increasing amount of English-medium instruction (EMI) classes, rising pressure for professors to publish in leading scholarly journals in English, growing need to develop the physical infrastructure to induce foreigners and international exchanges, and mounting concern over budgetary issues. In addressing these issues, the government mapped out the following internationalization policy strategies (Ministry of Education & Human Resources Development 2007): (1) student exchange, (2) faculty exchange, (3) inducement of foreign institutions, faculty, and students, and (4) export of Korean higher education services. In the end, the government set their policy sights on three main goals to be reached by 2020: (1) have 10 universities ranked in the top two hundred of world class universities, (2) rank at least 9th worldwide in the number of ISI-indexed journal articles published, and (3) increase the number of foreign faculty and students to 10,000 and 150,000 respectively (MEST 2010).

Policy research framework

According to Weimer (2009), policy research is defined by its relevance to some aspect of a policy and is useful in investigating the extent or nature of a policy condition or situation that may be worthy of public attention. In that, a guiding principle of policy research is value (Kahan and Consulting 2008); where value refers to the real and perceived worth of the policy to the stakeholders (Yarbrough et al. 2011). Since the selection of values relies on commonly held beliefs and practices that guide policy context, the chosen values could

---

[2] POSTECH (28), KAIST (79), Seoul National University (109), and Yonsei University (190)

be diverse and multiple.[3] In this context, House and Howe (1999) contended that value is not really objective and an issue or thing has value only because it is thought to be valuable. That is, values depend on individual choice somehow. Hence, it is difficult to develop a set of values general enough to guide a policy research framework since a value itself is selective and implicit. Values, nevertheless, must be selected to undertake comparative policy research (Benjamin et al. 1993).

Based on the literature reviewed and the context of Korean higher education internationalization policy discussed, we selected propriety, effectiveness, diversity, and engagement as the values that anchor the policy research framework for our study. The discussions below provide the rationales for why we selected these specific values and how they are important for this study.

Propriety

Yu et al. (2006) identified propriety as an essential value for policy research in higher education due to the belief that propriety of a given policy goal influences the level of the organizational commitment (Miner 2005). This argument is suggestive to this study. In order to internationalize higher education, the goals, objectives, and methods of the policy should be pertinent and timely to the needs of the stakeholders because, without their commitment, it is hard to expect the positive policy outcomes. To measure propriety, we focused on the stakeholders' perceptions of how internationalization policy of Korean higher education is valid and appropriate in terms of goal-setting, strategic approach and method.

Effectiveness

Effectiveness is the foundation of organizational success (Drucker 1973). To be effective, organizational goals should be integrated into individual goals. In other words, individual goals must be satisfied by the accomplishment of organizational goals (Hersey et al. 2001). For such reason, effectiveness is a *sine qua non* to be considered in examining the stakeholders' perceptions of how Korean higher education internationalization has been productive. In general, the degree of effectiveness is determined by the degree of policy goal attainment (Hoy and Miskel 2008; Lunenburg and Ornstein 2008).

In this study, effectiveness can be measured through the degree to which stakeholders perceive that Korean higher education is positively internationalized by government policy. In reality, however, multiple stakeholders usually prefer conflicting criteria in defining effectiveness. Effectiveness then can be seen as "mainly a problem-driven construct rather than a theory-driven construct" (Cameron 2005, p. 313) and thus does not remain constant (Hoy and Miskel 2008). Therefore, enduring and fundamental changes to policy practice become crucial for effectiveness.

---

[3] Studies have suggested the following values employable for higher education policy research: quality, excellence, shared responsibility, openness, honesty, equity, fairness, comprehensiveness, authenticity, validity, professionalism, engagement, equality, autonomy, accountability, efficiency, propriety (of policy purpose, means, and process), consistency, effectiveness, social need, cost, availability, political feasibility, moral, ethical, and social norms, competition, democratic accordance (Gross 1973; Kahan and Consulting 2008; Premfors 1982; Shin 2011).

Diversity

National higher education systems are diverse in terms of governance, admission policy, programs, funding modes, teaching and research, international cooperation, and academic structure. However, the diversity is now receding (Teichler 2004). In order to acquire international competitiveness and cooperation, countries are seeking systematic homogeneity with the belief that structural differences between national higher education systems impede internationalization. Paradoxically, diversity is still a critical value. In this context, OECD (2007) demands that the role of higher education institutions for a 21st century should be diversely defined because diversity becomes a fundamental underpinning of their social, economic and cultural development strategies at the local, national and international level. From this perspective, the 21st century higher education institutions must be glonacal[4] so as to be engaged in diverse activities at the local, national, and international level (Teichler 2004).

In this study, we regarded diversity as a constituent part of the internationalization policy. Prospective students and faculty in glonacalized campus view diversity as an essential asset for learning (Chan and Lo 2008; Denson and Bowman 2011).

