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Abstract

Internationalization of higher education has become a priority for many universities. It provides them with educational models that can respond efficiently to current issues and challenges of globalization. International academic collaboration plays an important role in the creation of such models and prepares educational systems to act effectively in foreign environments.

This study explores the Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development partnership through the specifics of institutional culture, power and joint project management. Canadian and Ukrainian educators participated in semi-structured, open-ended interviews to reveal processes associated with their joint venture. The findings indicate that the project was largely influenced by Canadian and Ukrainian university conceptualization of internationalization and involved multiple cultural and professional perceptions of the partnership context and developments. Diversity of expectations, commitment, acceptance of differences practiced in this collaboration revealed the importance of academic dialogue among developed and developing countries and suggested possible standards for future international curriculum development joint ventures.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

We must get “inside the skin” of other people as nearly as we can. We must learn the “language of their life” as far as possible. We must “make sense” of their conditioning and concerns of their idiom…A holistic contemplation of international education could be compared with the aesthetic appreciation of a work of art: the complete experience is of more value than just discussion about it.

(Kay & Watson, 1982).

I think that “international education” as a form of an organized activity does not exist. What exists is a surprise. Surprise how people in different parts of the world try to accommodate their needs to new environments. They curiously watch how foreigners act, collaborate, share and repeat mistakes of their previous generations. Everything is embedded in a pattern of values and behaviour. There is no use to pretend that without sharing socio-cultural experiences we can design a unified international education/collaboration/combination mechanism to mobilize identities to accept proposed changes… and through the prism of their confused national imaginations try to reduce differences.

(Ukrainian international curriculum development project participant, 2008).

Higher Education and Global Developments

Irrespective of their economic development and political inclinations, societies are experiencing an increasing demand for access to higher education. This is partly because the world is entering into “an accelerated process of multidimensional global changes encompassing the fields of economy, finance, science and technology, communication, culture, politics, education etc” (Gacel –Avila, 2005, p. 123). University graduates are expected to react to these changes to meet the demands of globalization. The expectation to “prepare students to become effective and responsible citizens in a more pluralistic and interdependent world” (Mestenhauser 2000, p.31) implies that universities throughout the world are not immune from global-minded preoccupations (Altbach, 2000). Because of the contemporary “organization and integration of university activities at levels which transcend national borders and jurisdictions” (Jones, 1998, p.143), Western universities
try to offer unique opportunities for knowledge exchange with universities in developing
countries. Developing countries explore these opportunities and try to map their higher
education system potential in the global academic collaborative networks.

This research investigates how two universities in Canada and Ukraine manage
their international collaboration initiative. Considering the joint international curriculum
development activities as an important institutional policy vision, Ukrainians and
Canadians join together with the purpose of sharing and learning. The study focuses on
how the Canadian-Ukrainian academic joint venture functions, makes decisions,
distributes roles, finds adequate resources as a two team organization created to
participate and collaborate.

According to Altbach (2003), academic collaborations are directly affected by the
seven trends of globalization in higher education:

- Academic competition and collaboration in its various manifestations
- The use of English as a common language for scientific communication
- Imperatives of societies mass demand for higher education and highly educated
  personnel to serve this demand
- The “private good” thinking about the financing of higher education
- Investment in informational technologies, research and development worldwide
- Multinational patterns in the publishing ownership
- Cultural diffusion.

There is no doubt that some of those cross-referenced and negotiated themes are at
the core of the current Canadian-Ukrainian university partnerships. Outreach-oriented
universities in both countries attempt to become global agents (Kushnarenko, 2002) and
try to develop extensive international networks through “the widening and speeding up all forms and themes of worldwide interconnectedness and collaboration” (De Wit, 2003 p.2). Various collaborative networks penetrate the academic systems and none of these systems has managed to escape this process.

Canadian and Ukrainian academic institutions realize that they cannot meet the demands of the globalized world acting alone (Kushnarenko, 2009). However, Altbach (2002) and Nikitin (2006) highlight the strengths of indigenous academic systems, the privileges of autonomy and the necessity “to protect national cultural identity with the growing ability to compete” (Fim’yar, 2008 p.12). Certainly the protectionist features contribute to the successful performance of national economies and educational systems, but they may constrain local universities with their regional mentality and limit their institutional strategies with regard to the global outreach.

Kurbatov (2009) mentions that current protectionist rhetoric often differs from reality. The current increasing trends towards international cooperation among institutions of higher education have never been more important as indicated in the Canadian National Survey (2006) jointly conducted by Knight (2006), the Canadian Bureau for International Education (CBIE), the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) and the Association of Canadian Community Colleges (ACCC). CBIE, AUCC, ACCC, as the major stakeholders, believe that more collaborative agreements, new types of joint ventures and better coordination among academic sectors and fields are important because universities desire to develop a more systematic and better structured approach to the marketing and exporting of educational products and services. According to the survey Canadian universities emphasize the importance of providing students with
international and intercultural skills, responding to the need of Canada’s contemporary labour market. Academic collaborators want to know how to insert their research and discoveries made in partner countries into the policy processes of their own systems and how to build strategic alliances with key universities abroad for promoting innovations in curriculum and diversity of programs. The survey highlights that Canadian research and scholarship are needed to address international collaboration analysis issues and express their interest in the criteria to measure and identify collaboration as a (1) “continuous cycle of collaborative modes and evolution of partnerships” (de Wit, 2005, p.45); (2) process (or activity), which “involves lurches forward and back dragging significant time, human and financial resources from universities” (Burn, 1996, p.3); (3) action, driven by a commercial gain within a “paternalistic paradigm” (Kurbatov, 2009) to pursue interests of the certain donor groups and (4) a “soft power” vehicle (Nye, 2002).

Canada and Ukraine approach academic collaboration with a different degree of resources, interest, expertise and openness. According to Nikitin (2006), the majority of national academic institutions in the Post-Soviet Newly Independent States/NIS, including Ukraine, consider their involvement in international endeavors as a serious step towards understanding “questionable foreign university exchange influences” (Simonenko, 2008, p.3). Independence from Russia, with the increasing transparency of the national borders and the emerging academic and workforce mobility, may make it possible for NIS higher educational institutions to reorganize their internationalization strategies and more actively participate in international education activities. The core element of the contemporary Ukrainian collaborative policy strategies is a “careful consideration of what is suitable and effective for the National Higher Education System
according to our citizens and our society’s current interests and needs” (Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine, 2007). The “National” and “Ukrainian” became the major policy benchmarks (Yushchenko, 2008). They highlighted the need to recognize the traditional rules of an institutional organization and explain why Ukrainians prefer to involve their institutions in international collaboration in their own way.

Recently Ukrainian universities began to collaborate with Germany on a joint international doctoral studies program. The aim was to overcome the “lack of structure and transparency which is now seen as a serious disadvantage in international competition” (Luijten-Lub, Van der Wende, Huisman, 2005, p.148). Collaboration with Norwegian universities has now become an important factor in Ukrainian international plans as “the Norwegian universities strive to act as global professionals” (Luijten-Lub, Van der Wende, Huisman, 2005, p.150). Russia proposed a range of exchanges to improve Ukrainian university administration and management. Russian instructors were invited to train young Ukrainian academic leaders to run “open to innovations and democratic changes” (Kurbatov, 2008, p.35) academic institutions.

Canada occupies a special place in the Ukrainian academic internationalization agenda. The Canadian multicultural mosaic, awareness and support of other cultures, and appreciation of its own Canadian tradition attract Ukrainians. The Canadian desire to promote their higher education system based on professionalism, acceptance and respect has prompted Ukrainian universities to initiate new academic partnerships with Canada.

While Ukraine and Canada are chartering their own ways in developing and sustaining collaborative partnerships, the UNESCO “World Conference On Higher Education in the XXI Century: Vision and Action-2000” has prescribed collaborative
development to be conceived as an integral part of the institutional missions for world universities and academic systems (Gacel-Avila, 2005). UNESCO’s statement served as a motto for action indicating “institutions of higher education, intergovernmental organizations, donor agencies and non-governmental organizations should extend their action in order to support inter-university collaboration projects, in particular, through twinning international initiatives between institutions. Each institution of higher education should envisage the creation of an appropriate structure and mechanism for promoting and managing international collaboration” (UNESCO-2005 Conference Final Paper, p. 25). As a result, in different parts of the world, university missions and visions are being reconsidered. Management and organizational units are being reorganized in order to effectively facilitate the coordination and mutual leveraging of different categories of international collaboration.

This research on the Canadian-Ukrainian university partnership investigated the specifics of curriculum development joint venture management. The question of how two universities in Canada and Ukraine collaborate and what makes that academic joint venture work in the changing and turbulent Ukrainian environment became the focus of investigation. The collaborative process between two universities presented the opportunity to analyze how the goals of the joint venture were being set, who performed managerial activities, how the roles were distributed, decisions made and results disseminated. I did not aim to analyze the content or effectiveness of the new curriculum which was based on the programmatic curriculum in physics approved by the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine. Neither the curriculum recommendations nor the proposed changes made by the Canadian side were the target for the analysis. The study
explored the dynamics of the two-team joint activities, the reasons that make the Canadian-Ukrainian partnership work and the key elements of the collaborative relationships.

**Rationales for International Collaboration**

To analyze reasons why two universities in Canada and Ukraine engage their systems, including their human and financial resources in international collaboration is a complex task. The reasons for internationalizing higher education are many and diverse. Rationales are “changing and closely linked to each other; they can be complementary or contradictory, especially as they can differ according to the interests of diverse stakeholder groups” (Knight, 2001, p.15). Political, economic and societal components according to Welsh (2005) are among the main globalization forces that affect universities and push them to a greater international involvement. Those components are the major macro-level issues that reflect the developmental level of the Canadian and Ukrainian educational systems and their openness for sharing.

Political rationale, according to Knight (2002) and Nye (2004), is a fundamental motif for international outreach. Historically, international education has been seen as “a tool for foreign policy, especially with respect to national security and peace among nations” (Knight, 2001, p.3). The political ingredient in international academic relations is an important element around which the other layers of negotiations revolve (Nye, 2004). Universities in Ukraine are continuously asking themselves about the presence of other universities in their countries. They are curious what their foreign colleagues want to achieve by operating on their territory and how the Ukrainian vision of democracy, collaboration and success coincides with “the foreign values and purposes” (Kurbatov,
2008). If human relations are about making friends and influencing people then “politics is about winning allies and influencing countries” (Khanna, 2008, p.43).

The current shift towards considering international education as a product for sale reflects the economic rationale of academic collaboration. The current analysis of the global academic export-import operations, especially at the Asian educational markets (Hayhoe & Pan, 2007), shows “the major shifts in foreign policies, from perceiving education as primarily a development assistance activity or cultural program to currently seeing it as a commodity” (Knight, 2003, p.16).

Countries and their universities focus on the scientific and technological competitiveness as a result of a growing economic interdependence among nations, communication networks and information revolution. The only way to improve and maintain competitiveness, as many national systems believe, is to prepare a highly skilled work force through the existing university system and to invest in applied research. The higher educational sector is one of the major domains that can fulfill this task. According to Knight (2003), at the institutional level, the economic rationale receives more emphasis when universities are pressured to diversify their funding sources and decrease their dependence on government support. However, it is “still unclear whether exporting educational products and services to international markets is indeed directly enhancing the international dimension of teaching, research, and service” (Knight, 2003, p.14).

Higher education has traditionally been a part of cultural agreements and exchanges. Cross-border economic developments and globalized information/communication systems suggest the consideration of another important rationale for academic collaboration: its social/cultural aspect. The preservation and
promotion of Ukrainian culture and language (Yuschenko, 2007) has created somewhat different interpretations of internationalization. Through the growing international connections and outreach, Ukrainians believe they can better appreciate and understand their indigenous knowledge and national traditions. Cautious and careful consideration of a possible negative effect of external international influences causes a delay in academic movement to the West. On the other hand, Canada, for instance, considers international education as an effective way to respect cultural diversity and to counterbalance the homogenizing effect of globalization. Canadians consider the acknowledgment of ethnic diversity within and between countries, intercultural competence and respect of differences as a key cultural rationale for collaboration in higher education.

It is almost impossible to organize Canadian and Ukrainian reasons for this specific partnership into clearly identified categories. Professors and administrators at both institutions in Canada and Ukraine have their own profound and many-sided motivations for creating the curriculum development academic joint venture. The research participants mention the political and cultural rationales most often.

The motivations reflect the priorities and preferences of both systems and are not static. They change according to available information, time, comparisons, institutional needs and interests of the major stakeholders. When describing their motivations both teams bring together their knowledge, experience and skills to contribute to the development of a new Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum, which they believe initiates new concepts and tasks.
Collaboration: Potential Problems

Challenges and issues of academic collaboration can be combined into three major groups: national, institutional and individual. According to Manning (2008), at the national level, the majority of universities experience the lack of:

- A coordinated and coherent federal/national government strategy to enhance internationalization efforts
- A clear and strategic priorities identification due to increased demands and opportunities for international engagement
- An improved coordination among provincial/regional, federal/national governments and non-government stakeholders
- An important information provision to key stakeholders: MPs, government officials, international partners, media
- New opportunities for strategic discussion and national and international levels
- New partnerships, which enrich government-to-government relations.

Ukraine, with its centralized system of education, relies on its Ministry of Education and Science (the Ministry). The Ministry plans, coordinates and sets priorities for international education. Canada is “fortunate that many diverse groups, organizations, departments, and networks in the education, government, and private sectors have focused on the importance of internationalization in higher education…” though their “shared commitment does not necessarily means shared vision” (Knight, 2001, p.3). According to the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada (DFAIT) Policy Paper “The International Dimension of Higher Education in Canada: Collaborative Policy Framework” (1994), the lack of coordination between national and provincial
governments leads to insufficient financing, lack of coherent development of existing collaborative achievements and ad hoc treatment of academic networking and joint ventures (Knight, 2001).

Among institutional challenges, the most prominent is the fact that international outreach suffers at the expense of the domestic demand. The lack of proper international education recognition results in insufficient faculty commitment to enhance internationalization efforts and “focus still is on quantity not quality” (Manning, 2008, p.3). Some partnerships, which do not have equal benefits and experience, suffer from the lack of expertise, recognition and uncertain jurisdiction of each party. These unsuitable partnerships may result in poor leadership and commitment in both or one of the collaborative teams.

Universities involve their intellectual, human and financial resources in collaboration with various academic systems. The lack of flexibility and variety of choices due to profound system differences are also among the major reasons why certain collaborations do not work out. The international partnership that is limited to the institutional/departmental level may result in insufficient joint research and minimal policy developmental activities with key-university networks (deans, international and comparative studies centers and faculty).

The intensively of collaborative activities varies among Canadian and Ukrainian institutions. In Ukraine, for instance, uneven resource distribution diminishes the international collaborative potential and slows competition for participation in international projects. Faculty, departments, and academic institutions have limited experience in working collectively with those Western universities who have previously
been defined by Ukrainians as “the promoters of the capitalist agenda”. Although it is
easy to include the description of international collaboration prospects in the Ukrainian
Ministry’s documents, it is much more difficult to initiate and develop a joint venture
(Appendix 4), which is built upon compatibility, support and trust. In Ukraine, the
principles of international collaboration may be interpreted differently depending on the
priorities, preferences and extent of exposure of a local/provincial context. Policies aimed
at improving the existing international programs and competitiveness of Ukrainian higher
educational institutions often tend to reflect the priorities of those who shaped them.

The challenges of collaboration for Canadian universities are usually created by
(1) insufficient knowledge of a recipient country’s educational system, (2) dependence on
English as a language of instruction, (3) private educational service providers’ intrusion
in university collaborative schemes, and (4) activation of the sophisticated distance
education techniques. Those factors, among others, may require the Canadian academic
collaboration policies to be conceptualized with a network of different and mutually
dependent internal and external developments.

**Collaboration in Specific Cultural Contexts: Focus of the Study**

Canadian and Ukrainian universities were selected for this research. The study
sought to trace the establishment, development and collective work of the Canadian-
Ukrainian partnership for curriculum development. It explores the partnership’s
organizational context and, in particular, its management. My focus, following Foucault
(1988), was not “institutions” or their “ideologies”, but the organizational practices of the
Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture. My intent was to grasp “the conditions, which are not
just governed by institutions and prescribed ideologies, but guided by pragmatic
I was interested in hearing the participants’ cohesive voice on partnership goal establishment, shared vision and decision making, equal responsibilities load, broad communication and knowledge dissemination.

