

“SPECIAL INVITE PAPER”

DIVERSITY, WORK ENVIRONMENT, AND GOVERNANCE PARTICIPATION: A STUDY OF EXPATRIATE FACULTY PERCEPTIONS AT A KOREAN UNIVERSITY

Douglas R. Gress and JungCheol Shin

Seoul National University, Republic of Korea

ABSTRACT

This study deploys three research questions and quantitative analyses of data obtained from an extensive diversity survey of expatriate faculty at a Korean university to analyze perceptions related to their work environments and governance participation. Analyses comparing expatriate faculty both with and without Korean ethnicity are conducted vis-à-vis institutional and power considerations. Results overall indicate that hiring documentation and processes need work, but that non-ethnically Korean expatriate faculty perceive more problems with promotion processes, trust at the university scale, and integration, especially in terms of communication and governance participation at the college scale. Perceptions related to personal satisfaction, professional satisfaction, isolation, and leaving the university are also explored. Results indicate an inverse relationship between thoughts of leaving and professional/personal satisfaction and department cordiality and a positive correlation between thoughts of leaving and feelings of isolation. Based on the analyses, several recommendations are forwarded.

Key Words: Expatriate Academics; Diversity; Governance Participation; Korean Universities; Work Environment

Introduction

English speaking countries remain the primary hosts and major providers of international academics (see Jiang, et al., 2010; Kim, 2016; Kim & Roh, 2017). However, globalization processes impacting higher education have seen the rise of ‘centers and peripheries’ (Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbly, 2009), including competing centers in East Asia and Oceania that attract mobile knowledge workers (Jöns & Hoyler, 2013). There have therefore been calls to increasingly broaden the focus to include the study of international faculty in other countries (e.g. Foote, Li, Monk, & Theobald, 2008), though even recently some authors (Altbach & Yudkevich, 2017; Bedenlier & Zawacki-Richter, 2015; Mihut, de Gayardon, & Rudt, 2017; Rumbly & de Wit, 2017) have conceded that more research needs to be done to better understand the complexities associated with the careers of these scholars in divergent places.

There is a burgeoning literature on international faculty working at universities outside of the North American and Western European contexts, including a growing number of Asian-based studies (Froese, 2010; 2012; Huang, 2018; Jiang, et al., 2010; Kim, 2005; Kim, 2016; Li, Yang, & Wu, 2018; Ortiga, Choe, Sondhi, & Wang, 2018; Palmer & Cho, 2012; Parnarian, Hosseinin, & Fen, 2013; Shin & Gress, 2018; Wan & Sirat, 2018; Worthington, 2000; Wu & Huang, 2018). However, in their review of the literature on international academics, Mihut, et al. (2017) found that research is tilted toward studies of short-term faculty that deployed ‘personal narratives.’ The present study, in contrast, focuses on *permanently* internationally-based, tenure-track faculty, or ‘expatriate academics’ (Trembath, 2016), much in line with other more contemporary work on the subject (see also Yudkevich, Altbach, & Rumbly, 2017).

Highlighting quantitative results from an extensive diversity survey of expatriate academics at a large South Korean university, the present effort builds upon diversity research as a crucible, further informed by considerations of institutions and power. More specifically, this study analyzes multi-faceted expatriate faculty member perceptions of their recruitment, working environments, and involvement in decision-making processes at the university, college, and department levels. Analyses of these perceptions are couched within institutional (e.g., rules, trust, and diversity), and power considerations (e.g., integration, participation, and influence). The contribution concludes with a look at relationships between personal and professional satisfaction, department collegiality, feelings of isolation, and the possibility of faculty leaving the case university.

This study further investigates how perceptions differ by ethnic background between non-ethnically Korean and ethnically Korean expatriate academics. Three major research questions are deployed: First, are there any differences between ethnically non-Korean expatriate faculty and ethnically Korean expatriate faculty concerning their satisfaction with hiring and promotion processes, and their perception of trust at their places of work? Second, is there a differentiation

between ethnically non-Korean expatriate academics and their ethnically Korean expatriate colleagues in terms of integration and participation in decision-making processes? Third, do ethnically non-Korean expatriate academics differ from ethnically Korean expatriate academics in terms of an association between workplace satisfaction, institutional cordiality, and an intention to leave?

Literature

A primary reason that studies of international academic work environments are so important revolves around diversity in the university workplace (Worthington, 2012). Diversity is not always accompanied by the hiring of minority faculty. Aguirre and Martinez (2002, p. 60), for example, stated, "...that institutions of higher education can be diverse, but not inclusive of diverse communities." Indeed, diversity is a persistent challenge for many universities, often exacerbated by a 'culture of exclusion' (Brown, 2004, p. 24). At the individual level, minority faculty facing these exclusionary work environments may experience negative impacts on their careers (Cooper & Stevens 2002). At the organizational level, negative perceptions of organizational cultures and administrative processes, immediate work environments, and available support structures have been found to contribute to expatriate faculty intentions to leave (see Ambrose, Huston, & Nonnan, 2005; Callister, 2006; Barnes, Agago & Coombs, 1998; Schoepp, 2011). Concerning diversity research in general, Worthington (2012, p. 2) outlined core areas deserving attention such as recruitment and retention, intergroup relations and discourse, and non-discrimination in addition to the identity characteristics (e.g., race and ethnicity, national origin, and language use) that impact the work environments and perceptions of minority faculty and students.