Engagement

Successful internationalization demands that university establish an institutional climate in which stakeholders are engaged in determining the criteria for the relevant performance of an individual or a group (Hersey et al. 2001). This engagement creates at least two advantages: (1) diverse groups of stakeholders are permitted to participate in determining the basis on which their internationalization efforts will be judged and (2) involvement of stakeholders increases their commitment to the goals and objectives established for internationalizing their campus. Bennett (2010) used the term engagement to describe the involvement of stakeholders in any activity related to student learning or organizational development. In this context, engagement is a proper value that guides the internationalization policy research.

Based on the idea of Yarbrough et al. (2011), we focused on inclusiveness and responsiveness as the essential attributes of engagement. Inclusiveness and responsiveness are respectively referred to as the breadth of involvement of and orientation to stakeholders.

Methods

Our study is based on the convergence model, which is a mixed methods research approach. This model collects and analyzes quantitative and qualitative data separately and then interprets the results by converging the different findings. The researcher then draws valid and well-substantiated conclusions from both sets of data (Creswell and Plano Clark 2007). The participants of this study responded to a mixed methods investigation based on a closed-ended survey (quantitative) and open-ended interview questions (qualitative).

---

[4] *Glonacal* is a term that Marginson and Rhoades (2002) created using letters from the words global, national, and local in order to describe how 21st century higher education institutions are strongly engaged in local, national, and global dimensions of activity.

Table 1 Demographics of the sample

	Stakeholder			Total (%)
	Faculty members	HE policy experts	Students	
National	11 (10)	29 (4)	14 (10)	54 (70.1)
Foreigner	8 (8)	–	15 (15)	23 (29.9)
Total (%)	19 (24.9)	29 (37.7)	29 (37.7)	77 (100.0)

Quantitative strand

We collected the quantitative data from a total of 77 stakeholders (see Table 1) using 10 structured survey items to analyze their overall perception of the internationalization policy of Korean higher education. The items focused on policy awareness and the abovementioned four policy values: propriety, effectiveness, diversity, and engagement. The questionnaire was provided in both English and Korean and was employed prior to the qualitative data collection to minimize response bias (Jenkins 2001).

We measured propriety by focusing on the goals, strategy, and method of the internationalization policy. We clarified effectiveness with two relevant standards, outcome and contribution, by evaluating the degree to which stakeholders perceive the policy outcomes and contributions to Korean higher education. Diversity was assessed by focusing on the degree to which the internationalization policy is both culturally unique and distinctive between domestic universities. Inclusiveness and responsiveness were determined by the degree to which stakeholders are involved in the policy process and the degree to which the policy process is responsive to the needs of stakeholders respectively.

Qualitative strand

We conducted open-ended one-on-one interviews with survey participants who agreed to this aspect of the study. Our questions aimed to have the interviewees freely speak about internationalization policy. The interviews were conducted based on guidelines suggested by Creswell (2007) and Patton (1990). Interviews lasted between 45 min and an hour. The default language for the interviews was English, but the interviewees were allowed to respond in both English and Korean. 48 out of the 77 survey participants voluntarily signed the certificate of informed consent, which was also provided in English and Korean.

The authors and two Asian American research assistants handled the interviews. The authors and one assistant are bilingual in English and Korean. The interviews were all recorded and field notes were taken. The interviews were transcribed and then used as a resource to validate, confirm, and corroborate the quantitative findings.

The sampling strategy and procedures

In order to yield a sample that allows meaningful comparisons between stakeholders' perceptions, we employed a mixed methods sampling. This type of sampling technique combines probability and purposive sampling to generate datasets that include deep and broad information (Teddlie and Yu 2007).

In detail, 48 faculty members and students were randomly sampled from two networks. We contacted the academic and administrative departments of Korean universities ranked

in the top 10 of highly internationalized universities by Korea Joong Ang Daily.[5] Of these top ten, seven allowed us to visit their campuses. Two professional organizations were also contacted due to their active involvement in internationalization policy.

We also purposively sampled 29 personnel from three authority bodies for educational policy research/administration: MEST, the Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI), and the Korean Council for University Education (KCUE). The purposive sampling relied upon unique sampling and snowball sampling. A unique sampling selects one that uniquely fits to the research interest of the study (Patton 1990); therefore we selected the sites associated with internationalization policy for Korean higher education. For snowball sampling suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994), we asked policy experts to refer us to other policy experts in order to identify participants with rich information.

The interviewees were classified into three distinct groups—faculty, higher education (HE) policy experts, and students. Faculty included both Korean nationals and foreigners affiliated with the universities. HE policy experts are professionals who work for higher education policy with or without governmental authorization. Students represent both Korean nationals and foreigners who are officially enrolled in the universities. Foreign faculty and students of the study represented Cambodia, China, England, Georgia, Germany, India, Russia, Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Vietnam, and the United States.