I made “now” the primary focus of my research, paying “brief visits to past and future when required to deal with the practical aspects of the current situation” (Tolle, 1997, p. 28). I was interested in the Canadian and Ukrainian project management regularities, logic, strategy, self-evidence and reasons for involvement. It is a question of analyzing a “regime of practices and places where what is said is done, rules imposed and reasons given, planned, taken-for-granted requirements meet and intersect” (Tolle, 1997, p.14).

Though the two Canadian and Ukrainian universities exemplify very different approaches to internationalization in their policy and practice, I have chosen to study their potential compatibility in running the joint Canadian-Ukrainian international project. Both universities’ leadership and commitment to international outreach, student and faculty mobility sustain their strong institutional portfolios and solid international reputation. From the policy perspective, it was important to select those institutions where the internationalization efforts reflect the tendencies of their national and regional priorities. From the international project management tradition, these two universities mirror their organizational structures, habits, mentality and desire/resistance to change. The aim was to find out how two different academic organizational structures adapted their international project management paradigms in order to reach collective commitment and consensus. The empirical circumstances of two academic systems
provided the basis for the investigation of organizational processes and sustainability of collaboration.

The analysis of international project management is accompanied by the investigation of a number of the sub-issues. An emphasis was placed on the obstacles to effective collaboration, simultaneously identifying motifs for collective action and conditions for organized joint activity. Each university had designed and proposed its own operational joint-venture model. The Canadian and Ukrainian teams’ behaviour was expected to be in agreement with their home university institutional habits. My intention was to trace the factors of the management techniques that emerged across the partnership for shared communication and understanding of the necessity for change in the collaboration context. Analysis of the joint venture’s key elements was based on the comparison of the team’s aims, outcomes, decision-making processes and distribution of roles and responsibilities.

In this particular case, the Canadian and Ukrainian teams operated in the different economic and socio-cultural niches and had their own understanding of conditions that seemed to drive the partnership to success. Entering into a collaborative relationship, they proposed a range of their own organizational and managerial options for setting the effective collaborative action. Advantages and disadvantages of each managerial model, power and institutional culture were also points of major interest of this study.

Upon entering the partnership, the Canadian and Ukrainian collaborators admitted that they did not have enough time and resources to study their partner’s previous collaborative experiences and operational successes/failures. Also, the partners had not previously performed a systematic analysis of their own collaborative activities. The
specifics of communication and negotiations according to the collaborators also were never investigated within the managerial dynamics framework. Taking all of those facts into consideration, I included a detailed description of the Canadian and Ukrainian systems of higher education, and their potential strengths and weakness related to collaboration in the study.

This research used qualitative analysis that was based on interview data received from two groups of people: (1) the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine International Cooperation Division staff, and (2) the coordinators of the Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development venture, who were collaborative partners and represented the Canadian and Ukrainian universities in the project. Data reflect the project’s operational steps in the process of the partnership initiation and development.

Considering the profound changes in partners’ mentality and attitudes along the way, this study was specifically aimed at understanding the achievement of mutual balance, the evolution of collaborative action and transformation into “true partners” as experienced and understood by the Canadian and Ukrainian sides. The research also highlighted how power projects on interorganizational relations and influences the joint venture collaborative team’s managerial decisions.

As a result of the focus and purpose of the study, the main research question for this research was:

*How do two universities located in Canada and Ukraine collaborate with each other?*

The research sub-questions for the investigation in this area include the following ones:

- What are the goals of this collaboration?
• How are the goals affected by the collaborators’ perceptions of each other as partners?
• How are the decisions made?
• How do the Canadian and Ukrainian partners understand their rules for their involvement in a collaborative process?
• How was knowledge acquired and disseminated?

Context of Joint Operation: Academic collaboration with Ukraine

It is hard to map the Ukrainian international education policies in the global academic development picture. Political, economic, cultural rationales for the Ukrainian foreign education initiatives are quite different from the international comparative philosophy generally practiced in the West. The major difference is in the access to information. A search for compatibility in international education collaboration is complicated by the scarce information, sporadically available on the official sites of the Ukrainian government or higher education interest groups/think tanks.

The contemporary development of Ukrainian international education initiatives indicates the following realities:

• Current collaborative agreements are understood by the majority of universities in Ukraine as a mechanism of the sophisticated Western “soft power” (Nye, 2004). The soft power concept is interpreted as a hidden political influence on the Ukrainian academic system
• Ukrainian university international activities focus on preserving and promoting the strong national element, national security issues, and preparation of cadres, which can function in Ukraine and for Ukraine
Initiatives and contacts with foreign academic institutions are declared as a prerogative opinion of the higher echelons of the Ukrainian academic administration and rely heavily upon the national policy priorities of the Ministry of Education and Science.

Internationalization of higher education as a cultural and diplomatic tool is not seen as a part of the Ukrainian foreign policy.

Participation of Ukrainian scholars in international education associations and organizations is seen as another way for the major global academic powers to increase influence on those scholars.

The political aspect of the Ukrainian international education concept substantially prevails over economic and cultural ones. International academic initiatives are not expected to be among the major forces that can efficiently influence the country’s economic and social development. They are considered more as a potential threat to the Ukrainian indigenous system of educational values. According to some Ukrainian politicians, active internationalization of education may cause ignorance and indifference to the values of their cultural heritage and mass idolization of Western/American culture (Simonenko, 2008). The multicultural component of educational policy and increased exposure to cultural diversity has limited support for development in Ukraine. Such a homogenized nation, in which the population consists of 77.8 percent Ukrainians, 17.3 percent Russians and 5 percent other (Wolowyna, 2003), is perceived to have “a serious advantage: we are able to solve our educational policy issues without the recipes from external advisors. In their majority, they (recipes) are prepared in advance” (Ivanchuk, 2001, p.15). The Ukrainian government declared “the promotion of the Ukrainian history
and cultural achievements abroad” (“Government News”, 2007), but international education is not considered as a vehicle for the realization of that declaration.

The majority of the current internationalization initiatives (Ministry of Education and Science, 2007) are based on the memoranda jointly approved by the Ukrainian Ministry of Education and Science and foreign governments. The Ministry’s International Agreements on Cooperation in International Education signed in 1992 with the governments of the USA, Korea, India, Belarus, Bulgaria, Rumania, Azerbaijan and in 2001 with the governments of France, Sweden, Armenia, Israel, Moldova, Poland, Turkmenistan (International Accords on Cooperation in the Fields of Education and Science, 2007) currently steer collaborative academic activities. The key points of these documents is the implementation of cooperative agreements in education on curriculum development, education administration innovations, projects in area studies, student and staff exchange initiatives, joint publications, etc.

The Memorandum on Mutual Understanding and Cooperation between the Government of Canada and the Government of Ukraine was signed in 1999 (Ministry of Education and Science, 2008). It features the main principles and foundations of collaboration in education between the two countries, such as the perspectives of international collaboration, major fields of development and potential resources as defined by the agreements. Collaboration in curriculum development and quality assessment of international initiatives is a priority topic for Canada and Ukraine. Ukrainians believe that international activities in education will help Ukraine “to prepare a competent working force for the national economy” while the Canadian side indicates its interest in the promotion of “mutual understanding and Canadian multicultural

Though the majority of Canadian-Ukrainian academic activities (Appendix 1) are initiated as a result of the official intergovernmental negotiations, individual Ukrainian and Canadian professor connections play a significant role in initiating new exchange projects. The current international trips to leading Canadian universities and presentations at various conferences result in meaningful connections among Canadian-Ukrainian scholars.

Although Ukrainians believe that the student exchanges and student mobility programs may form a major part of Ukrainian universities’ international initiatives, the Ukrainian budget for foreign student educational services has been cut by almost two-thirds (International Centre for Policy Studies/ICPS, 2006). The Ministry of Finance “simply ran out of money and failed to deliver 27.4 per cent of the promised budget to the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine” (Paton, 1998) and “did not include university and institutional internationalization efforts in the Ministry of Education and Science plans” (Kurbatov, 2008). It became difficult for Ukraine to play a serious role in educational negotiations with foreign universities. The critical overview of the Ukrainian internationalisation processes in higher education undertaken by the Ukrainian International Centre for Policy Studies (2006) and Foreign Universities Ukrainian Alumni Association/American Councils for International Education: ACTR/ACCELS, (2005) confirmed the lack of interest on the part of Ukrainian authorities in the analysis of world internationalisation tendencies and their possible development trajectories in Ukraine. Current publications in the Ukrainian media regarding the high quality of
education provided for Ukrainians at foreign universities (Kushnarenko & Katchanovski, 2007) and opinions of Ukrainian graduate students about collaborative projects with Canada, the USA and England (Kushnarenko, 2007) show that there are some effective individual and institutional attempts to change the situation. However, the Ukrainian official rhetoric claims that Ukrainian universities can be active and independent players in the international educational market based on their capacity and professional expertise. Such declarations are grounded on the “internal commercial activities, human resources capacity and a possibility to export educational services provided by the leading Ukrainian academic institutions” (Ministry of Education and Science, 2007). According to Ministry officials, “the Ukrainian university professional expertise to establish direct links with the foreign partners is substantial” (The National Doctrine on Education, 2002).

Ukraine has a historical tradition of turning logic and effective slogans into the ideological cliché. The neatly arranged and well-versed educational doctrines are intended to convince the Ukrainian public to believe in the effectiveness and professionalism of their government with regard to “the fruitful and professional international educational Ministry policies”. Individual professor initiatives, personal dedication, readiness to risk, professionalism and trust in the international collaborative movement serve as a locomotive for the slow and cautious Ukrainian internationalisation train.

It is important to acknowledge the role Ukrainians abroad play in the internationalisation of Ukrainian education. The Ukrainian diaspora’s commitment to support and promote academic exchanges with their homeland is unique among the
numerous diasporas in the world. The financial support from Canadian Ukrainians for joint research initiatives with Ukrainian universities, youth exchanges, curriculum innovations and textbook publications reached Ukraine long before the official governmental agreements and treaties. Philanthropists and businessmen of Ukrainian origin from Canada helped to initiate a number of Ukrainian collaborative programs with Canadian universities and institutions.

The well developed educational infrastructure inherited from the USSR, the central European location, and ambitions to compete with foreign educational markets make it possible for Ukraine to test the waters in Europe. A number of Ukrainian universities declared their readiness to collaborate with leading European universities on the “Europeanization” of Ukrainian education (Ministry of Education and Science, 2007). The integration into the European academic space, desire to enjoy future European citizenship and the feeling of belonging to economic and academic Europe are proclaimed as the current priorities of the Post-Orange Revolution (2004) leaders. In May 2005, along with 29 European Ministers of Education, Ukraine signed the Bologna Protocol and became a full member of the Bologna Treaty club. By joining the process, Ukraine “has confirmed a shared understanding of the principles, objectives and commitments of the process as expressed in the Bologna Declaration. Ukraine has also confirmed its commitment to coordinating its educational policies through the Bologna process to establish the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) by 2010” (Kurbatov, 2008, p.7).

Ukraine was included in the major European Union exchange initiatives such as The Joint European Project on Technical Assistance of European Communities
Commission/TEMPUS/TASIS, and the European Region Action Scheme for the Mobility of European Students/ERASMUS, etc. The previous organizational and contextual principles that sustain the ideology of suspicion toward the West looked incompatible with the very idea of a new, sustainable and candid dialogue with European universities. The threat of another and more sophisticated “soft power” wave exercised through “hidden” manipulations under the “Europeanization” umbrella, as declared by the Ukrainian left political parties, continues to keep the Ukrainian academia at a “safe” distance from active academic movement towards Europe.

However, the new global tendencies and contexts do influence Ukrainian universities. After 2004, the universities in Ukraine considered the leading Western university internationalisation models as those worthy for exploration. The Canadian international education developments, for instance, look very attractive to official Kyiv. Canadian multiculturalism, principles of global citizenship, conflict prevention etc. are declared by the Ukrainian officials as important ideas to import. Although those idea explorations take place only within the limits the authorities can control, it is a big step forward towards opening Ukrainian education to the world. Ukrainian universities initiate new processes for multidimensional organizational changes and encourage faculty and students to participate in international projects.

Ukraine still has a long way to go in order to accelerate its true cross-border people and ideas mobility. The absence of a consistent and coherent national internationalisation policy, which would reflect existing Ukrainian international education potential, inadequate financial support from the government, low motivation
and encouragement from the majority of faculty, has led to the current international education rhetoric based on the erroneous interpretations and moderate results.

The Ukrainian government lacks a holistic and integrated approach to the internationalisation of Ukrainian education at the policy level. However, foreign foundations support Ukrainian professors in their attempts to pursue their international professional aspirations in the West. They take advantage of the opportunity to receive some “practical training at foreign universities and perform tasks which help with cadres preparation for the national economic and social reforms” (On International Cooperation and Mutual Understanding (PICMU)/Ministry of Education and Science, 1991, p.9). As for Ukrainian students, they believe that in future they will have more opportunities to participate in educational exchanges and have the “possibility to experience the world’s best educational practices and systems” (PICMU, 1991, p 12). Ukrainian junior faculty cherish hopes of having access to foreign educational publications to “borrow the best that suits the needs of the Ukraine’s academe” (PICMU, 1991, p.9). A Ukrainian official declaration to support publishing in English in the West looks quite persuasive. It encourages Ukrainian graduate students to seriously study English. This emerging rhetoric within the context of new university realities and the Ukrainian identity revival promises a dynamic and productive international development for Ukrainian academia. According to Zabuzhko (2005), the only problem with current Ukrainian internationalisation prospects is that Ukrainians are still trying to do two things simultaneously: to understand the Western mentality and to maintain their hatred of it.
Academic Collaboration as a Tool for Global Competence: Canada

Internationalization of Canadian education is high on the agendas of almost all Canadian universities. It “strengthens and deepens the whole fabric of relations existing between people, allows fruitful exchanges of views to take place and facilitates multinational activities in the scientific, cultural, economic and social spheres” (De Wit, 2002). Such activities are considered to be among the priorities for Canadian universities.

Though Canada has no Federal Ministry of Education, provincial governments oversee postsecondary education and international outreach strategies. The Federal government is responsible for foreign affairs and international trade. The system is decentralized and educational policies are conceptualized and structured at the provincial level. These factors influence the capacity of Canadian universities to manage global pressures and develop their own internationalization paradigms, which are consultative, collaborative and driven by consensus (Manning, 2007).

The Ontario Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities (OMTCU) has responsibilities similar to the Ukrainian Ministry of Education and Science. It oversees the provincial higher education system. According to OMTCU data, $1 million was allocated for the marketing of postsecondary education in 2004. Collaborative initiatives and student exchange programs received $1 million (2006/07 academic year), $3 million (2007/08 academic year), and $5 million of the Ontario budget will be spent in 2008/09 academic year (Manning, 2008).

On February 07, 2005 the Former Ontario Premier Bob Rae, Advisor to the Premier and the Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities released a report entitled “Ontario, a Leader in Learning”. According to the report, Ontario will continue to develop an extensive international exchange and collaboration network and will remain
“an important destination for international students being a part of a global demand for international higher education. It is set to grow from 1.9 million international students today to 7.2 million international students by 2025” (Rae, 2005, pp.89-93). In response to Rae’s comprehensive review of postsecondary education, the government announced the “Reaching Higher” initiative, which further expanded the international strategy, specifically to increase the opportunities for Ontario students to complete a portion of their studies abroad, and to pursue marketing efforts to ensure Ontario remains an attractive educational destination. The Ontario International Strategy/OIS (Rae, 2005, OIS/AUCC 2005) has two key priorities:

- Expand and sustain international marketing and recruitment efforts, including promotion of Ontario educational services abroad
- Develop and implement initiatives to support increased student mobility through student exchange agreements and the establishment of the Ontario International Education Opportunity Scholarship.

The OIS supports the Ontario’s 47 publicly assisted colleges and universities (Manning, 2007).