As a basis for analyses, the present study builds on these considerations and follows Yudkevich, et al. (2017) as they provided more exacting topical considerations to cover vis-à-vis the study of diversity and expatriate faculty. The authors suggested examining regulations affecting hiring, promotion, and contract renewal, and expatriate faculty perceptions of these processes to include salary considerations. Finally, they welcome comparisons between expatriate faculty experiences and those of domestic faculty. In the present study comparisons are made between non-ethnically Korean expatriate faculty and ethnically Korean expatriate faculty, much in line with other contemporary studies of universities in Asia (see Huang, 2018; Paul & Long, 2016; Wu & Huang, 2018). This will be discussed in more depth in the data and methodology section.

Departmental support is seen as integral to the transition and careers of international faculty members (Collins, 2008), and departments and colleges are well-positioned to empower all faculty to more actively partake in internationalization and diversity efforts (Ray & Solem, 2009). In a study of international faculty retention issues at a Malaysian university, Amir et al.

(2013) found that positive departmental socialization opportunities ranked among the most influential variables explaining faculty satisfaction. Similarly, in a study undertaken by O'Meara et al. (2014, pp. 616-617), 'lack of collegiality in the unit' ranked third as a potential reason to leave. Another study of British expatriate academics (Richardson & Zikic, 2007) concluded that not being unable to form cross-cultural relationships at work may stymie the careers of these scholars. In one Korea-based study (Froese, 2012), language and cultural distance were found to negatively impact expatriate faculty's ability to integrate both socially and professionally at Korean universities. More recent work done by Altbach and Yudkevich (2017) concluded that lower levels of integration are associated with low expatriate faculty work satisfaction levels, and may, in turn, precipitate tension with host-country faculty. While there has been work done on departments and their relationships to other departments and the macro-institutional culture (Jumper, 1984; Lee, 2007), the college scale is conspicuously absent from analyses of expatriate faculty. The present research, by way of comparison, examines perceptions related to college-level interactions in concert with both university and departmentally-related perceptions.

There are also intra-organizational considerations that may impact the careers of expatriate faculty. Trowler and Knight (2000, p. 37) concluded that higher-level initiatives may be divorced from perceptions at the more localized departmental level at which many academics operate (see also Tierney, 1988). Smart and St. John (1996) concluded that such contradictions lead to faculty dissatisfaction. The present study takes into consideration all of the preceding.

Expatriate academics are sensitive to transparency issues when they move to different societal contexts, considerations that can be couched within discussions of institutions. Bathelt and Glückler (2014, pp. 346-47) define institutions as, "...forms of ongoing and relatively stable patterns of social practice based on mutual expectations that owe their existence to either purposeful constitution or unintentional emergence." Yet given the inclusion of 'mutual expectations', and 'purposeful constitution', this necessarily begs the question of whether or not expectations and rules are available, understandable, and perceived to be fair. In the present research, expatriate faculty perceptions are examined vis-à-vis student and faculty expectations, and promotion and tenure review processes.

Trust, an informal institution, is also important as it is inherently intertwined with establishing and continuing relationships that can impact careers. Some attributes of trust include recognizing diversity, respect, and a commitment to improvement that includes accepting suggestions from multiple sources (see Yorke, 2000). These attributes are core to universities seeking to effectively implement diversity-oriented change (see Aguirre & Martinez, 2002). This also harkens back to the aforementioned intra-organizational issues that build up should there be tensions between the internationalization message being forwarded by the university and the realities impacting the everyday lives and careers of individual expatriate academics in their departments and colleges. Expatriate faculty perceptions regarding this possibility are examined,

and perceptions related to diversity and trust in leadership are subsequently analyzed at the departmental, college, and university levels.

Power is also an important consideration when examining diversity and the careers of expatriate academics at their places of work (Morley, et al., 2018), largely because power impacts faculty participation in governance. As a heuristic starting point, Yeung (2005, p. 45) defines ‘power’ as, “...the relational effects of the capacity to influence and the exercise of this capacity through actor-specific practice.” Power creates the ability to influence over time and examining it enables a picture of how actors challenge entrenched organizational behavior and institutional norms to be drawn. In this respect, the concept of ‘emergent power’ (Yeung 2005, p. 46) is beneficial as it, “...enhances the possibilities for actors in heterogeneous relations to engage in recursive learning and reflexivity.” Power in the present study is therefore approached vis-à-vis participation, integration, and perceptions related to one’s influence at both the departmental and college levels.

Data and Methodology

Expatriate faculty members at the case university numbered 110 as of 2017, or roughly five percent of the total regular tenure-track faculty members there. By way of comparison, government statistics indicate that two competing and similarly-sized private universities had 119 and 105 expatriate faculty on staff the same year (Ministry of Education, 2018). 44 percent of expatriate faculty are originally Korean-born or ethnically Korean, though they hold non-Korean citizenship or foreign residency status. Paul and Long (2016) related that there is an increasing number of such returning scholars working at universities in Asia. Recent studies, for example, those by Wu and Huang (2018) and Huang (2018), differentiated between non-native expatriate academics and home-country returnees in China and Japan. Analyses in the present research similarly compare expatriate faculty both with and without Korean ethnicity. To the best of the authors’ knowledge, this is the first time such a consideration has been taken into account when quantitatively analyzing expatriate faculty at a Korean university.