Data analysis procedures

Based on the 5 Likert-scale from 1 for strongly disagree to 5 for strongly agree, the analysis of variance was conducted using PASW Statistics 18.0 to examine the stakeholders' perceptions of Korea's higher education internationalization policy. The reliability coefficient by Cronbach's Alpha was .929, which indicates that our study is highly acceptable to support the consistency of measurement (McMillan and Schumacher 2001). Based on factor analysis, the 10 variables were loaded on one factor with loadings higher than .640, which implies that these variables share the same feature(s) (Miller et al. 2002). In this case, internationalization policy can be regarded as the common denominator that underlies the associations between the variables. The extracted factor accounted for 61.24 % of the variance of the relationship between the variables.

We analyzed interview transcripts and notes through abstract coding. The codes were reduced to identify salient issues. We then attempted to build a logical chain of evidence by examining relationships among the issues. Creswell (2007) described this analysis procedure as a spiral model in which reading/memoing, interpreting/classifying/describing, and visualizing/representing of the data are sequenced in order. The qualitative findings were compared to the quantitative findings in an attempt to understand what the numeric results imply by using the four policy values as a merging device.

Findings

In order to determine the reliability of the stakeholders' responses we first examined the degree of their awareness of Korea's higher education internationalization policy. Indeed,

---

[5] Since 1994, the commercially-produced university ranking system by *Korea Joong Ang Daily* has ranked Korean universities based on four main evaluation criteria: educational environment, teaching and research, social reputation, and internationalization. The annual report of university rankings has greatly impacted the stakeholders of higher education as well as overall society in Korea (Lee and Choi 2008).

Table 2 Awareness of the internationalization policy

Stakeholder	M (SD)	F	Post hoc comparison
Faculty members	4.53 (.772)	6.051**	–
HE policy experts	3.59 (1.119)		Faculty**
Students	3.90 (.772)		–
Total (N = 77)	3.94 (.978)		

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$, and Likert-type scale from 1 for not at all to 5 for definitely yes

if they are not well aware, their responses would not be valid and reliable. Based on Table 2, we assumed that they responded with a reasonable amount of understanding and knowledge of the internationalization policy.

Combined with the numeric results, the qualitative findings suggest that the stakeholders' awareness includes three overlapping factors. First, their perspective is based on the unavoidable dominance of competitiveness (some may argue neo-liberalism). Second, most of the stakeholders roughly equated internationalization of Korean higher education with Americanization. We found that the tendency to regard English as *lingua franca* influences this perception. Third, most of the Korean national stakeholders looked at internationalization as a quantitatively measurable outcome, which is in line with the national government policy.

Propriety

Overall the stakeholders perceived the internationalization policy as moderately appropriate in terms of goal, strategy, and method (Table 3).

However, the perception of HE policy experts was significantly critical of the policy propriety when compared to the counterparts. In addition, foreign faculty members perceived the policy propriety less positively than Korean faculty in terms of goals and methods.

Goal

HE policy experts were somewhat critical of the goal setting. In that, they believed that the government was not very successful in establishing a balanced goal between competitiveness and cooperation (the two ends of internationalization) and paying attention to both core and peripheral countries. As a prime example, an educational policy researcher advised us that the government needs to put more weight on cooperation rather than competitiveness in order to create a true global standard for Korean higher education.

Although Korean national faculty perceived the policy goal as appropriate, foreign faculty were less positive. A foreign professor used the term "mental" in evaluating the propriety of the policy goal:

> The critical part is mental internationalization. I wouldn't say the internationalization of Korean higher education is totally at the surface level, but the government is just thinking mechanically about this.

He criticized the tendency that the government defines the internationalization policy goal in quantitative manner (i.e., number of foreign professors and students, EMI courses,

Table 3 Propriety of the internationalization policy (N = 77)

Factor	Group of stakeholder	M (SD)	F	Post hoc comparison
Goal	Faculty	4.16 (1.015)	15.953***	HE policy experts***
	HE policy experts	3.07 (.884)		–
	Students	4.17 (.602)		HE policy experts***
	Total (N = 77)	3.75 (.975)		
	Korean faculty	4.70 (.483)	8.559**	n.a.
	Foreign faculty	3.56 (1.130)		
	Total (n = 19)	4.16 (1.015)		
Strategy	Faculty	4.11 (1.100)	6.016**	–
	HE policy experts	3.24 (.912)		Faculty**
	Students	3.72 (.591)		–
	Total (N = 77)	3.64 (.916)		
Method	Faculty	3.79 (.918)	6.950**	–
	HE policy experts	2.79 (.902)		Faculty**
	Students	3.31 (.930)		–
	Total (N = 77)	3.23 (.985)		
	Korean faculty	4.20 (.632)	5.214*	n.a.
	Foreign faculty	3.33 (1.000)		
	Total (n = 19)	3.79 (.918)		

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$, and Likert-type scale from 1 for strongly disagree to 5 for strongly agree

and publications in leading international journals). In a related vein, a Korean national professor contended that Korean universities are not yet ready to think of internationalization in qualitative manner. However, she believes that the quantitative policy approach will eventually lead the quality improvement of Korean higher education by which competitiveness and cooperation are well balanced.