Collaborative international projects recognizing expertise and jurisdiction of each party are designed and administered by Canadian universities. Canada has developed a “network of academically strong universities which recognize that international collaboration leads to mutual benefit of the parties engaged” (Manning, 2007, p.3). One of the main tasks of Canadian internationalization of higher education is to conceptualize Canadian standards and prospects with the age of globalization and the complexity of
external academic environments. According to the Canadian Bureau for International Education/CBIE, internationalization of Canadian higher education also includes:

- Curriculum that integrates international content and perspectives
- Emphasis on foreign-language learning
- Study abroad initiatives engaging a substantial percentage of post secondary students
- International programs using information and communications technology (ICT), including team taught courses and projects integrating classrooms in Canada and abroad
- International events and sensitization of staff, faculty and students to international issues
- Recognition of the international experience of faculty and the provision of international research opportunities
- Technical assistance to developing and transitional countries.

Collaboration in higher education has become a subject of increasing interest in Canada from the early 1990s. Canadian universities and donor agencies began to extend their action in order to develop inter-university collaborative initiatives and test various international academic models. In particular, twinning institutions, curriculum development partnerships, academic research consortiums, student/staff mobility projects, joint/dual degree programs, etc. are considered to serve as effective means of knowledge export and application. Canadian universities create effective structures and mechanisms for promoting and managing those international structures. In Canada several national organizations, including the Canadian Bureau for International
Education/CBIE, the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada/ AUCC, Canadian International Development Agency/CIDA etc. advocate international academic collaboration, broadly conceived as essential to the quality of higher education and Canada's economic, scientific, and technological competitiveness.

Collaboration in higher education according to the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada/AUCC (2007) has become an important part of the Canadian international collaboration dynamics and “appears to be one of the key strategies in developing comprehension and receptivity to foreign cultures” (Gacel-Avila, 2005, p.125). Knight (2003), analyzing Canadian academic collaborative developments, acknowledges problems in the field connected with its insufficient financial and human resources. Manning (2007) as well indicates the following concerns that can limit the increasing Canadian appetite for collaborative partnerships:

- Collaborative agreements are only as good as the leadership – at the program level, not the executive level
- Partnerships lack suitable and equal benefit
- Limitation in resources: time, money and trained personnel
- Educational partnerships do not adequately enrich government-to-government relations.

However, the majority of Canadian universities have developed clear and inclusive policies for their international operations. Those policy frameworks form a platform for the international missions and visions. According to the University of Toronto Mission Statement (2007), collaboration is considered to be one of the important university tasks “to prepare University of Toronto graduates to live and participate as global
professionals”. The University of Alberta (1991) and York University (1993) have designed vibrant internationalization policy mechanisms to focus on Canadian multicultural values and claim benefits from appreciation of Canadian diversity abroad. The international relations/collaboration divisions at these universities navigating the institutional strategies highlight the development of the student and staff departmental and institutional exchanges, joint/dual degree programs, curriculum development activities, short-term international advising projects etc. All is being done with the aim to encourage Canadians “to make knowledge of the world a vital intellectual necessity” (University of Toronto International Student Centre, 2007).

De Wit-Knight’s fundamental research “Strategies for Internationalization of Higher Education” (1995) describes prospects for the Canadian higher education internationalization. Canadian institutional tactics have three important moments related to international programs implementation. According to the authors there is a strong indication of (1) a criteria search to measure and identify successful collaborative paradigms, (2) development, adjustment and sustainability of collaborative vision and (3) an obligation to responsively deliver the planned services with strong mutual respect and professionalism.

Among the challenges that Canadian international collaborative initiatives can encounter is the fact that sporadic and short-term overseas university activities can be summarized as the programmatic strategic processes of internationalization. Also, many Canadian universities may partner with too many academic institutions and organizations simultaneously proposing the same academic product in the same setting to different users. The absence of coordination with other Western donors who present themselves as
active players in the same region may seriously undermine the credibility in the quality of Canadian services. Such projects “rather than contributing to the internationalization of a university, may instead diminish it by generating negative local attitudes toward foreigners and internationalism” (Burn, 1996, pp.17-22). According to the Canadian Bureau for International Education/CBIE, (2008), perhaps the “most salient challenge faced by Canada is that the Canadian education image abroad is of high quality, but bland. We are up against some very exciting locales and marketers with nationally coordinated “branded” marketing plans” (p.3). The CBIE approach is clear. Ontario does need its own coordinated strategy for international education to:

- Provide a framework for measuring achievement in international education under a range of categories, from curriculum internationalization to support services for international students in Ontario and Ontario students on exchange abroad
- Commit to providing internationalized curriculum and resources for Ontario institutions seeking to attract top international partners
- Support a multilevel branding program to promote Ontario education, including school boards, colleges, institutes and universities
- Connect Ontario initiatives with pan Canadian international initiatives for maximum visibility and impact
- Aim to make Ontario a leader in online learning that works across borders and links students internationally in meaningful ways to achieve cross-cultural, cross-border learning
Achieve substantial articulation between colleges and universities, and expand applied degree programs to provide attractive options both nationally and internationally

Connect northern and francophone institutions internationally through initiatives identified by them, potentially using ICT, and by providing incentives to draw international students and activity to their campuses (CBIE/International Expectations for Higher Education, 2005).

**Significance of the Study**

This study is an exploratory, qualitative investigation of the Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development project with specific attention to its management and organizational structure. The study is important because it is oriented toward practical problem solving in international project initiation and organization. This research explores the interorganizational theory along with dependency and modernization models as the main theoretical approaches that explain the specifics of the Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture. Demonstration of the importance of modifying interorganizational theory that is widely used for similar collaborative studies and the creation of knowledge necessary for international education practitioners and international education policy makers are among the goals for this research.

This research is important because it provides new editions/changes to the previous studies on the collaborative organization of Canadian-Eastern European programs. It may lead to a better understanding of established facts and characteristics of the dynamics of Canadian-Eastern European curriculum initiatives.
Oleksiyenko (2008) proposes that more research and analysis of trends and critical issues of international collaboration in higher education need to be done. Reviewing the major issues of research on higher education policy during the past four decades, Knight (2005) predicted that international collaboration in higher education would be the theme of a new focus of both higher education policy and research for the next decades. In the light of the evolution of the Canadian and Ukrainian university international collaborative work within the trajectories of globalization, this research places emphasis on the collaborative management tactics, organizational models, and rationales behind the creation of the higher education Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture. It employs different strategies to explore macro- and micro-organizational tendencies of the partnership. The research combines theoretical and conceptual frameworks, interdisciplinary literature review, individual interview data analysis and suggestions for future research. This set may qualify the proposed work as a contribution to the existing interdependence and emerged “paradigm shift” studies on collaboration management and organization. This type of investigation requires an important transition diverging from the ready-made theories and interpretations to the exploration and reposition of the traditional organizational and management models within the context of international collaboration.

**Thesis Outline**

This thesis consists of seven chapters. Chapter I provides a description of higher education internationalization globally, and specifically in Canada and in Ukraine. It introduces the Canadian and Ukrainian academic systems, describes issues and prospects of internationalization and highlights the importance of the investigation of the
international collaboration organizational models. The main research question targets the operation and the organizational specifics of the Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development project. The importance of this research is described in this chapter also.

Chapter II is a “Literature Review”. It critically examines the management of academic collaborative organizations as they relate to: a) globalization and internationalization of higher education, and b) international collaboration in higher education. Part (a) covers a multidisciplinary review of the main global forces that influence international collaboration dynamics and justifies the conceptual framework for the research. Part (b) investigates the sources of specific contributions to the analyses of collaborative processes. It defines what academic collaboration is, identifies the key components of educational partnerships and explains managerial mechanisms and techniques involved in the organizational framework of international joint ventures. The literature review shows that there is little theoretical evidence about the dynamics of university collaborations with developing countries in developing and delivering curriculum development projects. Research specifically related to the management of international academic projects with Post Soviet countries is very limited. Therefore, the literature review for this research provided an opportunity to summarize the rewards and challenges of university collaborations and strategies to improve the management of international joint venture projects.

Chapter III, the “Conceptual framework”, contains the description of three related theoretical frameworks which reflect and investigate the process of collaboration between the Canadian and Ukrainian universities. Though all three frameworks support and explain the processes and dynamics of Canadian-Ukrainian project, I emphasize the
interorganizational approach as the main approach to investigate the Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development partnership. Negotiations and challenges of the joint venture development to my mind are conceptualized most precisely within the interorganizational theory from which future sound practices can be constructed.

Chapter IV, “Methodology and Research Design”, explores tools for obtaining a holistic picture of Canadian-Ukrainian collaboration. While progress has been made in bringing together the collaborative team members from departments, universities and government, the Ukrainian side has tended to be less responsive to the researcher’s interview efforts. The methodology and research design was adapted to those circumstances. The analysis of the Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development project as a case study of the international academic joint venture with two embedded country cases highlighted the opportunities for both systems.

Chapter V, “Internationalization of Higher Education”, includes the analysis of the Canadian and Ukrainian policies on internationalization. Here, also, I analyze different international collaboration philosophies, the participant perspectives on internationalization at their universities and their description of the role the Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development project plays in the development of international initiatives in their departments.

Chapter VI provides a comprehensive description of the collaborative dynamics of the Canadian-Ukrainian academic venture via semi-structured, open-ended interview analysis. The Canadian-Ukrainian project participants talk about the collaborative procedures reflecting their parent institutional settings and purposes which complemented the creation of a new collaborative partnership. Work on the Canadian-Ukrainian
initiative, willingness to collaborate and commitment to the project goals promoted appreciation and respect of differences. Tensions and challenges were also discussed and analyzed. These tensions led to the desire to change the traditional ways of operation at the members’ home institutions. Varieties of managerial methodologies used by the members contribute to achieving positive results and illuminate the dynamic and complex nature of Canadian-Ukrainian collaboration.

Finally, Chapter VII discusses the results of the study and analyzes key findings and conclusions. Some strategies to increase effectiveness when establishing and operating collaborative academic programs have been identified. The creation of an inclusive culture of collaboration by building consensus about roles and responsibilities, aims and decision-making, negotiating differences and attitudes remains the most important task for establishing and maintaining effective international programs.
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

**Studies on International Collaboration**

In this chapter, I summarize the relevant literature in the field of international collaboration in higher education and international academic project management. Most studies of international academic joint ventures are descriptive and depict the views of various forms of partnership (Barkema & Vermeulen, 1997; Slater, 2001; Osland & Cavusgil, 1996), resource sharing (Harrigan & Hamed, 2008; Yip, 1992), the effects of partner nationality and organizational dissimilarity on joint venture decision making (Park & Ungson, 1997), and system instability and partnerships (Yan & Luo, 2001; Hicks, Beamish & Killing, 1997; Kurbatov, 2008). Some studies rely on quantitative or mixed method analysis of joint venture locations and performance at a certain time period (Oja 1996; Oja & Smulyan, 1998); some describe joint venture types and their characteristics (Brindlye, 2003; Kwan, 2005; Oleksiyenko, 2008), or the level of institutional readiness and styles of leadership (Barnes & Phillips, 2000). Lasker, Weiss and Miller (2001) analyze the reasons for losing partnership stability. Lin and Germain (1998) describe the relationship of collaborative context and partnership performance. The majority of the above mentioned studies describe various components of academic partnerships and help to understand and analyze the joint venture’s performance according to its functional parameters, i.e. setting goals, decision-making, communication, and knowledge dissemination, which is important for this research.

As Canadian-Ukrainian project was unfolding in the international setting, I was particularly interested in multicultural descriptions of university collaboration. A number of studies on collaborative accomplishments (Lambert, 1994)) and cultural identities
(Shah, 2004; Mestenhauser, 2000) investigate collaboration through the prism of cultural influences. They highlight the appreciation of cultural differences and peculiarities of professional decision-making (Slater, 2001). The commitment to work together creates a picture of a joint structure which is “responsible for the specific cultural needs and challenges of its participants” (Ravid & Handler, 2001, p.142). This phenomenon was particularly important for the Canadian-Ukrainian investigation, as commitment in the Canadian-Ukrainian setting was among the major goals. Lin and Germain (2004) advise that the current debates on academic collaboration should focus more precisely on the “cultural context variables, which are central in predicting successful international joint venture performance” (p.27).

The literature review for Canadian-Ukrainian collaboration research examines two aspects of international collaborative processes as they relate to:

a) Globalization and internationalization of higher education

b) Cooperation, coordination and collaboration in higher education and the specifics of managing the international joint venture organization.

Those two domains include the analysis of scholars’ efforts to make sense of academic internationalization processes, particularly with regard to the academic joint venture development. Part a) covers the multidisciplinary research review of the main global forces that influence the dynamics of international collaboration and justifies the conceptual framework for the research. Part b) investigates sources of specific contributions to the success and effectiveness of collaborative processes organization. Analysis of the research literature helps to define motifs for international collaboration among higher educational institutions and to identify the key components of educational
partnerships. It describes the main personal and organizational characteristics of collaborators and leads to the identification of specifics of joint venture management.

The literature indicates that international collaboration processes are influenced by wide-ranging theoretical and ideological interdisciplinary debates about the partners’ interpretation of the cultural approaches to collaboration. The “periphery” approach in the analysis of the counterpart’s performance, the estimation of partnership goals, assessment of outcomes and dissemination capacity of joint venture results (Altbach, 1998) may indicate the dominance of one partner over the other. Kurbatov (2008) notices that the content, style of work, and professional expectations transferred from the collaborators’ home institutions into a collaborative joint venture may be controversial. However, the Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development joint venture indicates that international joint ventures can be managed as a mutual, thoughtful and predicted enterprise. The successful collaborative relationships rely on careful management of daily operations, prevention and resolution of internal conflicts, and formulation of the long/short term strategies. It depends on how an alliance was initially structured concerning equity and mutuality, and how old their relationship is (Lin & Germain, 1998). Disagreements and misunderstandings inevitably occur, providing evidence for new patterns and abilities for conflict resolution (Kornfeld & Leyden, 2001). The understanding and interpretation of the collaborative process can protect or ruin an international joint venture as a unit. This may lead to change, failure or improvement or may create intellectual excitement.

In most cases, collaboration means strengthening the participating academic systems, improving competitiveness, as well as, improving the image and the position of foreign academic institutions in a recipient country (Kurbatov, 2008). In the Canadian-
Ukrainian case, the reconsideration of management tactics, the development of new approaches to decision-making and role distribution were important steps for the optimization of the collaborative action.

**Globalization and Collaboration in Higher Education**

The global social and environmental mega-changes have confronted universities with increasing challenges of competitiveness and interdependence. Current political, economic and academic attention is focused on the ability to build effective partnerships, understand their nature and get to the core of the joint venture phenomenon. People hope for a better future when they see collaboration in action and are willing to live on the edge, understanding its wins and its losses (Barnes & Phillips, 2000). New “global village” consciousness, based on mutual understanding and readiness for change, is a key aspect of educational reform in many academic systems. Reform for the sake of diversity appreciation requires a change of mentality and, therefore, a change of educational paradigms (Gacel-Avila, 2005; Knight, 2003; Mundy et al., 2002; Mestenhauser, 2000).

Increased efforts are needed from all to make sense of the global age, forcing development of international collaboration “as an effective tool to respond to the pressures of globalization and develop policies of engagement and solution to international problems in the educational systems of different countries” (Luijten-Lub et al., 2005, p.150). Global academic linkages are becoming more visible in an increasing number of collaborative initiatives, such as transnational educational brands/branch campuses, international consortia, offshore independent academic institutions, trans-regional institutional departments, study centers, virtual universities, cross-border degree recognition initiatives, and university curriculum development partnerships (Knight,
Diversification of collaborative developments among higher educational institutions contributes to the “intercultural understanding and/or misunderstanding within nations across the globe and point toward the need to help students navigate themselves in the global informational age” (McLaren, 1998, p. 42).

The major platform for the development of collaborative initiatives is educational policy. An international academic joint venture as a new model of a policy operation conceptualizes new/different approaches to a local academic tradition and transfers new organizational structures to the cultural core beliefs. It investigates existing communication patterns and transforms the behavior of individual participants into organizational behavioral patterns. Collaborative initiatives affect the core of internationalization: the “increasing interconnectedness between national educational systems in which borders and national authorities are not questioned; it is perceived as a steerable policy process” (Van der Wende, 2002, p.49). The cross border interconnectedness serves as a foundation for integrating collaborative strategies into institutional mission, vision and developmental policies. Such processes create a system of change. International education policies and their interpretations of the Canadian–Ukrainian collaborative initiative are important features of the proposed research of curriculum development collaboration.