An in-depth survey was distributed online to all expatriate faculty at the case university between 25 October 2017 and 8 November 2017. The survey contained seventy-nine questions of 1) personal background, 2) the hiring process, 3) academic affairs, 4) administrative affairs, 5) research affairs, 6) promotion, 7) housing, education, and daily life, and 8) perceptions about internationalization efforts at the case university. Table contents are actual reflections of the questions asked in the survey instrument, and questions are also presented verbatim in the body of the results section.

Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was granted before the dispersal of the survey instrument, a process that was insisted upon, and later verified anonymity for participants. For this reason, given the sparse number of scholars in individual departments and colleges, particularly female faculty and those in higher ranks, individual and university details are not presented.

A total of 35 non-ethnically Korean and 13 ethnically Korean expatriate faculty responses generated response rates of 62 percent and 24 percent respectively or an overall response rate of 43 percent. Table 1 provides a breakdown of descriptive statistics for the sample. Many respondents did not proffer their rank, perhaps out of concerns related to anonymity, but the sample may be characterized as representative.

Quantitative analyses of survey data are utilized in this research. Descriptive statistics, t-tests, correlation analysis, and ANOVA are deployed to capture and compare ethnically Korean and non-ethnically Korean faculty perceptions related to aspects of their working environment unearthed in the review of the literature. Several of these aspects are examined at the department, college, and university scales to provide a better overall picture of the work environment being experienced by these scholars and their ability to engage in governance. No significant differentiation based on gender was found for any of the variables assessed, nor for the presence or absence of a Korean spouse.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics: Expatriate Faculty at the Case University

	Ethnic Origin			Ethnic Origin	
	Non-Korean	Korean		Non-Korean	Korean
Rank			Gender		
Full Professor	5	3	Female	6	5
Associate Professor	16	7	Male	27	8
Assistant Professor	7	0			
			Marital Status		
Time Since Hire			Not married	7	4
1-3 Years	10	2	Married; Korean Spouse	7	4
4-7 Years	11	5	Married; non-Korean Spouse	18	5
>7 Years	14	5			
			Korean Language^a		
Age			Listening	3.60 (1.12) ^b	1.31 (0.63)
<40	11	1	Speaking	3.69 (0.99)	1.31 (0.63)
40-49	16	10	Reading	3.46 (1.07)	1.38 (0.87)
50-60	6	1	Writing	3.80 (0.87)	1.54 (0.97)
>60	1	1			

Source: Survey responses; ^a Based on Likert scales (1=Very Good to 5=Inexistent); ^bStandard Deviations in parentheses

Results

Research question 1 delves into hiring, promotion, and institutions such as trust. Often not regarded in earlier work into the careers of expatriate faculty, the hiring process (inclusive of salary considerations), acknowledged to be challenging in a cross-cultural context, has now come to be accepted as a vital piece of analysis (Altbach & Yudkevich, 2017; Mihut, et al., 2017). To the best of the author’s knowledge, however, no study has explored this particular facet of expatriate academic career moves to any depth in the Korean context. Survey respondents answered on Likert scales to provide their opinion regarding the overall hiring process, documentation, communication, whether their expectations were met, this hiring process versus the process at their previous places of employment, and details about their salaries (Table 2). T-tests indicated no differences between expatriate academics with and without Korean ethnicity. While there are some positive signs in that some large percentages answered more optimistically than pessimistically to some of these questions, for example concerning the professionalism of communication and expectations being met, even these questions yielded a large percentage of respondents answering in the negative. An equal amount of information can be gleaned from both the large percentages in the ‘Neutral’ categories, and percentages in the ‘Disagree’ or ‘Strongly Disagree’ categories concerning the overall hiring process, the process compared to prior experience, and, most glaringly, the level of discomfort manifested from not knowing the exact salary before completing the contractual agreement.

Table 2: The Hiring Process: Impressions from the Expatriate Faculty Survey (%)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The hiring process was clear and went as expected	5.9%	31.4	21.6	27.5	11.8
All necessary documents were provided in English and were complete	2.0	27.5	25.5	25.5	19.6
The communication with X during the hiring process was professional	3.9	43.1	21.6	23.5	7.8
My expectations before hiring were confirmed after being hired	2.0	37.3	37.3	17.6	5.9
Compared to previous positions, X's hiring process is ^a	3.9	13.7	45.1	35.3	0.00
Not knowing the exact salary before getting hired made me uncomfortable	41.2	35.3	15.7	5.9	2.0

Source: Survey responses; ^a For this question, the Likert scale included Excellent, Good, Neutral, Below Par, Not Good.

In a smooth-running system adjusted for the introduction of expatriate academics, the best-case scenario would be one in which all of the categories reflect satisfaction over and above the neutral level. A subsequent ANOVA test revealed that, contrary to what one might expect, the amount of *dissatisfaction* with the hiring process *decreased* with the length of employment at the university (3.625, 0.04). It remains to be seen exactly why this would be the case. It could be, for example, that those with longer tenures have either forgotten or minimized their travails to a larger extent given their longer period of acculturation, or, in a worst-case scenario, that the university has backpedaled in its ability to smoothly engage in the hiring of expatriate faculty and to meet their expectations for this process. This could be negatively compounded by the case university's ongoing effort to hire more expatriate faculty, an important consideration when examining the work environment for expatriate faculty (Yudkevich, et al., 2017). When asked if sufficient efforts were being made in this regard, fully 76.5 percent of respondents answered in the negative, with only four percent answering in the affirmative. Further, when asked if the case university's institutions are supportive of expatriate faculty, only two percent of respondents strongly agreed and 17.6 percent agreed, with 33.8 percent disagreeing and 11.8 percent strongly disagreeing (35.3 percent answered 'Neutral'). A t-test confirmed no difference in means for expatriate faculty with and without Korean ethnicity for either of these variables (-0.22, 0.83 and -1.14, 0.26 respectively).