Strategy

Although moderate to above average, the stakeholders' perceptions revealed Americanization and tokenism as major concerns for strategic propriety. Most stakeholders viewed that Americanization is a dominant Korean national government strategy for internationalization policy. An American student illustrates this point:

> I feel like Korea has strong ties with the US.… You can see the internationalization policy of the Korean government is more Americanization within the culture here.

Regarding tokenism, several foreign and Korean national professors criticized the perfunctory actions that the government takes to mechanically meet quantitative requirements for internationalization without earnest policy consideration. In regard to this issue, a foreign professor complained that the internationalization policy encourages Korean universities to hire foreigners not for the academic quality but mainly for the increased number of foreign faculty on campus.

Method

With reference to methodological propriety, HE policy experts were relatively critical of the government's financial and political investment in developing world class universities. The way that the government mainly supported historically established elite universities led one educational policy researcher to comment that such approach may cause the internationalization policy to be unequal in terms of opportunity for all universities.

In addition, the perception of the methodological propriety was significantly lower for foreign faculty than Korean national faculty. The qualitative findings suggest that this is possibly a result of the unfair treatment of foreign faculty. As one foreign professor complained:

> Even though my business card says I am an assistant professor, it is just an honorary title because Koreans do not give foreigners professorship. They don't give us tenure. It is impossible for any foreigner to have tenure. There is no equal treatment.

Another foreign professor reported that the way that the government regulates Korean universities is also problematic. His criticism runs counter to the opinion of high-ranking government officials who assert that the government policy has been leaning towards deregulation and institutional autonomy of Korean universities. Shin et al. (2007) found that there exists a perceptible difference between the government and universities. While the government officials believe that they have continued to secure institutional autonomy for universities, universities still complain about excessive government intrusion into their legitimate activities.

Effectiveness

The stakeholders evaluated the overall outcome and contribution of internationalization policy to Korean higher education as moderate to slightly above-average. However, HE policy experts' perception of effectiveness was slightly under average (Table 4).

Outcome

HE policy experts appeared to be critical of the policy outcome as they held that Korean universities focus mainly on exchange of personnel and programs. However, faculty and students were relatively more positive about it.

For more effective outcome, several stakeholders suggested that the government should make strenuous efforts in: (1) aggressive advertisement to recruit foreigners, (2) expansion of EMI courses, and (3) network formation between Korean national and foreign students.

Contribution

Koreans and foreigners differently perceived the policy contribution to Korean higher education at a statistically-significant level. While foreign students perceived it more positively than Korean students, foreign faculty viewed contribution less positively than Korean faculty.

In the interviews, Korean faculty recognized that the following accomplishments of the government policy contributed to the internationalization of Korean universities: the increased number of foreign faculty and students, EMI courses, and publications in leading international journals. However, they drew a hard-and-fast line between the quantitative

Table 4 Effectiveness of the internationalization policy (N = 77)

Factor	Group of stakeholder	M (SD)	F	Post hoc comparison
Outcome	Faculty	4.00 (.816)	11.912***	HE policy experts***
	HE policy experts	2.69 (1.004)		–
	Students	3.59 (1.018)		HE policy experts**
	Total (N = 77)	3.35 (1.097)		
Contribution	Faculty	4.21 (1.134)	12.140***	HE policy experts***
	HE policy experts	2.97 (.944)		–
	Students	3.90 (.772)		HE policy experts**
	Total (N = 77)	3.62 (1.064)		
	Korean faculty	4.70 (.483)	4.751*	n.a.
	Foreign faculty	3.67 (1.414)		
	Total (n = 19)	4.21 (1.134)		
	Korean students	3.57 (.646)	5.586*	n.a.
	Foreign students	4.20 (.775)		
	Total (n = 29)	3.90 (.772)		

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$, and Likert-type scale from 1 for strongly disagree to 5 for strongly agree

and qualitative contributions. Most of them were concerned about the government's obsession with the quantitative goals, which they believed would deteriorate the overall quality of Korean higher education. That is, they contended that quantitative growth needs to be accompanied with qualitative growth.

The internationalization policy contributes to building a university environment where foreign students feel comfortable to stay and study. EMI policy has undoubtedly played a role. Several foreign students said that the English-friendly environment allows Korean universities to be internationally recognized.