**Research on Collaboration**

Hill (n.d.) argues that collaboration in education “creates a new educational vision able to provide the global society with education that meets current needs and can respond efficiently to contemporary demands and challenges which are characterized by globalization, interdependence and multiculturalism” (in Ravid &Handler, 2001, p.17).
Educational theorists attempt to develop rationales to support international educators who explore collaborative educational ventures. Numerous studies highlight collaborative cultures and contexts (Altbach, 2002; Knight 2002, 2003, 2004), language and joint university curriculum development initiatives (Schoorman, 1999; Kushnarenko, 2002), international collaborations between public and private higher institutions (Altbach, 2002; Mundy 2005, 2006; Cogan & Derricott, 1998; Hanvey, 1982; Kerr, 1990), university collaboration and responsible citizenship in an interdependent world (Evans 2005; Kurbatov, 2008), private authorities and offshore educational ventures created by private academic services’ providers (Bhanji, 2009; Knight, 2006). This research is a sign of a growing interest in exploring and expanding the importance of international academic collaboration in national agendas. It justifies the need to intensify and strengthen a dialogue amongst universities globally and pursue further research in the field of academic collaboration.

Reviewing the macro and micro influences on Canadian university internationalization policies, Knight (2003) notes that “in light of the evolution of the international work of universities in Canada over the last four decades the research focus on the international dimension of higher education is needed and welcome” (p.121). Ravid and Handler (2001), predicting the future of educational joint venture research trends, assert that “joint academic ventures would be the theme of a new focus of both higher education policy and research; an analysis of the factors that contribute to the success or failure of joint venture structures and their operational processes will illuminate problems examining them in a comparative perspective” (p.163).
Contemporary research on international collaboration responds to the collaborators’ practical needs. The concepts of power, equity, culture, diversity etc. indicate how international academic collaboration is perceived at a particular time and region of the world. It is important in collaborative practices not to be dependent on power struggles that can devour the energy needed for running and developing the joint projects (National Center for Technology Innovation, 2005). The power and dominance influence on international collaboration and the interpretation of this influence by the Canadian and Ukrainian sides were fundamental dimensions that shaped the joint venture participants negotiations.

Gacel-Avila (2005) writes that internationalization and international collaborative initiatives “brought the end of the 20th century to a situation of profound and increasing inequality, exclusion and misunderstanding among nations” (p.43). Altbach (2002) adds: “a few countries dominate in global scientific systems; the new technologies are owned primarily by multinational corporations or academic institutions in the major Western industrialized nations, and the domination of English creates advantages for the countries that use English as the medium of instruction and research. All this means that the developing countries find themselves dependent on the major academic superpowers” (p.32). It was very important for the Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development team to find its own way in organizing collaboration. Equality and balance were two key principles during the partnership initiation and development. Two teams from Canada and Ukraine were trying their best to create a strong academic alliance with a positive impact on people and curriculum. The question was not who was stronger or weaker, or
who had more sophisticated power influence mechanisms. The question was about the balance of experience and commitment in reaching the joint goals.

Dynamics of International Collaboration: Key Features

The Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development investigation highlighted the specifics of the international project’s management and organization. The literature on dynamics and organization of international university collaboration, and specifically international partnerships in higher education (Altbach, 2002, 2004, 2005) outlines its rationales (Welch, 1997; Burak & Hoffa, 2006), gives descriptions of collaborative academic activities and approaches (Pursell et al., 2004; Ravid & Handler, 2001; Tushnet, 1993), offers effective models and detailed resource analysis for collaborators (Borthwick, 2001; Fim’yar, 2008; Gates-Duffield & Stark, 2001) and proposes risk prevention tactics (Kurbatov, 2008), etc. Kushnarenko (2002) and Bhanji (2009) admit that international education partnerships may create systematic changes within partner institutional structures and can be a culmination of “sustained interactions between people who are representatives of their university culture, structure and functions” (Slater, 2001, p.45).

Various scholars highlight the following important academic partnership components:

- Recognition of common goals (Gray, 1989)
- Sustainability and coordinated steps in delegating responsibilities and decision making (Ravid & Handler, 2001)
- Professional development based on shared responsibilities and role recognition (Burak, P. & Hoffa, 2006; Van der Wende, 1994)
- Establishment of a set of priorities (Slater, 2001; Gates-Duffield & Stark, 2001)
- Readiness to accept different approaches and change (Huse & Cummings, 1985)
- Transformation (Kurbatov, 2008)
- Connections, sharing and exchanges for mutual benefit (Schramm, Bickel, Mc Nelis, Pine, 2001).

Such studies explain an academic partnership through definition and analysis of its major components (Kurbatov, 2008). Another group of scholars (Manning, 2007; Reed, 2000) argues that to generate a comprehensive picture of international joint ventures is quite problematic because of multiple systems, ideologies, doctrines, values, etc. Some studies picture collaborative structures as “units of autonomous actors, institutional cultures, governments steering from distance” (Luijten-Lub, 2005). These units are organized temporarily to pursue a certain joint initiative and represent another direction in research analysis. The “activity versus process” approach (De Wit, 2003) warns about the lack of sustainability of culturally diverse collaborative groups and their “limited time and professional ability to manage multicultural academic structures” (Kurbatov, 2008).

The analysis of the Ukrainian university practices (Fim’yar, 2008, Kushnarenko, 2002) reveals some common factors and approaches to collaboration with the West. The authors highlight the fact that the regional collaborators often do not have enough capacity to develop a mutual concept of the collaboration phenomenon. The lack of clarity and collaborative vision concerning joint goals and expected outcomes, rules of involvement, roles and responsibilities negatively influence the key expectations on both sides. The consequences for sharing and learning situations in this case are obvious: a
partnership loses the ability to recognize degraded predictors of poor performance (Burn, 1996) and identify proper strategies for further activities.

The major challenge for the Ukrainian academic policy makers is to design the strategy for mutual intention framed in the project’s major “cutting edges” (Nikitin, 2006) and present it clearly to their partners. Joint venture participants are expected to react adequately and articulate their needs and challenges accordingly (De Wit, 2003). Relying on “unclear predefined and determined perspectives discourses rather than on the practical stances research, despite the dedication and expertise from the both sides, the participants often do not share a mutual understanding of a complex practical collaborative context” (Wiburg and Lozano, 2001, p. 47). It is a big challenge to open meaningful, reciprocal communication channels within a partnership in order to prevent incomprehensible donor behaviour and recipient bewilderment (Handler and Ravid, 2001).

**Facilitators and Barriers of Collaboration**

The Canadian educational system is radically different from the Ukrainian system which approached Canada with collaborative intentions to develop an international curriculum. It is therefore important to gain the understanding of the collaborative aim and to create a mutual vision and strategy for each stage of the collaboration process. Research on what works and what does not work highlights the “behavioral expectations of each other in a partnership and provides a map to navigate the trends and complex relations among the members of a collaborative group” (Sosin & Parham, 2001, p.14). Hasslen, Bacharach, Rotto and Fribey (2001) developed a typology of the facilitators and barriers to collaboration which is described in the Table 1. below. Table 1. is based on
Hasslen’s (2001) and Kurbatov’s (2008) research findings and reports about the main facilitators and obstacles to academic collaboration.

Table 1.

*Facilitators and Barriers to Collaboration*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitators to Collaboration</th>
<th>Barriers to Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <em>Initial contact leading to building relationships over time</em></td>
<td>1. <em>Absence of a strong initial action</em> (formal/informal dialogue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <em>Resources to provide the time and incentive for people to participate</em></td>
<td>2. <em>Insufficient financial, time and human capacity</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <em>Trusting, respectful dialogue</em>: desire to share expertise, learn about the partner’s academic culture and educational priorities, to borrow the partner’s competency in curriculum content design and methodology, personal respect*</td>
<td>3. <em>Multiple foci and expectations while establishing goals</em> (forced to undertake too many goals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <em>People who are willing to compromise</em>: ability to provide time and incentive participants, knowledge of each partner’s particular context and shared understandings*</td>
<td>4. <em>Differences in the culture of two institutions</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <em>Open, honest, tactful and frequent communication among all participants</em>: growing understanding, personal trust and respect, flexibility “boundary spanners”* <em>(Lambert, 1991)</em></td>
<td>5. <em>Authoritarian decision-making, unclear instructions and communication</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <em>Agreement of all participants on the principal curriculum philosophies</em>: commitment to the acceptance, development and evolution of different perspectives and practices*</td>
<td>6. <em>Basic philosophical differences in content and methodologies, teaching and learning</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <em>Clarity of roles in the partnership</em>: commitment to the relationship, clear purpose that brings partners together, shared beliefs in the value of a task*</td>
<td>7. <em>Misunderstanding of the main responsibilities of participants</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <em>Support of administration from the Ministry and both institutions</em>: integrity and professionalism of leaders*</td>
<td>8. <em>Inability to directly address conflict</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. <em>Willingness to take risk. Need to push the collaboration perimeters</em>: openness to new ideas, and opportunities, willingness to share perspectives, policies and practices for the successful completion of the purpose. A relationship that is not threatening to both partners. Values safety, trust, integrity, reliability and comfort*</td>
<td>9. <em>Mistrust, suspicion, lack of understanding with partners, uncertainty of project future</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Clear process of decision-making: creativity to think outside the “norms” and “instructions” in the generation of leadership strategies to undertake the required tasks and to solve problems that arise

11. Positive feedback: joint ownership of and responsibility for the relationship. Each partner has a stake in the success

12. Mutuality: partners gain professional expertise from the collaboration (this does not necessarily mean financial or travel awards)

13. Partners as collaborative and critical learners: sustainable process of transforming individuals into active agents of change.

10. Following the orders from “upstairs”, personal benefits

11. Unwillingness to disseminate the project results, keeping the experiences and mistakes from peer criticism

12. Absence of self-motivation: no desire to make difference or undertake a particular project task


This table summarizes the developments and dynamics of academic partnerships and identifies key factors for their effectiveness. The authors point out that partners acquire expertise and knowledge in the process of “the arrival to shared vision which is the crowning glory of a partnership” (Hasslen et al, 2001). In order to achieve productivity in joint ventures, it is necessary to: (1) secure appropriate funding (2) jointly establish a vision for the project along with achievable goals (3) recognize the normalcy of “professional tensions” along the way (Kurbatov, 2008), and (4) insure open, honest communication. Partners need to “toughen up, openly and honestly address issues to resolve conflicts” (Hasslen et al, 2001) and set realistic expectations.

The Canadian and Ukrainian partners admitted the importance of participation in a transparent process of decision-making and the willingness to change roles when time and circumstances demanded. According to the Canadian-Ukrainian project participants, a supportive administration in external and internal conflicts prevents the scheduling of conflicts and helps to facilitate communication. Kurbatov (2008a) agrees that a joint venture team may set the level of the administrative interference, predicts resistance to
proposed change and regulates external pressure. Steffel and Steltenkamp (2001) admit “since our collaborative project was not illegal, immoral or fattening we were cautiously optimistic in our hopes to continue to have the same administrative support, sufficient funding and time to accomplish our goals” (p.89). The skill to maintain a balance between a certain degree of freedom and administrative support is very important.

The commitment to a partnership from the partners and stakeholders as Sosin and Parham (2001) acknowledge “leads to learning together, the development of mutual respect, trust and need to take the actions to sustain the relationships” (p.110). Finally, the majority of academic project participants, according to Robb and Cronin (2001), may experience “the profound personal and professional change. Each of us revealed and critiqued their basic philosophical assumptions about pedagogy, peer relationships and the ways we carry out the day-to-day activities in our professional academic lives” (p.129). Partners highlight that “individual change in the process of collaborative interaction is the most important result of work together” (Freedman & Salmon, 2001, p. 180).

Analyzing the essential features of western/ Swedish university collaboration with Ukraine, Kurbatov (2008) reflects on the critical necessity of positive feedback from the external stakeholders and institutions acting as collaborative and critical learners. The administrative units (ministries) and individuals (departmental administrators) who were usually not directly involved in the project activities but influenced the networking and financial policies reminded participants from time to time about being “informed and involved in the processes of decision making” (Fim’yar, 2008). Sometimes an unhelpful administration uses its involvement in specific ways to:
• Follow their (administration) own purposes
• Ignore the partner efforts
• “Make erroneous assumptions about those efforts” (Hasslen, 2001, p.17).

For the developing countries, according to Kurbatov (2008), participation in international projects usually is a stimulus for professional growth and reflects a desire for recognition from their administration. Some participants from Ukraine and other Eastern European universities, for instance, “are inspired by their possibility for further promotion and gaining respect among the local and international academic community” (Fim’yar, 2008, p. 17); others participate because it is a good opportunity “to climb up the professional staircase” (Reed, 2000, p.23). An opportunity provided by a joint venture on how to work together with foreigners, the personal and group commitment to achieving a common goal is a true opportunity for a personal and professional growth. It was not important “who was who and what professional level they were at before the partnership, it no longer mattered who did what at home, it only mattered that we had been given the opportunity to work together where the individual and professional voices blended so well” (Gates-Duffield & Stark, 2001, p.57).

What do we know about the main characteristics of international academic partnerships, which in spite of political, economic and social turbulences, and disturbing external influences, showed commitment and mutuality? Collaboration is “the culmination of sustained interactions between people who represent their parent organization’s structure and function. It is characterized by a systemic change effort to overcome the limitations of habitus” (Slater, 2001, p.11). If the major collaborative project phases (goal setting, outcomes analysis, decision making, role distribution, results
dissemination) are performed dynamically and competently, the results achieved at these benchmarks show a project’s capacity for success. These benchmarks are characterized by the need to constantly reevaluate its own and borrowed professional development tools and to develop a commitment to shared learning. They show the level of readiness to work together with a strong and/or different partner.

Desire for two or more institutions to establish links and collaborate may be not enough to run a partnership. Collaboration is a source of learning, an ability to help to turn individual learning into shared learning and serve as an example to follow (Robb & Cronin, 2001). The main features of a partnership according to Handler and Ravid (2001) are highlighted in Table 2 below. Here an academic partnership is a structure that works on international education project goals in the proposed time frames and builds its collaborative relationships towards openness and trust.

Table 2.

Main Positive Features of an Academic Partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared education philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong commitment to the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual respect for the knowledge base each partner brought to the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular and ongoing communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment of time on an ongoing basis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being respected and considered an equal by the partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual ownership and commitment to all phases of the project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The categories in Table 2 describe the important elements of an academic partnership which I am using for the Canadian-Ukrainian partnership investigation. I am interested
how these categories, as collaboration components, might work in different settings, which according to Handler and Ravid (2001), might be also characterized by the features in Table 3.

Table 3.

Main Negative Features of an Academic Partnership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lack of shared vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of shared focus (thought both partners can be committed to the project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power struggles among partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular, inconsistent communication among partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to work with each other; working parallel to each other instead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of recognition and support in respective educational context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict of schedule; difficulty in finding time to meet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of clear agreement of division of labour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ukrainian-Canadian collaboration may display characteristics indicated in both tables because the partnership process includes modification of goals, needs, resources and interactions; members move through stages of development, stabilization and institutionalization (Borthwick, 1994). Clark (1998) warns that the partnership can slide back from later to earlier stages, fail to maintain structure, but also can move fairly easy through the “turbulence of contextual and physical variables” (Green, 1985, p.v).

According to Vozzo and Bober (2001), personal characteristics and attitudes are both important and necessary to sustain an effective collaboration. In order to contribute to a long-lasting relationship and apply the best individual practices to collaborative relations, it is important to link the best individual partner qualities with collaborative team mutual actions. Nikitin (2006) refers to the importance of the individual players in
initiating and maintaining informal contacts with key policy and process figures. Informal contacts contribute immensely to the success of joint ventures, as major collaborative proposals may be discussed at informal meetings. According to Table 2., personal attitudes to timelines play an important role in meeting the project deadline and completing a certain project’s phase within the expected time frame (for some international project participants the project timeline might be much shorter than for the others).

Academic collaboration and a “sense of a person” in it define the concept of culture in collaborative settings and assert that academic collaboration usually occurs in the intersection of two or more cultures (Mattessich & Monsey, 1992). There are, according to the authors, four important personal dimensions, which distinguish one collaborative culture from the other. These dimensions are applicable to international collaboration among universities in the developed and developing countries:

- Work tempo and the nature of professional time
- Professional focus, from theoretical to practical
- Reward structures
- Sense of personal power and efficacy, or the connection one perceives between one's educational efforts and intended outcomes.