Along with the problems associated with documentation unearthed by the survey results, this also helps to explain the huge amount of dissatisfaction with the salary issue. The actual hiring process begins at the departmental scale, after which application packets for recommended candidates are processed at the university level. Individual departments and colleges then make the final hiring recommendation and the university either approves or declines it. Salaries are formulated based on an antiquated and complicated system by central financial administration (Case University, Office of International Faculty Liaison, 2013), so even if the decision is made to *administratively* hire an individual scholar, while a guestimate can be provided, no actual solid salary information is usually available until after a decision has been reached. Often enough, scholars are required to sign a contract with no specified salary.

Next, Table 3 presents the results of survey response analyses regarding institutions and rules directly impacting the expatriate faculty working environment. Immediately evident is that expatriate faculty leaned toward disagreeing with statements concerning the availability and understandability of university-level rules regarding students, and rules and regulations regarding faculty at the department, college, and university levels. These rules include guidelines regarding service. Statistically, differences emerged between ethnically Korean and non-ethnically Korean faculty where promotion is concerned. Concerning overall rules and regulations being clear and available, non-ethnically Korean expatriate faculty leaned toward disagreeing, while their ethnically Korean colleagues leaned toward agreeing. Opinions also diverged where the perceived presence of unwritten regulations for promotion was concerned at the department,

college (weaker at the .10 level), and university scales; non-ethnically Korean expatriate faculty agreed that these existed, while their ethnically Korean counterparts disagreed. It is no surprise, therefore, that ethnically Korean expatriate faculty leaned toward agreeing that the promotion process is fair and transparent, while non-ethnically Korean expatriate faculty disagreed, akin to expatriate faculty perceptions voiced in Palmer and Cho (2012) and expatriate faculty perceptions at a Malaysian university concerning contract renewal (Wan & Sirat, 2018).

As there were statistically significant differences in Korean language ability (see Table 1), this may be explained in part by the fact that ethnically Korean expatriate faculty may have been able to avail themselves of codified handbooks on the one hand, while having been able to access tacitly known codicils via their Korean colleagues on the other. In another Korea-based case (Froese, 2010), the scholar, writing autobiographically, was supplied with information by his Korean colleagues but asked not to share it with other non-ethnically Korean faculty members. It should be noted in all fairness, however, that at the time of the data acquisition effort, the university’s faculty handbook had not been translated into English and disseminated; as of the writing of this article it had, so follow up research would be required to see if this has an impact on expatriate faculty perceptions.

Table 3: Institutions and Rules: Work Environment Perceptions of Expatriate Faculty

		Ethnic Origin		T Statistic	P-Value
		Non-Korean	Korean		
Rules and regulations regarding students ^a are readily available in English and understandable		4.00 (0.92) ^b	3.75 (1.04)	-0.67	0.51
Rules and regulations regarding faculty are readily available in English and understandable	Department	3.75 (1.14)	3.89 (1.17)	0.32	0.75
	College	3.94 (0.97)	3.44 (1.24)	-1.28	0.21
	University	3.67 (1.12)	3.00 (1.23)	-1.57	0.13
Rules and regulations for promotion are clear and readily available		3.53 (1.08)	2.08 (.641)	-4.54	0.00
The promotion process is fair and transparent		3.38 (0.78)	2.38 (0.65)	-4.10	0.00
There seem to be "unwritten" requirements for a promotion that I am/was not aware	Department	2.60 (1.22)	3.70 (1.25)	2.45	0.02
	College	2.75 (1.18)	3.56 (1.01)	1.84	0.07
	University	2.29 (0.90)	3.67 (1.00)	3.72	0.00

Source: Survey responses ^aDescription included: graduation requirements and grading rules; ^bBased on Likert scales; 1=Strongly Agree to 5=Strongly Disagree; Standard Deviations in parentheses

Continuity, diversity, and trust are addressed next, again shedding light on faculty perceptions of diversity and their working environments. According to respondent input (see Table 4) both

groups of expatriate faculty leaned toward disagreeing that there was continuity between the university’s communicated internationalization efforts and what they were experiencing in their everyday work lives, though non-ethnically Korean expatriate faculty disagreed more strongly. In terms of recognizing the importance of diversity, there was statistically a more pronounced difference at the university scale; non-ethnically Korean expatriate faculty disagreed that they and the university agreed on the importance of diversity. This was also true where trust in leadership was concerned. In general, both groups of faculty were more trusting of their departmental and college leadership, and only diverged in opinions concerning the university scale; non-ethnically Korean expatriate faculty leaned toward distrusting university-level leadership, while ethnically Korean expatriate faculty leaned toward trusting it. Though interviews would be necessary to verify it, this may be because ethnically-Korean expatriate faculty are identifying more with their Korean colleagues. Korean is a high context language, so a large amount of meaning comes from commonly understood, often unspoken pretexts, and a schism between ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’ is prevalent (see Hall, 1981, p. 113).