On the other hand, the perceptions of Korean students can be summed up in two issues: exaggeration and reverse effect. For example, a Korean student claimed:

> According to Korea Joong Ang Daily my university was ranked within the top three of highly-internationalized universities [in Korea]. In my personal opinion, my university wouldn't go so far as to be there. Frankly speaking, the university relentlessly pushes for internationalization. Because of that, students are already struggling to live up to the expectation of the university.

Regarding the reverse effect, Korean students believed that EMI policy raises specific issues concerned with the ineffective and inefficient communication between domestic students and Korean instructors in EMI class. A Korean professor stated:

> Korean is way better than English as a language medium for Korean university education. It is just a tragedy that we have to use English instead of own language for instruction. It seems like Korean universities exist only for English education. Do you think that a university that provides a lot of lectures in English looks better? The fact is that the university is losing a lot of others [aspects that are] very important for Korean higher education.

In fact, Korean students' EMI class satisfaction was not very high. They reported that Korean professors are academically qualified, but the issue is not their qualification but

their English speaking proficiency. In the end, several students believed that EMI policy might cause Korean universities to gradually lose their integrity and value (i.e., quality).

Diversity

The overall perception of the internationalization policy was moderate in terms of diversity. However, HE policy experts were deeply worried that diversity is not fully reflected in the government policy. In addition, Korean and foreign students showed different perceptions of diversity issues (Table 5).

Cultural diversity

Most of foreign students agreed on the positive cultural potentiality of Korean higher education and anticipated that the internationalization policy will promote Korean cultural uniqueness and multicultural integration. Korean students however were anxious and bemoaned that Korean universities have lost their cultural uniqueness and thus have become indistinguishable from universities in other countries as a result of global homogenization.

Distinctiveness

All of the universities that we visited accommodated the government policy and therefore their internationalization programs were quite similar. In this sense, most Korean students agreed that Korean universities need individual distinctiveness. A Korean professor also emphasized that the government needs to understand how diversity is important for internationalizing campuses. On the other hand, two foreign students at a university located outside of Seoul foreign students perceived their campus as institutionally distinctive in that uniquely-designed instructional programs are offered for their learning experience.

Table 5 Diversity of the internationalization policy (N = 77)

Factor	Group of stakeholder	M (SD)	F	Post hoc comparison
Cultural diversity	Faculty	4.06 (.938)	16.516***	HE policy experts***
	HE policy experts	2.55 (.783)		–
	Students	3.46 (.999)		HE policy experts**
	Total (N = 77)	3.25 (1.079)		
	Korean students	3.00 (.961)	7.498*	n.a.
	Foreign students	3.93 (.829)		
	Total (n = 29)	3.46 (.999)		
Distinctiveness	Faculty	3.89 (.875)	16.581***	HE policy experts***
	HE policy experts	2.45 (.870)		–
	Students	3.48 (.986)		HE policy experts***
	Total (N = 77)	3.19 (1.089)		
	Korean students	2.93 (.917)	11.858**	n.a.
	Foreign students	4.00 (.756)		
	Total (n = 29)	3.48 (.986)		

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$, and Likert-type scale from 1 for strongly disagree to 5 for strongly agree

Engagement

Overall the stakeholders perceived that the internationalization policy has moderately responded to their needs and encouraged their involvement. HE policy experts however remained rather critical (Table 6).

There were no perceptible differences in regards to engagement between Koreans and foreigners. Inclusiveness obtained a relatively low mean score, which implies that the stakeholders want the government to more actively and responsibly guarantee public participation in the internationalization policy process.

Responsiveness

To actively respond, a HE policy expert advised that the government needs to invite or coordinate partnerships between multiple stakeholders of Korean higher education—for instance, consumers, providers, industries, governmental authorities (including local ones), and NGOs. In addition, a few participants indicated that the government should be concerned with discrimination against domestic students due to the current excessive emphasis on internationalization. In this regard, a foreign professor confessed:

> [The] Korean government and universities need a constant adjustment to the needs of the stakeholders. As they are more focused on foreign students, they must ask themselves "do we under-serve our Korean students?" As I am going to teach [foreign students], I am asking myself "am I not doing as much as I could do for local Koreans?" Balancing all those things is needed.

A Korean student also felt a sense of deprivation because his university continues to increase investment in foreign students. He concluded that it could gradually encroach upon the interests of deserving and qualified Korean students because the budget is always tight.