Vozzo and Bober (2001) combine the major personal characteristics of joint venture participants in clusters to describe how personal commitment affects the outcomes of a project. Their research highlighted “how to advance possible joint venture structures for reflection of identity, what personal qualities and actions were important for enhancing the professional growth of educators” (Vozzo & Bober, 2001, p.233).
Vozzo and Bober (2001) emphasize four important factors that allow personal characteristics to contribute to successful partnerships. They are:

- Time for practitioners to plan their activities, to know and reflect on the professional and personal expectations of participants
- Ability to make an analysis of the chosen methods and strategies to ensure effectiveness of action
- Resources available to develop participant commitment
- Funds available to sustain the planned and emerging activities.

Personal commitment to the project goals leads to the development of mutual beliefs and values. Shared commitment, real partnership negotiations and constant desire for improvement will be achieved as a result of creating an opportunity for maximum realization of the members’ personal qualities.

### Personal Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mutual participation</th>
<th>Growing personal trust and respect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm for learning</td>
<td>Beliefs and values, vision, culture for reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared goals and commitment</td>
<td>Critical professional partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>Sense of personal power and efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong interpersonal skills</td>
<td>Effective communications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collaboration Process: Major Phases. Setting the Goals

This section describes the specifics of the major collaborative project phases. They are: Goals and Outcomes, Rules of Involvement and Role Distribution, Decision Making and Knowledge Dissemination. Ideally, members of an international collaborative team concentrate their efforts on the establishment of the common project goals and clearly identify what they hope to achieve. To establish common goals the partners need to focus collective energy and resources for shared solutions (French & Bell, 1984), create a web of interdependence among the partnership members in order to discuss their intentions (Zywine, 1991) and enhance human and intellectual diversity consistent with core cultural values (Knight, 2006).
The partners’ own history of collaboration may accelerate the process of goal setting and the initiation of effective discussion. It is important at the initial stage to set the concrete task followed by the written objectives and description of the necessary procedural steps (Grobe, 1993). There are a lot of serious professional, societal, educational and cultural issues within the developing country that make the goal setting phase a challenging one. Among them are (1) misunderstandings among the external stakeholders’ (the ministry), a disadvantaged economic position and inability for substantial institutional cost-sharing (Kurbatov, 2008); (2) the criticism of the partner’s project management skills and ongoing delays caused by work habits (Sinclair & Pierre, 2001); (3) the partners’ schedules do not meet expectations of the joint team; and (4) the use of English as a lingua franca of academic international joint ventures (Altbach, 2002). These challenges have a major influence on goal setting.

A number of researchers highlight the need to find ways to negotiate meaningfully during the goal setting process (Huse & Cummings, 1985). Effective negotiation and communication skills are crucial for potential conflict resolution, clear definition of actors’ responsibilities, delineating the decision-making process, establishing a viable means of communication and managing personal responsibilities. Achieving a mutual goal/vision demands commitment from individuals who are willing to be reflective, flexible and unafraid of change or confrontation (Maeroff, 1983). Tushnet (1993) identified seven factors, which influence the collaborative unit goal-setting stage:

- Environment
- Membership characteristics
• Techniques of collaborative negotiations
• Institutional structure and culture
• Communication
• Resources and output.

These seven factors show that international academic partnerships are not closed systems. They are open for negotiation, influenced by external and internal forces and are themselves an “appropriate response to the environmental turbulence or uncertainty of member organizations” (Slater, 2001, p.26). They are inclined to adopt the developmental guidelines of their external environments, address partners and their own needs, provide accountability and quality assurance, and take responsibility for all the risks.

When goals are identified and clearly stated they can be perceived differently by different collaborative team players at different phases of a project. Perhaps there can be as many goals and their interpretations as there are participants (Borthwick, 2001). The ideological and cultural differences, personal perceptions about purposes of collaboration can contribute to partnership challenges and should be addressed at the initial stage of a partnership.

Participants need to be clear about their major purpose for involvement in collaboration (Ravid & Handler, 2001). It is necessary for international partners to understand that goals can be viewed and interpreted from different frames of reference. But both sides, by concentrating on mutuality and shared commitment, should be able to say, “this is a good mutual thing to do” (Ogawa, 2002, p.12). Havelock (1982) states that a mutually stated goal can be expected to add strength to a partnership in conceptual, as well as, practical matters.
The mechanism that gives the goal-setting stage its unique advantage is synergy (Borthwick, 2001). Its framework for operationalizing, assessing intentions and identifying their likely determinants is used to address evaluation and management issues related to what is planned to be achieved (Lasker, 2001). Synergy as the joint interaction of partnership agents helps to “develop and sustain the vision when partners continue to solve problems together, but also may make adjustments to their initial agreements, as they build a longer term working relationship aimed to successfully fulfill their goals” (National Center for Technology Innovation, 2005, p.3). The goal-setting stage works effectively when different skills, experience, resources and values come together to make a holistic picture of intentions based on mutually assessed capacity, professionalism, and trustworthiness. Collaboration teams with strong intentions are built on the ability to navigate diverse abilities toward their goal: to improve the professional lives of collaborators (Dasko, 2002).

**Outcomes: Project Result Evaluation**

The major reason for members staying involved in a partnership includes successfully meeting goals, mutual evaluation and appreciation of the outcomes at every phase of the collaborative process (Borthwick, 2001). Clark (1999a) warns “the thing that sinks collaboration is a lack of necessary strategies to properly assess results you were aiming for, to see if everyone’s looking at the project outcomes in the same way” (p.13). Project outcomes have a direct impact on the motivation of the members of a partnership, the university systems, and the wider international community to maintain support for the collaborative idea. Evaluating project results, “partners often feed on exchanging ideas, imagining new possibilities, understanding from different perspectives how people learn,
finding ways to design something that is useful in a new way, or applying received knowledge to their own new use” (National Center for Technology Innovation, 2003, p.4). Individual (Kurbatov, 2008) and group commitment (Tushnet, 1993; Borthwick, 2001) continuing through the stages of collaboration enables participants to be content with small successes at each stage and adequately evaluate their ultimate achievements (Lafleur & MacFaden, 2001).

Collaborations usually run over an extended period of time and are results-oriented. It requires that “participants believe that important and useful purposes are being accomplished over time” (Trubowitz & Longo, 1997, p. 97). Both partners try to deliver a response which is “thorough, thoughtful, and on-target” (National Center for Technology Innovation, 2005, p.4). This response articulates the practical benefits of the project. The collaborators will take whatever steps are needed to support the chosen methodology to achieve the project’s goals and are secure in their expectation that the project will be sustained after its final official stage. Though all collaborations are different, collaborators can benefit from the lessons they’ve learned. Clark (1999b) notes that “a partnership which has as its purpose the creation of “the partnership”- rather than the accomplishment of some ultimate result approved and evaluated by all- is inevitably doomed to failure” (p.23).

**Rules of Involvement**

When an academic partnership is formed and the international team members have set expectations, determined goals, and distributed roles, the clarification of rules for involvement is one of the most challenging tasks the collaborators face. At the initial stage there is a need to clarify and clearly articulate the roles and responsibilities of the
participants: who is doing what, whom to substitute and what is expected out of his/her role (Grobe, 1993). Each actor needs to know the various aspects of his/her role such as: (1) how and to what degree to engage in the partnership activities, (2) what to be responsible for, (3) what tools to use to solve problems and achieve effective individual performance, and (4) how free one can be in choosing a personal style in a collective performance (Ravid & Handler, 2001). The choice of rules of involvement reflects the degree of mutual respect, trust, and reliability that can be developed through the process of collaboration (Vozzo & Bober, 1991). Setting the rules of involvement that are manifested in “attitudes, behaviour and dollars” (Borthwick, 2001, p.74) is critical to achieve participant commitment. The degree of participant involvement “prevents the work from stalling and falling victim to power struggles that can devour the energy needed for running and developing the project” (National Center for Technology Innovation, 2005, p.4). The adequate role performance leads to sustaining collaborative project vision and mutual ongoing planning. New roles can emerge in the process. Context is important and “if all of a sudden things fall apart, if they don’t agree with you about those basics” (Ravid & Handler, p.12), the project managers should quickly evaluate the situation and assign new roles. The partners cannot walk away, but need to continue to develop a common understanding of their roles in the project. As the collaboration happens in a non-hierarchical setting (Tunshet, 1993), a project coordinator is expected to share his/her leadership role and responsibilities, though this may be easier said than done (Kersh & Masztal, 1998). Borthwick (2001) argues that leaders from both sides and a core planning team serve as “idea generators, oversight providers, policy developers or strategic planners” (p.79). Participation of project implementers should be
carefully planned, considered and examined (Gray, 1989; Tunshet, 1993).

Complementary diverse roles of all stakeholders should not be neglected, but be expected to add strength to a partnership in conceptual, as well as, practical matters (Padak, et al., 1994). It is crucial to trace how main actors were selected, what major groups/individuals were included, and how inclusive these decisions were. Intriligator (1986) points out that members must work on “commitment at both personal and institutional levels” (p.17). Reed (2000) highlights the importance of member openness in sharing constraints on their participation. Handler and Ravid (2001) identified the following necessary actions to explain the process of roles/responsibilities distribution:
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**Initial Contact**

Building an initial contact leads to role distribution, defining responsibilities and expected outcomes. Open to new ideas and opportunities.

Growing understanding through the assigned roles, awareness of a need to collaborate; mutual dialogue via professional performance.

Possible disagreement on time frames and responsibilities load (mutually developed mechanisms on problem and conflict solving).

Growing personal commitments and trust through learning and assessment of potential conflict.

**Partnership**

Different approaches are valued, synergy prevails. All efforts are directed towards consensus, commitment to success as a group.

*Figure 2. Distribution of roles and responsibilities.*

For many international academic joint ventures, the distribution of roles and responsibilities is an important though difficult process. A multicultural team may need
to determine concrete steps to insure that the workload is fair and responsibilities are well understood. The roles and responsibility distribution process aligned with the decision-making dynamics promotes, shapes and reinforces the expected quality and performance.

**Decision Making Dynamics**

Kersh and Masztal (1998) warn, “unilateral decisions destroy a partnership” (p.24). Inclusive and collaborative decision-making creates consensus through appreciation of differences when the participant’s needs, responsibilities and requests are being met.

Analyzing the benefits of collaborative decision making, Trubowitz and Longo (1997) suggest that the process can serve as a form of self-correction in which partners reject “bad or premature ideas” (p.27) and propose their own. If partnership members need to seek authorization from top-level management in their organization, it could serve as a barrier to their full participation in the decision-making process (Smith, 1999, Fim’yar, 2008). Horizontal power distribution, no domination from any side, clear expectations, and shared responsibilities are important factors for effective decision making. Action planning serves as a method to determine the operational steps and to solve problems that can be expected to arise during the normal course of collaborative action (Borthwick, 1994; Trubowitz & Longo, 1997). Bringing together the representatives from diverse cultures can create dissonance, conflict and anxiety (Maldonado et al., 1994) but also can add a dynamic element to decision making. Fullan (1999) discusses the importance and sustainable efforts of team building. He suggests that, if necessary, groups obtain assistance to learn how to work together.
Knowledge Dissemination

Borthwick (2001) proposed that members be encouraged to think of partnership as an opportunity for resources and knowledge to be exchanged. Through established International Academic Resource Centres, the project materials can be disseminated widely in the community and among other academic institutions of a recipient country. An ongoing system of research via such centres is among the elements contributing to the success of educational partnerships (Wangemann, 1989). The dissemination process for the joint project provides an overview of the partnership structure, process, and agenda (Sirotnik, 2002), and creates an opportunity for a collaborative paradigm change for future partnerships (Kurbatov, 2008). Tunshet (1993) recommends the wide dissemination of a collaborative project feedback to be “a part of regular public meetings of the academic community” (p.97). Dissemination of project results helps the members examine partnership activities (McGill & Peterson, 1999). Kersh and Masztal (1998) note that partners should disseminate knowledge about the process and evaluation of their partnerships within their institutions across all areas of collaborative process, including goals, outcomes, members, needs, roles and responsibilities, and stages. They should disseminate that knowledge through widely publishing and presentations at scientific forums.

Policy developers designing an international collaborative project focus on a specific context for techniques to disseminate results. They take into consideration the partner institutions’ procedures and politics (Borthwick, 2001; Fullan, 1999), academic climate (Trubowitz & Longo, 1997) and their own past mistakes (Reed, 2000). Trubowitz and Longo (1997) highlight the importance of understanding that each collaborative
venture will present its own specific institutional set of challenges, although not every one will be willing to talk about mistakes and flaws in their joint project. It is important to prevent others from making those mistakes. Ideas and best professional practices are “continually being generated, tested and disseminated through analysis of the areas of diversity and similarity” (Kurbatov, 2008). Such analysis allows identification of effective ways to disseminate the project’s best experiences and pointing out ways to avoid potential zones of conflict, thereby creating desired frameworks for future collaborations.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, international and comparative education researchers, educational administrators and practitioners of academic joint ventures describe the characteristics of various collaborative academic projects and highlight the specifics of their organization. From the different collaborative organizational models described in the literature review, I am focusing my research on the investigation of the Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development projects’ goals and outcomes, role distribution, decision making dynamics and results dissemination techniques which represent the specifics of mutual action in the Canadian-Ukrainian collaborative configuration. I highlight the major joint actions in the organization and management of collaborative activities that are likely to be the key factors for future effective partnerships. Individual project participant motivations combined with the collective responsibility become the important components of the Canadian-Ukrainian partnership behavior based on mutual expected benefits. The concept of interest evolution as a part of this research conceptual framework is a major element of Canadian-Ukrainian collaborative negotiations. The collaborative decision-
making techniques based on participant needs, responsibilities and requests generate
strategies for knowledge sharing in the Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture. Many
researchers consider the participation in international activities as an increased
opportunity for faculty professional development and a tool for the maximization of
limited resources.

Among the challenges that influence the decision-making techniques and general
project management are differences in institutional values/culture and internationalization
strategy priorities. These tend to protect institutional identity and autonomy. A serious
obstacle to effective collaboration may be the unwillingness to challenge the status quo;
concern about maintaining control over a project and differences in approach to the
philosophy of curriculum development. Insufficient knowledge about the partner’s
culture and organizational specifics may lead to the unexpected complexity of
communication requiring additional knowledge of a local system, underestimation of the
time required for curriculum design and unified approval of the collaborative team’s
responsibilities. In my research I have made an effort to fill the knowledge gap in the
sphere of challenges to academic joint ventures and to analyze the main features that may
increase the successful outcome of international academic projects. According to various
authors, the agents for effectiveness are quality time and true commitment to creating a
collaborative environment, building consensus about roles and responsibilities,
maintaining the capacity for flexibility and establishing true collaborative
communication. The identification and description of these multifaceted processes in the
Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture develops evidence for collaborative efforts’ beneficial
outcome.
The literature on collaborative academic joint ventures is particularly insightful in helping to understand changing modes of collaboration through the improvement of managerial mechanisms. It informs the initial terminology presented in Chapter 1 and explores concepts of relevance for advancing an initial understanding of joint venture organization described in Chapter V.

The key insights discussed in this review of research literature engage in some divergent interpretations and serve as an initial understanding of the specifics of the Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture managerial mechanisms. The literature helps to look for insights to help to diagnose some minor, but important, peripherals in modeling the Canadian-Ukrainian partnership model’s conceptual framework which is discussed in the next chapter.
CHAPTER III: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Several theoretical frameworks can be used to build a foundation and serve as navigation for a study of international partnerships in higher education. The multiple theory framework (MTF), when two or more theories are combined together to explain a researched phenomenon, proposes a theoretical connection with various disciplines and provides a holistic conceptual approach to understanding the phenomenon of academic internationalization. The MTF admits that a certain theoretical framework can take a leading position in its explanatory propositions that illustrate the dynamics of collaboration and demonstrate the complex interplay of both content and process of collaboration. Other MTF “accompanying” theories can serve as an important background for the major theory to explain the complex interconnected context of academic internationalization.

The three related theories-interorganizational, dependency and modernization-illuminate international collaboration offering a lens for describing an international educational partnership as an organization and a social activity unit. Those three frameworks take into account the economic, political, economic and social circumstances of collaboration (Holmes, 1981) and propose a more precise view of the range and depth of negotiations between Canada as a donor university and Ukraine as the recipient. The three theories form a kind of a “combination model” characterized by an aspiration to achieve a common result through assembling different and separate but coordinated elements. However, the act of combining things in a new unit does not guarantee the successful result. Unpredictability is a core feature of the combination paradigm. Though neutral (it does not assume negative or positive connotations), it represents the
combination as a system that accounts for the inclusion of chance. However an awareness of the risks (possible misunderstandings/failures) does not stop combinators from attempting to develop a “winning combination”, which is an effective collaborative enterprise.