Table 4: Institutions - Continuity, Diversity, and Trust: Work Environment Perceptions of Expatriate Faculty

		Ethnic Origin		T Statistic	P-Value
		Non-Korean	Korean		
There is continuity between the university's communicated internationalization efforts and what I am experiencing in my everyday life.		4.03 (0.76) ^a	3.46 (0.98)	-2.13	0.04
University leaders and international faculty agree on the extent to which diversity is important	Department	3.06 (1.22)	2.77 (1.17)	-0.74	0.47
	College	3.15 (0.86)	2.69 (0.75)	-1.68	1.00
	University	3.79 (0.77)	2.92 (0.95)	-3.25	0.00
I can trust my leadership when it comes to issues impacting my career	Department	2.63 (1.07)	2.46 (0.88)	-0.49	0.63
	College	2.79 (0.86)	2.85 (0.69)	0.22	0.83
	University	3.39 (0.90)	2.77 (0.60)	-2.03	0.03

Source: Survey responses^a Based on Likert scales; 1=Strongly Agree to 5=Strongly Disagree; Standard Deviations in parentheses

Research question 2 addresses integration, participation, power, and recursive learning. To learn, to influence, and to enact change within an organization, it stands to reason that one first must be present. Table 5 reports findings related to power in terms of integration, participation, and recursive learning. Respondents in both groups (no *Chi-square* difference) reported attending departmental meetings quite regularly. There was a lower percentage of participation for college-level meetings, but that may have merely been the result of scheduling conflicts. As such, college-level interaction is examined via other variables. For example, both groups reported

being well-integrated into their departments and colleges, and both groups participated in both departmental and college-level official functions (e.g., colloquiums and dinners)

Table 5: Power, Integration, and Participation: Expatriate Faculty Perceptions

		Ethnic Origin						
		Non-Korean			Korean			
Integration and Participation		Y ^a	N	D	Y	N	D	
If I am available, I participate regularly in meetings.	Department	83%	3%	11%	92%	0%	8%	
	College	60%	0%	37%	46%	23%	31%	
							T Statistic	P-Value
I am well integrated into my department/college			2.49 (0.92) ^b		2.00 (0.82)		-1.67	0.10.
How often do you participate in official functions? ^c	Department		1.63 (0.60)		2.08 (0.50)		2.41	0.02
	College		2.67 (1.02)		2.92 (0.95)		0.78	0.44
Power and Recursive Learning								
Faculty meetings are regularly held in a language I can understand.	Department		3.21 (1.37) ^d		2.08 (0.76)		-2.81	0.01
	College		3.50 (1.40)		2.31 (0.95)		-2.83	0.01
Compared to my Korean colleagues, I often feel uninformed about...affairs.	Department		2.35 (1.19)		3.31 (0.94)		2.61	0.01
	College		1.94 (0.97)		3.38 (1.04)		4.49	0.00
My voice/opinion weights my...	Department		2.91 (1.08)		2.46 (0.78)		-1.37	0.18
	College		3.51 (0.92)		3.00 (0.82)		-1.77	0.08

Source: Survey responses; ^a Y=Yes, N=No, D=Depends; ^b Based on Likert scales (1=Strongly Agree to 5=Strongly Disagree); Standard Deviations in parentheses; ^c (1=Always to 5=Never); ^d(1=Strongly Agree to 5=Strongly Disagree)

Emergent power, however, has to do with opportunities for recursive learning and to accomplish this, communication is vital. Even though Korean fluency was not a stipulated hiring prerequisite, however, participating in governance at the case university may not be easy without Korean fluency (see Shin & Gress, 2018). It is interesting to note, therefore, that more non-ethnically Korean expatriate faculty than their ethnically Korean colleagues reported attending college-level meetings despite a markedly inferior level of Korean language skills (see Table 1). Still, at 60 percent and 46 percent respectively, the turnouts are not as high as one may have expected given the importance of the college scale to overall decision making at the case university. The language was a detractor in this regard. Non-ethnically Korean expatriate faculty leaned toward disagreeing on the issue of both departmental and college meetings being held in a language they could understand, while they tended to agree that they felt uninformed compared to the native Korean faculty; neither of these presented an issue for the ethnically Korean expatriate faculty. At the college level, however, rank emerged as a possible consideration. An

ANOVA test revealed (3.29, 0.04) that the higher the rank, the less non-ethnically Korean expatriate faculty felt uninformed about college-level affairs. Still, even tenured Full Professors registered an overall neutral response, with those at the Associate and Assistant Professor levels registering significantly more negative perceptions.

Recalling that trust is more pervasive at the departmental than college level, it should come as no surprise that both groups reported their opinion having more weight in their respective departments. At the college level, there was a weak statistical difference between groups, with ethnically Korean expatriate faculty registering neutral, while their non-ethnically Korean counterparts leaned toward disagreeing. Results suggested that in the previous question concerning integration, respondents were answering based on their departmental experience. This, however, is only conjecture, so interviews would be necessary to confirm or deny this possibility. In the end, however, results suggest that non-ethnically Korean expatriate faculty were somewhat less well-situated to enact change at their places of work than their ethnically Korean counterparts, particularly at the college level.