Inclusiveness

Most foreign students and faculty reported that they are generally aware of the internationalization policy but do not know the details because their accessibility to the policy process is circumscribed at the institutional and national level. For instance, some foreign

Table 6 Engagement of the internationalization policy (N = 77)

Factor	Group of stakeholder	M (SD)	F	Post hoc comparison
Responsiveness	Faculty	4.00 (.882)	8.022**	–
	HE policy experts	3.00 (.886)		Faculty***
	Students	3.45 (.783)		–
	Total (N = 77)	3.42 (.923)		
Inclusiveness	Faculty	3.58 (1.121)	6.002**	HE policy experts**
	HE policy experts	2.72 (.882)		–
	Students	3.41 (.867)		HE policy experts*
	Total (N = 77)	3.19 (1.001)		

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$, and Likert-type scale from 1 for strongly disagree to 5 for strongly agree

professors complained that Korean professors do not allow them to be part of the decision-making process.

Foreign students realized that one of the major causes for their indifference towards the policy is related to limited interactions between foreign and Korean students. A Tanzanian student diagnosed that there obviously exists a language barrier between Korean and foreign students, and a Korean student also accepted that the social attitude of Korean students toward foreigners may prohibit friendship from building. He stated that Korean students are not altogether hostile towards foreign students, yet they are not welcoming towards foreigners either. Two foreign professors agreed that Korean students have very much of the "peninsular mind," which causes them to be automatically negative about and protective against international relationships.

In addition, there is a separation physically constructed by the university. A foreign student from the US pointed out:

> We are on the east side of campus, [Koreans] are down toward center or back side of campus. If you are extroverted type, you would probably go out on your own and try to talk to Korean people on campus. And if you are not, you are at a disadvantage.

As a result, foreign students tend to be with foreign students and Korean students with Korean students. It slows down their friendship formation and sharing of the internationalization issues. In fact, most leading Korean universities have constructed campuses that physically and emotionally separate domestic and foreign students (Rhee 2006).

Concluding remarks and suggestions for future internationalization policy research

We delved into stakeholders' perceptions of internationalization policy for Korean higher education based on the four policy values framework. According to the findings, the stakeholders perceived that the internationalization policy of the government to date has contributed to the internationalization of Korean universities by and large in terms of the quantitative growth. Their views however signaled that the government should consider the quality and identity of Korean higher education institutions when designing and implementing internationalization policy.

In detail, quality and quantity have collided in terms of propriety and effectiveness of the internationalization policy. Although most stakeholders admitted that the quantitative accomplishments have been a strong and efficient driving force for Korean higher education internationalization, Koreans, in particular, believed that the internationalization policy has surrendered the quality of university in favor of the number of foreigners, EMI courses, and publications in English (i.e., quantity).

In addition, we identified cultural and institutional identity as a sensitive issue in evaluating the diversity and engagement of the internationalization policy. Koreans deemed that the policy inclination toward Americanization has driven Korean universities to lose their institutional and national identity. In fact, Korean higher education tends to define internationalization as a process of constructing a world-class higher education system via exchange of personnel and programs (Choi 2008) but rarely regards it as a comprehensive endeavor to expand and integrate multicultural awareness into the institutional mission and policy framework.

With respect to the criticism of Americanization, it is apparent that the hegemony of industrialized countries in the international order, given their hierarchical position and English dominance, has inevitably influenced the way that the most stakeholders have

portrayed the government's internationalization policy as Americanizing Korean universities (Rhee 2006). Deem et al. (2008) argued that East Asian governments and universities may have been simply copying western standards. However, these governments need to distinguish the difference between policy learning and policy borrowing (Steiner-Khamsi 2010). For instance, regarding the EMI policy that triggered the Americanization argument in this study, compulsory enforcement was problematic (Byun et al. 2010). EMI policy becomes controversial in Korean higher education because Korean universities have pretended not to see the inefficient and ineffective communication between Korean instructors and domestic students. This has in turn forced government officials and university administrators to distortedly correlate internationalization outcomes with the number of EMI courses.

The way that the stakeholders in this study have perceived the internationalization policy for Korean higher education suggests at least two critical implications for future policy research. First, the internationalization of Korean higher education should seek a balance between commonality of global society and uniqueness of Korean society. The government then should spell out what "world-class Korean university" entails in the glonacal context through policy learning. In so doing, the internationalization policy should reflect local and national values in the process of international standardization. In this regard, Chan and Lo (2008) suggested that the government and universities need to act in a belief that "internationalization does not necessarily mean surrendering to the homogenization of the international standard and giving up distinctive cultural framework" (p. 646).

Second, this study witnessed that although quantity prevails at the present time, academic and public attention leans toward the quality of Korean higher education internationalization policy. Concerning this matter, the current government-led internationalization needs to be modified with the goal of improving the quality of Korean higher education. However, this model may reinforce an interventionist higher education governance system which will then constrain Korean universities' institutional autonomy and uniqueness. This individuality is important in maintaining universities' salient identities (Kim 2008a). In this sense, internal self-governance and entrenched academic tradition must be considered the keys to measure world-class traits of Korean universities (Ngok and Guo 2008).