The three mentioned theories represent collaboration as a complex and interconnected system indicating that collaboration does not live in isolation but lives as a part of larger contextual system. Although the dependency and modernization components seem less able to represent the dynamics of interaction within and between international collaborative units than the interorganizational model does, the influence of dependency and modernization elements on explaining the political, economic and social circumstances of globalization may be profound.

Taking into account that the perspective of the “multiple voices” collaborative relationships and management dynamics within the Canadian-Ukrainian project team taken as a focus for this study, I choose the interorganizational theory as this study’s main theoretical construct. I summarize the main principles of the interorganizational theory that I used to conduct the inquiry to advance knowledge about the collaborative negotiations. In addition, defining the key contributions of the interorganizational theory for this type of research, I propose the conceptual framework for this study as a model for investigation of the Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development project.

**Epistemological Considerations**

**Dependency and modernization theories**

Kurbatov (2008) claims that connecting dependency effects with modernization aspirations assumed that developing countries could achieve modernization and progress
with aid from developed countries. International and comparative educators describe and analyze situations in which, according to Altbach (1988), “developing systems copy the educational development from abroad, produce little that is original and are generally not at the frontiers of knowledge” (p.43). Developed and developing countries participating in the competitive academic exchange process begin from the different starting points. According to Nikitin (2006), the recipient countries try, but cannot act as their donors do. Developed countries are not expected to provide equal partnership services due to differences in their academic, professional and personal experience, human and financial capacity, management techniques and fluency in relevant languages. Within developing countries, infrastructures, knowledge, methodology and external support for collaboration with Western countries are below the level of their developed counterparts. Frank (1966) coined such societal models as “underdeveloped”.

The processes in some developing academic systems show that, through the establishment of joint academic programs and research, regional universities try to promote their international image and develop new approaches to their curriculum content. However, meeting these goals is difficult for many peripheral universities. Ideological, financial, cultural challenges and traditional ways of organizing the collaborative operation prevent the developing democracies from moving forward effectively to participate in global academic developments.

Analyzing the post-Soviet transitional trajectories of development, for instance, Aslund (2007) asks the rhetoric question: transition to what? He challenged the “readiness to initiate a dialogue with the West as equals” though embraced the cautious optimism of the current post-Soviet researchers on the potential of academic
collaboration with Ukraine (Yurii & Savel’yev, 2008). In his characterization of the Ukrainian realities Aslund is more inclined to Hanson’s (1997) description of post-Soviet political, social and cultural transformation, which is caught between the “triumphant aspirations for Westernisation and hopeless post-Leninist paralysis” (Fim’yar, 2008).

Taylor (1997) criticized the current analysis of collaboration with the transitional systems for its focus on markets rather than on social relations. The rapid developments of some Asian “Third World” countries (Hong-Kong, Singapore, South Korea, Taiwan) confirmed that an approach based solely on production categories does not include the analysis of the societal characteristics of those societies.

The key argument of the dependency theory is that Third World countries suffer from visible and invisible internal conditions and complex social transformations due to the lack of access to external resources. Developing countries have been trying to generate indigenous knowledge within their own boundaries in order to propose it as currency for intellectual exchange with the West (Kurbatov, 2009). They feel that dependency on their powerful, persuasive Western collaborators with their sophisticated networks (Selvaratnam, 2002) from one side can be balanced by their indigenous intellectual capacity in order not to limit their internal freedom and choice (Kurbatov, 2009). From the other side, the developing societies choose modernization to make themselves closer to the best world practices.

For a long time the borrowing of Western knowledge and technologies was seen as a hidden capitalist agenda by developing countries (Nye, 2004). However the contemporary developing country elites understand that communication with the West
can serve as an effective instrument for the country’s aspiration to be in the avant-garde of current worldwide scientific and intellectual developments. The Ukrainian academic establishment and infrastructure, for instance, have serious financial, organizational and ideological obstacles to effectively integrate their system into the world academic club. The Ukrainian elites desire to provide Ukrainian universities with high-quality, competitive academic content and to modernize existing methodologies. Such desire reflects the Ministry’s official long-term rhetoric to initiate and sustain a dialogue with world universities. Most Ukrainian universities are encouraged by the government to connect their institutional research with the leading Western universities to maintain international standards by seeking financial support from international agencies. The effort to satisfy the growing ambitions of young active Ukrainian leaders through enhancing international contacts and introducing the motto “Knowledge has no borders” is popular. However it has a very limited financial base. In this matter the pragmatic modernization theorists put forward questions: How well are the academic modernization aspirations connected to the current Ukrainian market need for Western-type Ukrainian specialists? How functional are the costly programs borrowed from the West at a Ukrainian universities? How far do these new joint initiatives reflect the real needs of local academic communities? How can the privileged Ukrainian young men and women, who were lucky to be enrolled in the exchange programs with Western universities, avoid isolation as the emerging pro-Western elite in a “transformational” and unpredictable Ukrainian economic, political and social environment? These important questions illustrate opportunities for further integration of collaborative practices into the Ukrainian government and university visions. The questions go beyond the boundaries of this
research and may be addressed in the future investigations of the developing academic world.

Serious challenges happen on the way to modernization of academic collaboration in the developing world. Lack of expertise to deal with the theoretical and methodological superiority of well-trained Western partners, unbalanced local infrastructures, minimum solidarity among indigenous scientists, and the serious financial constrains make modernization in the educational collaboration with developing countries quite challenging (Harrigan & Hamed, 2008). The majority of developing countries rely on the Western financial support to realize their hopes for transformation. Helping to navigate the stabilization processes in the developing countries, Western countries realize that it is to their own advantage to deal with predictable, stable regional partners and their markets. These partnerships can be created through sustainable collaborative initiatives to “embrace human, cultural, educational dimensions and create a desired ground for further democratization, responsibility and global security” (United National Development Programme /UNDP, 2005).

For the Canadian-Ukrainian study on collaboration it was important to sustain the philosophy of partnership development as a dynamic modernization tool, which was important for Canada and Ukraine. It required serious and reciprocal actions on transformation within the academic and social fabric of two universities.

**Interorganizational Theory**

**International academic joint venture as an organization**

The dependency and modernization approaches described in the previous section focus on the macro-environment. Those approaches ask macro-developmental questions
about the relationships among international academic collaborators and their home systems and organizations. They use cross-national comparative evidence to describe economic and social change and include recent efforts to make sense of processes in which international collaboration in education is organized and sustained.

In this section, describing the microclimate of Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development collaboration, I consider the Canadian and Ukrainian joint venture as an organization. I integrate the following two interorganizational theory approaches and develop them further. I look at the Canadian-Ukrainian collaborative unit as: (a) an organization, which consists of the two teams of the Canadian and Ukrainian academic professionals voluntarily united in the temporarily created international group with the aim to collaborate; (b) I use the interorganizational theory’s interpretation of collaborative context and explain its main components and processes through the establishment of Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development goals, analysis of results achieved, decision making, role distribution and results dissemination.

Borthwick (2001) and Kurbatov (2008) consider an educational partnership as an interorganizational collectivity. Such organizations created jointly between academic institutions function according to their own rules and mechanisms. According to the authors, the practice of an academic joint venture is based on interorganizational networks and processes and the specifics of their management techniques. As a unit for analysis, the Canadian and Ukrainian university collaborative team represents a new international mini-organization within two parent mega-organizational structures. The Canadian-Ukrainian partnership represents its specific functions, new roles of its members, new tasks and hopes. The members of the Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture
are subject to constant personal and professional changes as they prepare, adapt and create their partnership.

Academic institutions initiating an international joint venture create “a specific unit deliberately constructed and reconstructed to seek mutual goals” (Etzioni, 1964, p.13). Objections to consider those partnership structures as organizations, because they “do not exert power or control” (Nikitin, 2008, p.12) or rarely change core parent organizational beliefs (Oleksiyenko, 2008) appear to be more common than the explanations of their new organizational nature. It is easy to find in this criticism a reasonably correct presentation of a joint venture as a “combined effort of individual change forces and role specialists” (Gray, 1989, p.34). However, Gray’s approach does not explain the increased signs of the team’s efficiency, confirming that the internal processes of an academic joint venture have organizational features. According to the other opponents of the partnership organizational aspirations, it involves a “dispersion of influence among several stakeholders making a naïve, misconceived and politically distasteful enterprise” (Ring, 1994, p.27). Its functions are “rooted in the activity approach, which is not a cycle of processes needed to develop and sustain such activities” (Ahuja, 2000, p. 23).

Burn (1996) warns that the majority of the anti-organizational approaches to international academic partnerships are in sharp contradiction to the basic premise of the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA), namely, that an academic international joint venture calls for concrete organizational measures and considerations. These measures facilitate the coordination and mutual leveraging of different categories of international activities. An international joint venture, through various organizational
arrangements, inner logic and external influences has a task to reinforce and sustain the
effective partnership process as an organizational unit. Without appropriate
organizational structures and strategies the dynamics of its activities can absorb an
enormous amount of time, resources and human energy while only marginally advancing
the internationalization of the university (Burn, 2002).

The anti-organization concept interprets the joint venture’s organizational
specifics as a source of alienation, related to the unique characteristics of international
collaborative negotiations. If that is correct, how then one can explain an international
education partnership’s “predilection for the classic interorganizational models? Do we
have enough evidence to claim that a joint academic venture unit lacks the ability to act
as an organization and to sustain itself according to organizational rules and
logic?”(Ravid & Handler, 2001, pp.24-26). Are we criticizing “the actual idea of the
organizational activities” (Abrahamsson, 1993, p.xii) rather than specifics of various
forms of academic organizations?

The Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture possesses the indicators that contribute to the
understanding of international academic partnerships as the collective human
organizational units. The joint-venture confirms Burrel and Morgan’s (1979) definition of
organizational components in such units and indicates the existence of:

- “Purposive rationality” as the dominant and most valued mode of cognition
  within organizational contexts
- Rules and control systems which monitor the exercise of organization as a rational
  system and regulate power preferences
• Roles which confine or contribute to the effectiveness of human activities within narrowly defines limits
• The languages of organizational life which reflect a situation of communicative distortion or cognition of the partners’ organizational philosophies
• The ideological mechanisms through which a partner is habituated to accept the rules of behaviour of an organization
• The worship of technology as a liberating force
• Stresses and risks of organization and the arts to negotiate them
• Human creativity before productivity
• Value rationality before goal rationality (in Abrahamsson, 1993).

These features characterize the Canadian-Ukrainian partnership as a complex and interconnected system. As an organized unit, the Canadian-Ukrainian project includes the elements of home institutions’ financial, human and communication patterns, goals and planning mechanisms, leadership styles, technological achievements, conflict prevention techniques, values etc. Harmony among these components ensures the desired operational result, especially in the Eastern European environment where decisions are made in an “orderly, logical fashion… of the centralized power and control” (Borthwick, 2001, p.26).

Members of the Canadian-Ukrainian international joint venture try to act in unison as a team in order to ensure the effectiveness of operation where the superior-subordinate relations are created according to habits of their own home organizations. Their actions coincide with the Bourdieu and Passeron’s (1977) description to “impose an arbitrary set of their (home units) power structures where additional positive dynamics can be fully
achieved through collective work environments” (p.32). The opinions and priorities in such settings may be different. Action planning and practices may threaten the partnership through a dissonance but the striving for rationality of collective action can generate unique shifting forms of partners’ thinking and behaviour.

The collaborators’ primary task, according to the Kurbatov’s (2008) description of interorganizational characteristics is to make communication within a team meaningful. The latter deals with interactions, images and meanings, which are important for effective functioning of a partnership. The Canadian-Ukrainian academic venture is unique in this sense because their interaction occurs in a foreign language. Different participants’ attitudes towards the specifics of collaboration in a foreign language, approaches to different communication styles, and mechanisms of action planning connected with language challenges are the important factors to consider in a mutual interaction planning (Fim’yar, 2008). Some Eastern European academic elites do not know English well enough for fluent communication with their Western colleagues. Knowledge of Russian as a second language helps the majority of local academic specialists, especially in hard sciences, to maintain a more productive dialogue with Moscow. The complications connected with insufficient knowledge of the English language indicate that the direction for collaboration research in the near future may not be necessarily directed to the English speaking West (Kurbatov, 2008).

**Main Components of the Interorganizational Theory and Their Implications for the Analysis of the Canadian-Ukrainian Joint Venture**

Interorganizational theory highlights that collaborative actions require readiness for change in both systems that participate in a partnership (Etzioni, 1964; Clark, 1999b).
Change and ability to accept it serve as an important signaling mechanism to the Canadian-Ukrainian participating universities about the values of their partnership. The international interorganizational units are open systems that are strongly influenced by their environments. Change in this case may be not the result of the effective and rational performance of the international team but of social and cultural external pressures to conform to beliefs of the system. Oleksiyenko (2008) reports that joint ventures with Eastern European academic organizations have to adapt their structure to the existence of and pressures from external national organizations (Ministries, administrative divisions, peer institutions). Such adaptation is often done in order to maximize their legitimacy and increase their resources and survival capabilities to run international projects. The process of the Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture adaptation to external challenges is a part of this investigation.

Ukrainian bureaucracy forms a complex and contradictory environment that tries to reproduce the status quo (Andriewsky, 2001). Academic institutions in Ukraine, which are the recipients of foreign aid, may not always have adequate tactics to act according to their competencies and beliefs. On the one hand, the Ukrainian government preaches revolutionary academic modernization and promises to support universities in their international aspirations. On the other hand, the Ministry of Education and Science tries to preserve the “habitus” (Bourdieu & Paseron, 1997) of the administrative system and its operational canons with a sophisticated covering of their control mechanisms under the umbrella of the national standards and priorities. The research traced how the external forces influence the Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture. It investigated how the joint venture restructured itself to remain an open system and how the partnership members as
crucial players of communication with the outside environment coped with these influences and proposed new models for facilitating such interventions.

An international joint venture Western partner can experience some confusion along the way by being involved in unexpected shifting of regional policy accents. It can experience various external influences on the modification of the joint venture goals and functions, which interorganizational theorists (Whetten, 1981; Tushnet, 1993) warn about.

Canadians proposed their support and help in the development of a joint structure, which corresponded with the initially jointly claimed goals. However, such proposal may not necessary reflect the changing needs of a recipient country during the collaborative process (Altbach, 1998). At this level of negotiations, interorganizational new leaders play an important part in navigating the Canadian-Ukrainian project dynamics towards solving unexpected issues and tasks. Daft (1989) suggests, “managers may strive to adopt rational processes of conflict prevention, but it is an illusion to assume that an organization can be run without politics” (p.148). Conflict resolution strategies mixed with politics of external influences mobilize international project managers to be vocal about how the positive aspects of the international collaborative relationships overweight the negative aspects and participant fears.

The interorganizational theorists emphasize that challenges drive the collaborative development (Nikitin, 2008). In this matter the interorganizational theory is important for the Canadian-Ukrainian partnership investigation because of its focus on the institutional specifics of the conflict prevention techniques and policy detours at the goals setting,
decision making and results distribution stages. A lot depends on the balance of power and agreement to listen and hear, which may be not easy to achieve.

The interorganizational theory utility has become increasingly apparent through its application of a range of the cultural characteristics engaged in international partnership groups. The Canadian-Ukrainian collaborative team works on the creation of a joint venture and tries to free it from bureaucracy, institutional habitus and external turbulences, which may characterize a certain culture. The existence of the “rules of a political game” (Gibb, 1959, p.19) in Ukraine tends to be performed through informal personal agreements (Kushnarenko, 2002). Such processes make the joint project decision-making vague and unclear. Wolowyna (2003) suggests that it can be problematic for Western institutions to create an international partnership in the Post-Soviet conditions of behind-the-scene deals. Foreigners cannot predict “the degree of political/social turbulence and the local hidden agenda. They cannot measure precisely the level of partner organization’s uncertainty and unpredictability. They do not know what to expect from the local networks to which they have no attachment” (Fim’yar, 2008, p.7).