Several studies on Korean universities ventured pessimistic conclusions with regards to expatriate faculty integration, participation, and influence (Froese, 2010; 2016; Kim, 2005; Palmer & Cho, 2012). Kim (2016), in her one-university study, described a sort of revolving door situation, where expatriate faculty came to a Korean university to work, became disgruntled, left, and were replaced by new hires while the university did little to alter its organizational culture to integrate them. In the present study, there was a negative perception of the case university's efforts to hire more expatriate faculty. But are expatriate faculty thinking of leaving sooner than expected? There was, after all, concern among senior managers at the case university that expatriate academics may simply leave the case university for a better job once they build up their research records (see Shin & Gress, 2018). Based on a review of the previously discussed literature, expatriate faculty may leave because of personal and professional satisfaction issues, including cordiality at work and feelings of isolation. Analyses conclude with RQ3 and a look at these issues.

Table 6 shows the means, the standard deviations, and the results of the correlation analysis. T-tests indicated no differences between ethnically non-Korean and ethnically Korean faculty for these variables. There are some positive signs in that faculty leaned toward both personal and professional satisfaction and that department cordiality was perceived in a positive light. However, all three of these variables had fairly high standard deviations, while feelings of isolation and thoughts about leaving sooner were perceived to be stronger. As in other studies, there was an inverse relationship between thoughts of leaving and professional/personal satisfaction and department cordiality, and a positive correlation between thoughts of leaving and feelings of isolation. Feelings of isolation, in turn, are strongly positively correlated to both personal and professional satisfaction (also correlated to each other). Respondents also had the

opportunity to fill in an open-response question, “If I were to leave _____, it would be because of _____.” Answers (30 respondents in all) predominantly revolved around 1) language barriers, 2) limited leadership opportunities or problems with integration at the department level, 3) promotion and tenure issues, 4) dissatisfaction with the pace of the internationalization efforts, and 5) family and child welfare (education, spousal employment). Numbers one through four are largely reflective of the quantitative results presented thus far. In short, should the university wish to avoid the revolving door situation described by Kim (2016), it needs to address these issues, along with hiring-related issues sooner rather than later.

Table 6: Correlations: Workplace satisfaction, cordiality, isolation, and leaving

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5
Professional Satisfaction ^a	2.37	0.77	1.00	0.57**	0.40**	-0.39**	-0.48**
Personal Satisfaction	2.55	0.81		1.00	0.39**	-0.43**	-0.34**
Cordiality ^b	2.10	1.09			1.00	-0.15	-0.28*
Isolation ^c	2.92	1.07				1.00	-0.28*
Might leave sooner	3.29	1.00					1.00

Source: Faculty survey; *P<.01; **P<.05; ^a1=Extremely Satisfied to 5=Extremely Dissatisfied; ^b1=Very High to 5=Very Low; ^c1=Strongly Agree to 5=Strongly Disagree

Discussion

Recommendations based on the preceding analyses may be forwarded. First and foremost, the hiring drive must continue in earnest. We know that any successful drive toward the globalization of world-class universities must encompass the *continuous* recruitment and retention of minority faculty (Chun & Evans, 2009), but expatriate faculty did not believe this to be the case. Directly related to this, results indicated that the university needs to improve the overall hiring process, particularly concerning documentation and the timely supply of salary information. Once hired, the availability of rules regarding students and faculty needs to be better codified in both Korean and English, and made available to all incoming expatriate faculty.

A review of documentation from the case university revealed that it did not pursue change to its administrative systems or academic culture to accommodate the large-scale hiring of expatriate academics (Case University, Office of International Faculty Liaison, 2013). Rules and processes governing promotion need to be more concretely codified and disseminated in English for those without Korean language fluency. In the end, promotion and tenure processes need to be transparent and well-articulated, both via formal and informal communications, for all faculty (Tierney, 1997; Tierney & Rhodes, 1993). Expatriate scholars leave because they perceive a low

level of potential to integrate, and because of a perceived low chance of advancement (O'Meara, Louder, & Campbell, 2014).

A lot of other difficulties may be ascribed to language issues as well, but, again, working knowledge of Korean was not a pre-requisite for employment at the case university (see Shin & Gress, 2018). Provisions need to be made for those without a Korean fluency to participate in meetings, engage in higher levels of governance (e.g. at the college level), and stay informed. Assigning formal mentors at the department level, along with hiring at least one full-time, bi-lingual administrative assistant at each college dedicated solely to expatriate faculty assistance would help in these regards. These staff members could potentially coordinate and improve the consistency of expatriate faculty services university-wide. Over the longer term, like universities in other systems (e.g., in Israel, Japan, and Norway), the case university could make learning the language a pre-requisite for continual employment, but assistance will still be required. In short, the university needs to make up its mind on the language issue, it needs to bolster trust in its senior administrative levels, and it needs to better and more systemically execute its vision for internationalization and diversity going forward.

Concluding Remarks

This research adds to a burgeoning literature on expatriate academics and diversity in a non-Western context. Building from the diversity literature, the perceptions of expatriate faculty both with and without Korean ethnicity concerning their working environment and their ability to participate in governance were analyzed vis-à-vis institutional (e.g., rules, trust, and diversity), and power considerations (e.g., integration, participation, and influence) across the university, college, and departmental scales.