Nurturing a culture that can host a world class university is no less important than supporting domestic institutions to make them world-class. To do so, the government should relax the financial and administrative control over Korean universities and reshape the government-university relations oriented to phasing in a mixture model of centralization and decentralization (Hawkins 2008). This will eventually lead both the government and universities toward a distinctive path in establishing a new Korean higher education governance model for internationalization.

References

Benjamin, R., Carroll, S., Jacobi, M., Krop, C., & Shires, M. (1993). *The redesign of governance in higher education*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Bennett, L. (2010). A framework for engaging leadership in higher education quality systems. In C. Nair, L. Webster, & P. Mertova (Eds.), *Leadership and management of quality in higher education* (pp. 55–71). Cambridge, UK: Chandos Publishing.

Benneworth, P., & Jongbloed, B. (2010). Who matters to universities? A stakeholder perspective on humanities, arts and social sciences valorization. *Higher Education, 59*, 567–588.

Burrows, J. (1999). Going beyond labels: A framework for profiling institutional stakeholders. *Contemporary Education, 70*(4), 5–10.

Byun, K., & Kim, M. (2011). Shifting patterns of the government's policies for the internationalization of Korean higher education. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 15*(5), 467–486. doi:10.1177/1028315310375307.

Byun, K., Chu, H., Kim, M., Park, I., Kim, S., & Jung, J. (2010). English-medium teaching in Korean higher education: Policy debates and reality. *Higher Education, 62*(4), 431–449. doi:10.1007/s10734-010-9397-4.

Cameron, K. (2005). Organization effectiveness: Its demise and re-emergence through positive organizational scholarship. In K. Smith & M. Hitt (Eds.), *Great minds in management: The process of theory development* (pp. 394–429). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Chan, D., & Lo, W. (2008). University restructuring in East Asia: Trends, challenges and prospects. *Policy Futures in Education, 6*(5), 641–652.

Choi, J. K. (2008). The concepts and rationale for the internationalization of Korean higher education: A comparative study. *Korean Journal of Religious Education*, *28*, 213–234. (In Korean).

Creswell, J. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J., & Plano Clark, V. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Deem, R., Mok, K.-H., & Lucas, L. (2008). Transforming higher education in whose image? Exploring the concept of the 'world-class' university in Europe and Asia. *Higher Education Policy, 21*, 83–97. doi:10.1057/palgrave.hep.8300179.

Denson, N., & Bowman, N. (2011). University diversity and preparation for a global society: The role of diversity in shaping intergroup attitudes and civic outcomes. *Studies in Higher Education*. doi:10.1080/03075079.2011.584971.

Drucker, P. (1973). *Management: Tasks, responsibilities, practices*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Gress, D., & Ilon, L. (2009). Successful integration of foreign faculty into Korean universities: A proposed framework. *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy, 6*(2), 183–204.

Gross, P. (1973). A critical review of some basic considerations in post-secondary education evaluation. *Policy Sciences, 4*, 171–195.

Hawkins, J. (2008). Higher education transformation: Some trends in California and Asia. *Policy Futures in Education, 6*(5), 532–544.

Hersey, P., Blanchard, K., & Johnson, D. (2001). *Management of organizational behavior: Leading human resources* (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hien, P. D. (2010). A comparative study of research capabilities of East Asian countries and implications for Vietnam. *Higher Education, 60*, 615–625. doi:10.1007/s10734-010-9319-5.

House, E., & Howe, K. (1999). *Values in evaluation and social research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hoy, W., & Miskel, C. (2008). *Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice* (8th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Jenkins, J. (2001). Rural adolescent perceptions of alcohol and other drug resistance. *Child Study Journal, 31*(4), 211–224.

Jongbloed, B., Enders, J., & Salerno, C. (2008). Higher education and its communities: Interconnections, interdependencies and a research agenda. *Higher Education, 56*, 303–324. doi:10.1007/s10734-008-9128-2.

Kahan, B., & Consulting, K. (2008). Excerpts from review of evaluation frameworks. The Saskatchewan Ministry of Education.

Kim, T. (2008a). Higher education reforms in South Korea: Public-private problems in internationalising and incorporating universities. *Policy Futures in Education, 6*(5), 558–568.

Kim, Y. C. (2008b). *Univeralization of tertiary education (understanding Korean educational policy volume 2)*. Seoul, Korea: Korean Educational Development Institute.

Kim, K. S. (2010). Is Korean education a replica of American model: The twisted results of an encounter between indigenous forces and global models. *Korean Journal of Comparative Education, 20*(3), 27–45.

Kim, S., & Lee, J. H. (2006). Changing facets of Korean higher education: Market competition and the role of the state. *Higher Education, 52*, 557–587.

Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 8*(1), 5–31. doi:10.1177/1028315303260832.