However Kurbatov (2008) paints the Western university internationalization aspirations in moderate almost pastel colours, giving them a stable and calm leadership role in creating international partnerships. The author believes that Western universities are able to create partnerships with Ukraine as open systems, obligated with responsibility “to deliver academic services and not to change the regimes” (p.27). These partnerships can function as interorganizational units with the appropriate responses to external competitive influences and provide advice and competency, which their
competitors may lack. Such organizations may operate with less expert dominated mechanisms to move towards delivering advice, content and style that is timely and necessary. Borthwick (2001) adds that any kind of partnership is an appropriate reflection i.e. “response to the home environment of its participants, including the potential users of services, their habits to do business … availability of external resources and federal programs” (p.26).

The described components of interorganizational theory can be categorized as the political, rational and symbolic ones, which are employed as a foundation for the investigation of the interorganizational version of the Canadian-Ukrainian partnership. The conceptual understanding and practical considerations of the interorganizational theory components are taken into account. These conceptual understandings relate to systemic and individual response towards the launch of the Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture. The concepts of the interorganizational theory explain and develop an algorithm on how to achieve connectedness and compatibility in the establishing goals, outcomes evaluation dynamics, decision-making techniques and dissemination of the project results.

**Interorganizational Theory in Action**

According to Nikitin (2006) less powerful, developing country universities can reduce their dependency on their strong counterparts through the interorganizational mechanisms of the joint venture. For this reason a number of scholars (Borthwick, 2001; Kurbatov, 2008; Fim’yar, 2008) consider the creation of joint academic ventures as a way to develop and sustain true partnerships.
Drenth, Thierry & Wolff (1988) add that two or more academic organizations as primary participants “join together as an action system to attain a specific objective by performing a set or series of goal-directed behavioural acts… As a social system, the actions of collaborative organizations take on specialized roles and develop behavioural expectations of each other regarding the rights and obligations of membership in the collectivity” (in Borthwick, 2001, pp.26-27).

Van de Ven (1976) developed an interorganizational theoretical framework to explain the formation and maintenance of interagency relationships. He claims that an educational partnership, when it comes to the actual project implementation stage, is dependent on situational factors, including the host (recipient) organization’s need for resources, its awareness of a partner agency’s capacity to deliver/accept services, its cultural domain habits, and the degree of commitment and consensus on decision-making techniques and goals.

The members of the Canadian-Ukrainian partnership expected that their collaboration would grow incrementally as a small chain of steps and successes. Canadians and Ukrainians planned to sustain their collaboration as a cycle of need, commitment, and meaningful communications “to spread awareness and consensus” (Van de Ven et al., 1980 p.33-36). The participants expected that their joint venture would grow into a real and committed partnership. In such cases special attention, according to the Van de Ven’s (1980) opinion, should be paid to the resource exchange and structural and behavioral adaptations of the member teams. The Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture suggested that their collaborative organization was prepared to respond to such internal pressures through the collective and responsible action. The Canadian-
Ukrainian collaboration could as well result in “interorganizational agency’s joint adaptive behaviour” (Kurbatov, 2008). At the same time, according to Ukrainians, the major tools and techniques of the joint venture’s negotiations with external and internal actors as well as the mechanisms for the internal pressure regulation were expected to be borrowed from the Canadian team’s expertise.

The research done by Hill (n.d.) and Burn (1996) provides evidence that interorganizational evolution is shaped jointly by the process of interaction. It is not easy to achieve harmony interacting with an unknown structure and its representatives, when sometimes “uneven advances are frequently counterbalanced by project slippage and regression” (Burn, 1996, p. 3). Similar to the Burn’s perspective, Gray (1989) states that international academic partnerships can be thought of as negotiated orders created among stakeholders to control environmental turbulence by regulating the exchange relationships among them. The Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture paid special attention to the developmental character of their collaboration, especially to relations between the major players, which under the project conditions later were transformed into an effective project agreement.

Gray (1989) and Borthwick (2001) argue that interorganizational partnership is impossible without taking into consideration power dynamics and specifics of the partners’ institutional culture. The even dispersion of power among several stakeholders (which has been somewhat problematic in the Ukrainian case) “is necessary to insure that all stakeholders can influence direction-setting” (Gray 1989, p.927). According to Huse and Cummings (1985) the distribution of power requires adaptation of the partners’ institutional culture to the priorities of the interorganizational unit.
Abrahamsson (1993) adds that people who form the interorganizational interest groups are expected to have “sufficiently similar values to make a number of decisions without any conflict arising. People often have similar desires and attitudes even before the association is formed, and when they begin to interact, these similarities usually increase” (p. 195). The Canadian–Ukrainian case was probably not an ideal setting for a “similar values” performance; on the contrary the values brought to the partnership were quite different. Kersh & Masztal (1998) predicted that the members of the interorganizational group who have substantial differences in their opinions may co-work effectively if they understand the necessity to create and support a joint-venture goal through open, honest and ongoing discussion. It is critical to gather “perceptions constantly from all directions and ensure that all factions communicate, even if it is difficult” (Borthwick, 2001, p.33). Communication in which members share and understand each other’s point of view (Caplan, 1988) enables participants of the interorganizational collectivity to match their expectations about roles and commitments (Tunshet, 1993). People in a unit make “cardinal measurement of preferences and allows them to be weighted” (Abrahamsson, 1993, p. 196). In the Canadian-Ukrainian case consensus and balance of preferences (as the interorganizational theory predicts) may be reached at the later project stages. At these stages Canadians and Ukrainians understood the specifics of the major operational processes, when the diverse perspectives of participants and cultural interpretations were clearly emphasized.

Kurbatov (2008) claims that the formation of a team is the most important achievement of an interorganizational unit. According to Lieberman (1992) a professionally trained workforce and professional individuals “have to combine
contradictory preferences in a common choice. A single individual may not dominate the decision making process within the group. The members of the collectivity can negotiate, form coalitions, make compromises, and make various kinds of tradeoffs among themselves” (p.20). Factors such as “intelligence, negotiating skills, a feeling for realpolitik, and the ability to persuade others affect the final decision” (Abrahamsson, 1993, p. 196).

Havelock et al. (1982) describe emerging commitment of partners to the interorganizational educational philosophy when “member support manifests in attitudes and behaviour… (p.xiv). Intriligator (1986) adds that it is important to establish commitment both at personal and institutional level, which characterizes the quality and focus of a partnership. Huse and Cummings (1985) assert that interorganizational structures must withstand the internal and external threats. It is particularly applicable to the interorganizational collaborations between Canada and Ukraine, when “…majorities are counted, different kinds of external negotiation models are followed, preference are weighted, and vetoes are allowed” (Abrahamsson, 1993, p. 196).

In order to explain organizational changes followed by various external and internal manipulations it is important to identify the factors that determine the level of interorganizational partnership effectiveness. Interorganizational effectiveness is the “degree to which partners achieving a goal satisfy the relevant needs of its members/key external stakeholders and raise targets” (Cambridge Dictionary, 1995, p. 236). Such degree of achievement is characterized by a degree of a shared vision. It is a strategic process when individual interests are translated into the interests of an interorganizational unit. The organizations cultivate “a shared vision, eliminating power struggle among
partners in order to guide and sustain a partnership” (Abrahamsson, 1993, p. 201). The concern about the partners’ shared vision can be translated into the value of competency, which is the importance of honoring and valuing the knowledge each partner brings to a partnership and may be essential in achieving a shared vision. The value of shared vision will illuminate the goals and expected results identification, decision-making and role distribution dynamics, and the process of results dissemination in order to enhance the quality of approach and synergy at the each project stage.

**Conceptual Framework**

The interorganizational theory served as an integrated framework for the Canadian-Ukrainian partnership investigation and facilitated the inclusion of the important joint venture categories analysis into the study. Borthwick, Ravid and Handler (2001) responding to the Clark (1999a), Thorkildsen and Stein’s (1996) findings analyzed the interorganizational collectivity categories and combined them into a set of the main elements of educational partnerships.

Table 4.

*Main Elements of an Educational Partnership*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOMAIN</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members</td>
<td>General Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal capacity for integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commitment to problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of Roles and Responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions</td>
<td>Communication/connections, sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal compromise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decision making and action planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group interdependence dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural specifics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Enhancing the capacity of a partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Results dissemination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the four major domains, the authors consider the indicated above sixteen key categories as the most necessary components for establishing and maintaining educational partnerships. I am using some components of this categorization in my research conceptual framework, considering them as the major elements for investigating the Canadian-Ukrainian project organization’s functions and developments. Goals and outcomes, distribution of roles and responsibilities, communication via complex power and institutional culture dynamics, decision-making, knowledge creation and results dissemination were the benchmarks for my research. I highlighted those categories to explore how the Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture had begun its communication, preceded with goals and expected results clarification. I was interested in the joint venture processes of decision-making and role distribution and how they influenced the collaborative team’s joint action. Specifically, I was looking at the core of the joint
activities: the managerial techniques between two teams and how the goals of the Canadian-Ukrainian partnership were being set. I was interested in how the collaborative planning activities took place, what drove the partners to a certain outcome, how roles were distributed and responsibilities assigned and how the decision-making took place and the results disseminated. Those categories guide the research step-by-step through the perspectives and interpretations of the Canadian and Ukrainian collaborators.

I simplified the Borthwick (2001), Ravid and Handler’s (2001) academic partnership framework and eliminated the “Personal Capacity for Integration” from the Members Domain, the “Cultural Specifics” from the Interaction Domain and the “Assessment” from the Impact Domain. The cultural uniqueness, personal characteristics and assessment are certainly very important categories, which have the capacity to grasp the challenges and construct the meaning of international academic joint ventures, but the detailed investigation of the above features goes beyond the goals of this research.

My task was not to identify how the cultural or personal characteristics of individual participants in the collaborative project influence its function, but rather co-construct through the participant interpretations of the systems of influence in the management mechanisms that illuminate the project’s certain performance. Those understandings demonstrate the importance interconnectedness and mutual understanding. As suggested by Borthwick (2001), the interconnectedness is the first step to compatibility, which is fundamental to the formation of a collaborative spirit. I also highlight the influence of power and institutional culture on the Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture dynamics.
I use the image of scale to illustrate the partners’ desire for balance and equality in their relations. Internationalization as the major principle and purpose of the Canadian-Ukrainian relations lies in the foundation of the framework. Though the partners understand academic internationalization in their own ways it is the major component of both universities vision and mission. To realize the idea of the international curriculum development the Canadian and Ukrainian universities created a mini organization/joint ventures with its own rules, values and routine activities.

I propose the conceptual framework for this investigation as follows:

![Conceptual framework](image)

*Figure 3. Conceptual framework.*

The main purpose of the Canadian-Ukrainian collaborative activities was to enhance the quality of approach to curriculum development organization by employing collaborative thinking and sharing. It was important to articulate these expectations, expressing clear understanding and agreement on the Canadian-Ukrainian project goals and outcomes. Power and institutional culture were in the heart of the multiple processes of the Canadian-Ukrainian collaboration and regulated the activities of the both teams. Goal
setting, results, decision-making, role distribution, knowledge production, results dissemination reflect the choice of the major benchmarks for the research. They contribute to understanding how the Canadian and Ukrainian partners construct and co-construct their collaborative activity through knowledge exchange and sharing.

The conceptual choice of the mentioned benchmarks moved this research beyond the theoretical bounds of interorganizational theory and expanded its explanatory capacity. The conceptual framework grouped the benchmarks and brought meaningful coherence to what was earlier called as “a complex system of collaborative negotiations” (Borthwick, 2001, p.37).

According to Vozzo and Bober (1991, p. 237), the “lasting partnerships should be based on understanding and ability of every one of us to apply the best practices of our teaching and learning into collaborative action”. The important characteristics of collaboration as readiness for change, integrity, strong interpersonal skills, effective communication and commitment were explored in the study through the analysis of the conceptual framework components.

**Conclusion**

I have identified the interorganizational theory as the major theoretical framework, which illuminates international collaboration in higher education and explains a multidimensional picture of collaborative philosophies. Although there is no clear definition of an interorganizational collaborative unit and the concept is left open to different interpretations and objections to existing definitions, the interorganizational theoretical model most precisely describes the complex relations of international academic partnerships. I proposed the partial integration of the modernization and
dependency model elements into the interorganizational theoretical description of the Canadian-Ukrainian partnership. The integrative capacity of the interorganizational model with a broad array of influences from the modernization and dependency approaches provide an opportunity to investigate the major components of the Canadian-Ukrainians partnership.

Modernization and dependency interpretations, however, do not propose a sufficient explanation of the issue of interconnectedness of collaborative joint ventures. It appears, therefore, to be difficult to focus entirely and exclusively on the theories above.

It is also clear that there is much to be learned from further exploration of theoretical perspectives and connections within the interorganizational model. The major contribution of the interorganizational theory is in the focus on the dynamics of interactions in Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture progression.

I focus on the analysis of the main components of the interorganizational theory and include them in my conceptual framework. The goal setting stage, analysis of the achieved results, decision-making dynamics and role distribution, knowledge production and results dissemination are the major benchmarks in my investigation of the Canadian-Ukrainian collaboration.

The next chapter will provide the description of methodologies chosen for this research and describe the tools used to illustrate the theory-practice connection.
CHAPTER IV: METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN

Research on Academic Collaboration

I was a boy when I left home.  
I came back as an old man.  
I think I remember the country dialect,  
But my hair has turned white since I spoke it.  
Children stare at me.  
Nobody understands me.  
They look at me and laugh, and say,  
“Where do you come from, Milord?”

(He Zhizhang, Tang dynasty poet).

There are many ways of studying international academic collaborations. On one hand, international educators employ various tools to investigate the relationships between international policies in higher education and collaborative developments at the international scale (Knight, 2006; Altbach, 2002). The dynamics of globalization, internationalization, international mobility and relocation challenge researchers to develop new cross-cultural methodology paradigms (Shah, 2004). On the other hand, taking into consideration the evidence from current international joint-venture developments, researchers meticulously structure their investigations using old and tested methods of investigation. They do so in order to make sense of and explain the internationalization processes, particularly at the institutional level. Among other things, they investigate how various offshore academic partnerships are organized and how they function.

Miller (1991) indicates that issues of international project performance require new and effective investigation. The practice of using stereotypes, assumptions and clichés, which can emerge from contacts with particular cultural groups, can lead academic researchers into transferring surface cultural perceptions to interpretations of
professional activities of a certain group. Ukrainian researchers (Kurbatov, 2008; Fim’yar, 2008), highlight the importance of the development of effective research tools to study joint offshore academic ventures. Authors emphasize that the qualitative research methodologies used to guide various studies on the improvement of international joint venture movements became popular because of their ability to focus the researcher on cross-cultural attitudes and qualities of operational techniques. Qualitative research methods are flexible in adapting researcher-interviewing skills to investigate joint venture social contexts, collaborative actions and modes of partners’ behaviour.

Conducting qualitative/interpretive research in an intercultural environment can be a challenging task. It is important to put proper emphasis on the role culture plays in the investigation and its influences on sharing knowledge and expertise in cross-cultural contexts. Culture is “an intertwined system of values, attitudes, beliefs, and norms that gives meaning and significance to individual and collective identity” (Adler, 1998, p.236). Culture depends on the specific interpretation of those who study it. The researcher’s bias, ownership and manipulation of research design and direction, and consideration of himself/herself as a representative of a certain cultural group can have a major influence on the results of the research.

The investigation of cultural influence on international joint ventures has convergent and divergent perspectives (Kerr, 1990 & Shah, 2004). The convergent perspective shows how “the similarities in social characteristics will gradually dominate the differences” (Shah 2004, p.554). The divergent approach assumes that “different values and behaviors, different stages of economic development and uneven distribution
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of global resources will always be present and guarantee global diversity” (Shah, 2004, p.553-554).

As a researcher, who conducted an investigation of the specific professional group in a foreign academic setting, I discovered various ways in which my research purpose was interpreted by interviewees. Project participants who belong to different cultural groups interpreted the purpose of my research in their own specific ways. On one hand, my investigation and I were perceived as possibly threatening the status quo. Sometimes research was hindered by dissatisfaction with my research objectives because of the interviewee group’s lack of control over most aspects of the research. For example, so-called “time limits” were given as a reason to not participate fully because the interviewee’s personal or professional needs were not met. Some of the participants were unwilling to share information about the aims, structure and dynamics of their academic system when they felt that I possessed insufficient skills in managing the content and the process of the interview. On the other hand, if I chose the right track in planning the interview, had enough time to properly structure it in advance in order to prevent myself from drifting off topic, the interview went smoothly and productively for both sides. An appropriate choice of my conversational style (more relaxed or more formal) played an important role during the interviews.