In general, results were reflective of findings from other studies of expatriate faculty at Korean universities with one important caveat; findings for integration, participation, and influence were more pessimistic for non-ethnically Korean expatriate faculty. Hiring documentation and processes need work, but non-ethnically Korean expatriate faculty perceived more problems with transparency (promotion rules and processes), trust at the university scale, and integration with the system as it stood, especially in terms of communication, information flow, and governance participation at the college scale. Based on the analyses, several recommendations were therefore forwarded.

The limitations of the study include the fact that despite the fairly high response rate, not all expatriate faculty were represented by the data gathered. Also, follow-up interviews would have helped to flush out intricacies associated with trust, power issues, and language and participation. Further, this is merely a one-university case study, though the case university employs significant numbers of expatriate academics. Much as in Kim (2016), it is hoped that evidence

from this one-university study may help to inform the hiring and organizational change processes at other universities in Korea.

A future comparative study deploying the suggested framework would help to understand whether or not differences exist based on the macro-Korean culture or the organizational cultures of the universities under study. It would be interesting to see, for example, if the trends between ethnically Korean and non-ethnically Korean faculty unearthed in the present study are representative across universities in Korea, both national and private alike. Building in part on the present research, a country-wide study of expatriate faculty working at all Korean universities is currently underway. It is hoped that this and other research being done on expatriate faculty working at universities globally will help to build out our understanding of diversity issues, work environments, governance participation, and other pertinent facets of the careers of these scholars at their places of work.

Acknowledgment: Funding from the case university, Office of Planning and Coordination, to the International Faculty Research Group (Project Number 0668-20170139) is gratefully acknowledged. The authors would also like to express thanks to the Diversity Council and all involved with the committee. In addition, partial fulfillment of this study was supported by the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Korea and the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF-2018S1A5A2A03029277).

References

- Aguirre, A., & Martinez, R. (2002). Leadership practices and diversity in higher education: Transitional and transformational frameworks. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, 8(3), 53-62.
- Altbach, P.G., Reisberg, L. & Rumbley, L.E. (2009). 'Trends in Global Higher Education: Tracking an Academic Revolution. *A Report Prepared for the UNESCO 2009 World Conference on Higher Education*', United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization.
- Altbach, P. G., & Yudkevich, M. (2017). International faculty in 21st-century universities: Themes and variations. In M. Yudkevich, P. G. Altbach & L. E. Rumbley (Eds.), *International faculty in higher education: Comparative perspectives on recruitment, integration, and impact* (pp. 1–14). New York: Routledge.
- Ambrose, S., Huston, T., & Nonnan, M. (2005). A qualitative method for assessing faculty satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, 46(1), 803-830.
- Amir, P., Narges, H. & Wong, S-F. (2013). Adjustment, motivation for retention, and environmental similarity toward satisfaction among expatriate academics. *Jurnal Teknologi (Social Sciences)*, 64(3), 123–130.
- Barnes, L. B., Agago. M. O., & Coombs, W. T. (1998). Effects of job-related stress on faculty intention to leave academia. *Research in Higher Education*, 39(4), 457-469.
- Bathelt, H. & Gluckler, J. (2014). Institutional change in economic geography. *Progress in Human Geography*, 38(3), 340-363.
- Bedenlier, S. & Zawacki-Richter, O. (2015). Internationalization of higher education and the impacts on academic faculty members. *Research in Comparative & International Education*, 10(2), 185–201.
- Brown, L. I. (2004). Diversity: The challenge for higher Education. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 7(1), 21–34.
- Callister, R. R. (2006). The impact of gender and department climate on job satisfaction and intentions to quit for faculty in science and engineering fields. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, 31(3), 367-375.

Case University, Office of International Faculty Liaison (March 2013). *Proposed Policies and Procedures for International Faculty*. Seoul: Author.

Chun, E. & Evans, A. (2009). Special Issue: Bridging the University Divide – Globalization and Reciprocal Empowerment in Higher Education. *ASHE Higher Education Report* 35(1): 1-144.

Collins, J.M. (2008). Coming to America: Challenges for faculty coming to United States' universities. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 32(2), 179-188.

Cooper, J. E., & Stevens, D. D. (Eds.). (2002). *Tenure in the sacred grove: Issues and strategies for women and minority faculty*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Foote, K., Li, W., Monk, J. & Theobald, R. (2008). Foreign-born scholars in US universities: Issues, concerns, and strategies. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 32(2), 167-178.

Froese, F. (2010). Acculturation experiences in Korea and Japan. *Culture & Psychology*, 16(3), 333-348.

Froese, F. (2012). Motivation and adjustment of self-initiated expatriates: The case of expatriate academics in South Korea. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(6), 1095-1112.

Hall, E.T. (1981). *Beyond Culture*. New York: Random House.

Huang, F. (2018). International faculty at Japanese universities: Their demographic characteristics and work roles. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 19(2), 263-272.

Jiang, X., Napoli, R. D., Borg, M., Maunder, R., Fry, H. & Walsh, E. (2010). Becoming and being an academic: The perspectives of Chinese staff in two research-intensive UK universities. *Studies in Higher Education*, 35(2), 155-170.

Jöns, H. & Hoyler, M. (2013). Global geographies of higher education: The perspective of world university rankings. *Geoforum*, 46, 45–59.

Jumper, S.R. (1984). Departmental relationships and images within the university. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 8(1), 41-47.

Kim, D. & Rho, J. (2017). International doctoral graduates from China and South Korea: A trend analysis of the association between the selectivity of undergraduate and that of US doctoral institutions. *Higher Education*, 73(5), 615-635.