Lee, J. H. (2005). *Internationalization of Korean universities and development strategies*. Unpublished document of parliament inspection for government offices. (In Korean).

Lee, J. M., & Choi, J. Y. (2008). An analysis of limitations and alternatives to university ranking systems based on the conceptualization of university quality. *The Journal of Educational Administration*, 26(3), 301–324. (In Korean).

Lunenburg, F., & Ornstein, A. (2008). *Educational administration: Concepts & practices* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.

Marginson, S., & Rhoades, G. (2002). Beyond national states, markets and systems of higher education: A glonacal agency heuristic. *Higher Education, 43*(3), 282–309.

McMillan, J., & Schumacher, S. (2001). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction* (5th ed.). New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

McNeill, D. (2008). South Korea seeks a new role as a higher-education hub. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 54*(28), A1.

McNeill, D. (2009). South Korea powers ahead with globalization plans. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 55*(40), A1.

Miles, M., & Huberman, A. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Miller, R., Acton, C., Fullerton, D., & Maltby, J. (2002). *SPSS for social scientists*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Miner, J. (2005). *Essential theories of motivation and leadership*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Ministry of Education & Human Resource Development (2007). *The 2007 strategic plans for internationalization of higher education*. Unpublished government document (February 28). (In Korean).

Ministry of Education, Science, and Technology (MEST) (2010). *The 10 year general plan on financial investment in higher education*. Unpublished government document (November). (In Korean).

Mitchell, R., Agle, B., & Wood, D. (1997). Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts. *Academy of Management Review, 22*(4), 853–886.

Mok, K.-H. (2007). Questing for internationalization of universities in Asia: Critical reflections. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(3/4), 433–454. doi:10.1177/1028315306291945.

Mok, K-H., & Welch, A. (2003). Globalization, structural adjustment and educational reform. In K-H. Mok, & A. Welch (Eds.), *Globalization and educational restructuring in the Asia Pacific region* (pp. 1–31). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mok, K-H., Yoon, K., & Welch, A. (2003). Globalization's challenges to higher education governance in South Korea. In K-H. Mok, & A. Welch (Eds.), *Globalization and educational restructuring in the Asia Pacific region* (pp. 58–78). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ngok, K., & Guo, W. (2008). The quest for world class universities in China: Critical reflections. *Policy Futures in Education, 6*(5), 545–557.

OECD. (2007). *Higher education and regions: Globally competitive, locally engaged*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Premfors, R. (1982). Values and value tradeoffs in higher education policy. *Policy Sciences, 14*, 365–378.

Rhee, B. S. (2006). A historical approach to unravel the current state of internationalization of higher education in Korea. *Ewha Journal of Educational Research*, 37(3), 279–298. (In Korean).

Shin, J. C. (2009). Building world-class research university: The Brain Korea 21 project. *Higher Education, 58*, 669–688. doi:10.1007/s10734-009-9219-8.

Shin, H. S. (2011). *Issues of university restructuring policy*. A paper presented at the annual meeting of Korean Association for Higher Education. Seoul, Korea, December 9. (In Korean).

Shin, J. C., Kim, M. J., & Park, H. B. (2007). Perceptional differences between government and universities on institutional autonomy. *The Journal of Educational Administration*, 25(3), 243–269. (In Korean).

Steiner-Khamsi, G. (2010). Presidential address: The politics and economics of comparison. *Comparative Education Review, 54*(3), 323–342.

Stromquist, N. (2007). Internationalization as a response to globalization: Radical shifts in university environments. *Higher Education, 53*, 81–105. doi:10.1007/s10734-005-1975-5.

Teddlie, C., & Yu, F. (2007). Mixed methods sampling: A typology with examples. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 1*(1), 77–100. doi:10.1177/2345678906292430.

Teichler, U. (2004). The changing debate on internationalization of higher education. *Higher Education, 48*, 5–26.

van der Wende, M. (2001). Internationalisation policies: About new trends and contrasting paradigms. *Higher Education Policy, 14*, 249–259.

Wang, Y. (2008). Internationalization in higher education in China: A practitioner's reflection. *Higher Education Policy, 21*, 505–517. doi:10.1057/hep.2008.22.

Weimer, D. (2009). Making educational research more policy-analytic. In G. Sykes, B. Schneider, & D. Plank (Eds.), *Handbook of education policy research* (pp. 93–100). New York, NY: Routledge.

Yarbrough, D., Shulha, L., Hopson, R., & Caruthers, F. (2011). *The program evaluation standards: A guide for evaluators and evaluation users*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yu, H. S., Choi, J. Y., Cho, Y. H., Shin, J. C., Kim, M. H., & Song, S. Y. (2006). *Evaluating policy accomplishments of major government funding projects for higher education reforms*. Seoul, Korea: Korean Educational Development Institute. (In Korean).