Kim, S. (2016). Western faculty 'flight risk' at a Korean university and the complexities of internationalization in Asian higher education. *Comparative Education*, 52(1), 72-90.

Kim, T. (2005). Internationalization of higher education in South Korea: Reality, rhetoric, and disparity in academic culture and identities. *Australian Journal of Education*, 49(1), 89-103.

Lee, J.J. (2007). The shaping of the departmental culture: Measuring the relative influences of the institution and discipline. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 29(1), 41-55.

Li, M., Yang, R. & Wu, J. (2018). Translating transnational capital into professional development: a study of China's Thousand Youth Talents Scheme scholars. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 19(2), 229-239.

Mihut, G., de Gayardon, A., & Rudt, Y. (2017) The long-term mobility of international faculty: A literature review. In M. Yudkevich, P. G. Altbach & L. E. Rumbley (Eds.), *International faculty in higher education: Comparative perspectives on recruitment, integration, and impact* (pp. 15–31). New York: Routledge.

Ministry of Education (2018). *Higher Education in Korea*. <http://www.academyinfo.go.kr/>, accessed 10 July 2018.

Morley, L., Alexiadou, N., Garaz, S., Gonzalez-Montegudo, J., & Taba, M. (2018), Internationalization and migrant academics: The hidden narratives of mobility. *Higher Education*, 76, 537-554.

O'Meara, K.A., Louder, A. & Campbell, C.M. (2014). To heaven or hell: Sensemaking about why faculty leave. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 85(5), 603-632.

Ortiga, Y.Y., Choe, M-H., Sondhi, G. & Wang, J. (2018). Working within the aspiring center: Professional status and mobilities among migrant faculty in Singapore. *Higher Education Policy*, <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41307-017-0078-0>. Palmer, J.D. & Cho, Y-H. (2012). South Korean higher education internationalization policies: perceptions and experiences. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 13, 387–401.

Parnarian, A., Hosseinin, N. & Fen, W-S. (2013). Adjustment, motivation for retention , and environmental similarity toward satisfaction among expatriate Academics. *Jurnal Teknologi (Social Sciences)*, 64(3), 123–130.

Paul, A.M. & Long, V. (2016). Human-capital strategies to build world-class research universities in Asia: Impact on global flows. In M-H. Chou, I. Kamola & T. Pietsch (Eds.) *The Transnational Politics of Higher Education: Contesting the Global/Transforming the Local* (pp. 130–155). Abingdon: Routledge.

Ray, W. & Solem, M. (2009). Gauging disciplinary engagement with internationalization: A survey of geographers in the United States. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 33(1), 103-121.

Richardson, J. & McKenna, S. (2003). International experience and academic careers: What do academics have to say? *Personnel Review*, 32(6), 774-795.

Richardson, J. & Zikic, J. (2007) The darker side of an international academic career. *Career Development International*, 12(2), 164 – 186.

Rumbley, L. E., & de Wit, H. (2017). International faculty in higher education: Common motivations, disparate realities, and many unknowns. In M. Yudkevich, P. G. Altbach & L. E.

Rumbley (Eds.), *International faculty in higher education: Comparative perspectives on recruitment, integration, and impact* (pp. 267–287). New York: Routledge.

Schoepp, K. (2011), The path to development: Expatriate faculty retention in the UAE. *International Education*, 40, 58–75

Shin, J. C. & Gress, D. R. (2018). Expatriate academics and managing diversity: A Korean host university's perspective. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 19(2), 297-306.

Smart, J.C. & St. John, E.P. (1996). Organizational culture and effectiveness in higher education: A test of the "Culture Type" and "Strong Culture" Hypotheses. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 18(3), 219-241.

Tierney, W.G. (1988). Organizational culture in higher education: Defining the essentials. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 59(1), 2-21.

Tierney, W.G. (1997). Organizational socialization in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 68(1), 1-16.

Tierney, W.G., & Rhoades, R.A. (1993). Faculty socialization as a cultural process: A mirror of institutional commitment. Enhancing promotion, tenure, and beyond. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports, 93(6).

Trembath, J. L. (2016). The professional lives of expatriate academics: Construct clarity and implications for expatriate management in higher education. *Journal of Global Mobility*, 4(2), 112-130.

Trowler, P. & Knight, P.T. (2000). Coming to know in higher education: Theorising faculty entry to new work contexts. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 19(1), 27-42.

Wan, C. D. & Sirat, M. (2018). International academics in Malaysian public universities: Recruitment, integration, and retention. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 19(2), 241-252.

Worthington, C. (2000). Combatting discrimination at a Japanese university. *Asian Perspective*, 24(4), 131-157.

Worthington, R.L. (2012). Advancing scholarship for the diversity imperative in higher education: An editorial. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 5(1), 1-7.

Wu, X. & Huang, F. (2018). International faculty in China: Case studies of four leading universities in Shanghai. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 19(2), 253-262.

Yeung, H-W-C. (2005). Rethinking relational economic geography. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 30(1), 37-51.

Yorke, M. (2000). Developing a quality culture in higher education. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 6(1), 19-36.

Yudkevich, M., Altbach, P. G., & Rumbley, L. E. (Eds.) (2017) *International faculty in higher education: Comparative perspectives on recruitment, integration, and impact*. New York: Routledge.