**Research Strategy: Methodological Models**

Different methodological models emerge from the description of “how collaboration is initiated, what factors contribute to the sustainability of collaboration and what leads to successes or failures of collaborative relationships” (Ravid & Handler, 2001).
The prevailing research methodologies of academic partnerships are:

- Quantitative studies (Hagedoorn, J. Link, A. & Vonortas, N., 2000; Brostrom, & Loof, 2008)
- Critical analysis (Katchanovski & Kushnarenko, 2007; Altbach, 2005, 2006; Knight 2006; Ravid & Handler, 2001; Andriewsky, 2001)
- Mixed method (Zha, 2007; Nikitin, 2006).

The quantitative methodology is a powerful tool for revealing the state of things in the field of international academic collaboration. The method defines clearly, and in advance, the significant elements and concepts of international collaboration. Quantitative researchers identify the factors of influence on management of collaborative projects and the tools and mechanisms to develop academic collaborative operations into effective partnerships. They clearly measure the forms and ingredients of the collaborative process. But they do not fully explain findings. Quantitative data tends to lack richness, tending to be overly aggregated, missing important nuances in interpretation (Zha, 2007).

The qualitative research mode provides evidence based on two major factors: (1) use of a holistic, multiphase approach to the studied phenomena and (2) ability to explain change over time. It makes informed conclusions on the researched phenomena. Most of these conclusions are based on interviews and help explain the rich contexts of international organizational cultures (Shah, 2004). Qualitative researchers study phenomena in natural settings and attempt to make sense and interpret their findings in
terms of the meanings that people bring to them (Merriam, 1998). Through an interactive context the interviewer learns about complex internal and external factors, which influence the investigative process. Interviews in a cross-cultural/international collaboration environment, where culture shapes the interaction and formulates attitudes, have emerged as the most effective method for data collection. The qualitative method is contextualized in human experiences. The development of a qualitative research framework is a process that is never purely inductive but one that is valuable nonetheless in directing research thorough systematic analysis of data (Marshall & Rossman, 1989).

The qualitative method turned to be the best fit for the “ontological and epistemological relevance to the nature of cross cultural inquiries” (Shah, 2004, p.550). It was the right choice for studying such contrasting academic cultures, as Canadian and Ukrainian, where the complexity of challenges, personalities and situations eliminated easy responses and quick resumes.

Merriam (1998) notes that the openness of qualitative inquiry allows the researcher to approach the inherent complexity of a social reality, to do justice to that complexity, and to respect it in its own right. The complexity of the social and professional reality of international academic partnerships reveals the key aspects of a particular culture and their impact on a professional co-existence with an international partner over the time period.

The qualitative research methodology was an important source of data for theoretical interpretations of collaborative developments. In this research, the dialogic method of investigation was consistent with the interorganizational theory, allowing knowledge to be co-constructed by the Canadian-Ukrainian collaborative team.
**Qualitative Method: Choice and Approach**

The study of the Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development venture targeted matters inherent in qualitative research method. It addressed the less-investigated exploratory case study analysis from the perspectives of those being studied (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2003). Research of the Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture seemed, at first, as a somewhat chaotic investigation of everyday Canadian-Ukrainian team practices, people’s reaction to the unusual methods of partner’s decision-making and role distribution, communication and project result dissemination. Such “qualitative intrusions” in the project routines allowed me to investigate the variety of cross-cultural perceptions of collaboration by undertaking the comparison of the collaborative contexts and processes.

In the Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture’s investigation the case study method coincided with the exploratory method. They both allowed knowledge to be co-constructed and empowered partners by allowing them to participate in research through their descriptions, opinions and attitudes towards their own and their partner’s operational behaviours.

A case study approach, which I have chosen for investigating the Canadian-Ukrainian academic joint venture, is a qualitative research method, which is “conducted in great detail and often relies on the use of several data sources” (Orum et al., 1991, p.14). It is a “multidirectional exploration of a unique event in which the phenomenon and the context are inseparable” (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2004). It perceives realities of participants and processes in change (Shah, 2004). It is also an in-depth, multifaceted investigation of such social phenomenon as international partnerships. The case study method was particularly appropriate for the Canadian-Ukrainian study because it provided an opportunity to:
• Apply comparative analysis techniques to the collaborative processes in a Canadian-Ukrainian partnership

• Provide information from a number of sources over the collaborative project’s time period

• Pursue a multidimensional analysis of complex mutual operational actions and processes between the Canadian and Ukrainian collaborators

• Understand “why particular phenomena occur through rich, textured descriptions of infrastructural and interorganizational processes” (Ruggie, 2002, p.76)

Re-interpret and re-examine Canadian-Ukrainian collaboration concepts and research interpretations in “major, deep and innovative ways” (Yin, 2003).

**Interviews**

In this study, the joint venture was explored and analyzed through conducting interviews with selected participants, who were involved in the Canadian-Ukrainian collaborative process. The interviews focused on defining, understanding and interpreting collaboration. They “offered the greatest promise of making significant contributions to the knowledge base and practice of education” (Merriam, 1998, p.17). The individual participant perceptions of the collaborative process shaped the answers to the research questions of this study in its search of unknown and unsystematized information about the Canadian-Ukrainian partnership.

The interviewees’ interpretations of their attitudes towards collaboration, routine project joint practices, conflict resolution techniques, role distribution and decision making tools showed the increasing awareness of the different dimensions of collaboration through the prism of participant experiences. It was important to trace how
power influenced these experiences, and specifically “whether change was imposed on individuals or whether they voluntarily decided to do something new” (Fullan, 1991 p.121).

The Canadian-Ukrainian participant descriptions of their joint actions helped to identify change at the individual and group level. They determined how they perceived the reality of the collaborative process. According to Abrahamsson (1993) “listening to people in international organizations… is a vital means of moderating the “totalizing accounts” of management. A challenge is to concentrate on local actors’ meanings, symbols and values…obscuring the ambiguities and variations of the empirical situations and the multiple ways they can be accounted for ” (p.17). The collaborators described the Canadian-Ukrainian unit in action, giving primary attention to management tactics, collaborative group dynamics and communication.

The interviewees added a rich set of opinions, attitudes and perceptions and covered broad themes related to joint project management, cross-cultural communications and understanding. In my interviews with the project participants I focused on factors that shaped the discourse and ascertained the understanding that administrators and coordinators had about collaboration dynamics. The Canadian and Ukrainian interviewees described their construction of “themselves”, the vision of their own expertise through the joint action and the importance of adjusting their “mental programs” (Hofstede, 2003) to the collaborative goal. I tried to avoid simplifying the social phenomena, and explored the range of behaviour that influences cross-cultural interactions (Kim, 1991).
I generated the research questions from 15 years of professional experience as an administrator of the US-Ukrainian academic exchange programs and from the current literature in the field. My ongoing personal interest in the contemporary issues related to the field of international education and my interest in the research literature on collaborative movements also helped to focus on the specific issues in the field.

My professional experience in management of international exchange programs provided rich information and knowledge about the challenges of international collaboration. The professional contacts and discussions with university colleagues, negotiations with the representatives from the Ministries of Education of Ukraine, Moldova, Belarus and Russia, and contacts with foreign embassies in Ukraine generated the ideas for research questions and further investigation of the understudied phenomena in the field of international education management.

When answering the interview questions (Appendix 5), the interviewees discussed their unique roles as emerging international collaboration leaders. They identified how their involvement in the collaborative project maintained their group commitment and helped to ensure that the Canadian-Ukrainian partnership principles were valued within the collaborators’ organizational cultures. Members of a collaborative unit who are competent (Flowe, 1990), stable (Smith, 1999) and have an access to top-level management (Grobe, 1993; Intriligator, 1986) focus on synergy to ensure that the project decisions are not concentrated in one person’s hands (Borthwick, 2001). In this matter, the Canadian-Ukrainian participants highlighted the effects of collaborative decision-making tactics and manifested participatory attitudes and behaviour through the collaborative actions.
As indicated in the theoretical and conceptual frameworks for this study, I investigated the explicit phenomena of collaboration such as: goals and outcomes, role distribution and decision-making, knowledge production and project result dissemination. Later, in the process of investigation, grasping the larger social picture of the cross-cultural communication and negotiations, new themes and meanings emerged. The analysis of management tactics and collaborators’ practical experiences at different project phases was pursued with the intention of identifying factors that energize the collaborative actions. The investigation also highlighted how it helped to withstand both external and internal pressures.

The research was focused on how the participants interpreted their own and their partner’s actions and made sense of the collaborative activities through meaning-making conversations. During the interviews, participants described their perceptions of the joint venture by highlighting different cultural and professional factors. They described their willingness to take risks while participating in partnership activities. It was a valuable “new knowledge building activity, informed by knowledge of social counter systems operative in that foreign culture, and performed by constant adaptations of the interview process to suit each individual situation in awareness of the participant subjectivities” (Shah, 2004, p.525). The possibility of misunderstandings, misinterpretations and unexpected assumptions, while dealing with foreigners as partners, was very noticeable during the ongoing professional evaluation expressed in the interviews. Their frustration in some unmet collaborative expectations increased when I asked them to elaborate on the desired professional qualities of international education partners. It was important to determine whether such categories as “professionalism” and “competency” emerged as
contested and dynamic concepts within the cultural bounds and measured by the cultural and moral criteria (Shah, 2004) or whether they were accumulated through experience that have no links to culture (Kurbatov, 2008).

As the Canadian-Ukrainian interviews showed, there was a need to reconsider the relative strengths and advantages of the qualitative research interview techniques used in a homogeneous environment against their flaws in the Canadian-Ukrainian setting. The meaning-making process through the recognition of cultural differences shaped the cross-cultural interaction. It was a key process that gained its significance as the research unfolded. It required the restructuring of a “homogeneous interview” paradigm and the reconsideration of the interviewer’s navigation techniques towards the interpretation of the cross-cultural phenomenon under the investigation. The disparity between “what we intend to say and what we actually say is central to pragmatics” (Poole, 1999, p.34). Therefore, as a cross-cultural interviewer, I kept in mind four important factors mentioned by Shah (2004) and Ball (1991):

- An international partnership interview must avoid the situation when “the respondents may find themselves being manipulated into saying more than they intend” (Ball, 1991, p.181)
- Different cultures enable different ways of thinking and different ways of interpreting objects and events
- A researcher in an international context requires “understanding of the socio-cultural norms to adjust a research action accordingly without being offensive” (Shah, 2004, p.561)
• There is a tendency to judge a partner. The cultural stereotypes and clichés in analyzing the partner’s procedural steps influence the presentation and interpretation of information for the researcher.

As a Canadian researcher and a Ukrainian citizen, I planned to combine two things: (1) to identify and construct my research goals using the Western theoretical base of interorganizational relationships and (2) to construct knowledge about the operation of the Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture displaying my experience of living and working for a long time in the Ukrainian system. I knew about the restrictions for a foreign researcher, which existed in the local context, and was ready for errors and biases hidden in the perception of a Ukrainian with a Canadian mind. I realized that I should be innovative, creative, and ready to adapt, test and improve my conceptual framework. What I did not know was how the interviewees would perceive me and interpret their experiences to somebody who shared their values and behavioral habits. I was acting in the situation influenced by “the respective subjectivities of the participants and the complex prejudices presented within the local context” (Shah, 2004, p.552). I was not sure if the interviewees had knowledge and skills I was looking for but I was sure that they had experience and worked in the field for a long time.

The academic content and professional style, understandings and interpretations were unusual, as reflected in the pre-interview conversation with a Ukrainian administrator: “Your qualitative research model reminds me of the USSR or the TV Discovery Channel: it is the pride and quality of the Soviet Union as the country and the system and it is always a discovery of a new thing, which is very broad. I can qualitatively persuade you that the subjective people’s opinions and feelings about your research topic have
very little to do with our changing reality. You will never find “the universal truth”. All depends on a degree of agreement between you and me on how far I can go. Your qualitative research findings will depend exclusively on my skills how to navigate you “qualitatively” to a place, which you may find hard to get out”.

Such comments indicated that my cross-cultural interviews should be well prepared, taking into consideration the complex interpretations of international collaboration and unique personal experiences based on cultural perceptions and understandings. The descriptions and opinions were a true “discovery” process. I found myself being a part of that processes. The perceptions of individual members and of the collaborating group as a whole created new meanings and new interpretations of collaborative behavior. The Canadian individualistic and Ukrainian communal behavioral orientations were blended into a new creation, a partnership. Individual and collective comprehension, reasoning and knowledge were far away from the surface of this creation.

I was interested in finding out if the interviewees were more inclined to analyze the project results according to their cultural perceptions and experiences or according to their professional knowledge. I was trying to establish if they tended to describe their achievements as facts rather than a process that led to those achievements. I wanted to know if the achievements described in a collaborative context were emphasized as those that resulted from a participant own input or were the Canadian-Ukrainian group achievements. It was important to observe Canadian and Ukrainian anxiety concerning the perception of foreigners as professionals and colleagues.
Ukrainians often talked about curiosity, reflecting the complexity of perceptions of different styles of leadership. Such “unpredictability, helplessness, a threat to self-esteem... having a general feeling of walking on ice – all of which are stress producing and hamper understanding of an opposite side” (Shah, 2004). Canadians had the reputation of those who tended to successfully manage anxiety at the initial phases of their joint international projects and “developed the adaptive capacity in dealing with the unknown” (Kim, 1999). Through interviews I hoped to identify the reasons behind culture-related actions in the Canadian-Ukrainian collaborative setting and to grasp how the cultural dimension of collaboration was introduced through the project interactions. It was important to trace the emergence of individual commitment and growing confidence in personal ability and strength that was needed to sustain the partnership.

The interviews showed an individual ability to conduct a dialogue. They illustrated a preparedness to take unexpected turns in this dialogue, a willingness to consider different opinions and a readiness to interpret challenges. Participant responses about individual and group perceptions, their readiness to expend energy, willingness to take action to defend the partnership if necessary and ability to rise over stereotypes had a strong potential to solve the project problems.

Oleksiyenko (2008) describes international academic partnerships as interconnected and sometimes complex dialogues, having at their core a set of value-laden concerns about an individual, a group and a community. The Canadian-Ukrainian interaction compelled me to employ a delicate tone and to avoid sensitive remarks. I used appropriate body language to overcome an interviewee’s suspicion, trying to respond neutrally to his/her debatable answers. However, Lincoln & Guba (1985) argue that the
constant adaptation of the interview structure to a participant’s subjectivity in order to maximize the research outcomes makes neutrality almost impossible. Both sides may feel uncertain and there is a need to be conscious of the interview process. It is a progression from the initial contact, moving thorough stages of denial/defence/minimization, towards acceptance/adaptation/integration (Bolman & Deal, 1991).

The discussion of the Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture dynamics showed a variety of responses and a mix of opinions. Because of the variety of interpretations, misunderstandings and clichés resulting from different patterns of perception and behaviour (Burrel & Morgan, 1979), it was important to highlight a set of value-laden concerns about individual and collaborative project relationships. Through interviewing as a reciprocal learning activity I investigated how the participants in a cross-cultural context influence and construct meaning and engage in the “knowledge building activity” (Kurbatov, 2008). My concentration was on recording the complexity of situational contexts and interrelations as they occurred naturally (Marshall & Rossman, 2006).

The extensive literature review helped to further develop and polish the interview questions. The publications were assembled into a literature review database. The major topics and subtopics were organized, coded and sorted according to author and publishing date. Different policies, approaches and strategies of internationalization of higher education and managements techniques were assembled according to the key words and themes, which correlated with the interview questions. I did the comparisons across themes and sub-themes in order to identify emerging topics and matched them with the themes of the current research interest. Each interview question focused on the
understudied phenomena of collaboration, as well as identifying and referring to a corresponding literature entry.

There were several major clusters across the literature: (1) specific approaches to internationalization of academic institutions in developed and developing countries; (2) the effectiveness of international initiatives dependence on cross-cultural contexts, i.e. the historically, economically, politically contextualized roles of international education and competence in international communication; (3) relationship of internationalization to the power dynamics and the countries’ autonomy; (4) resistance to or acceptance of international education principles and inspirations; (5) specifics of institutional culture and effectiveness of international educational organizations. All these queries gained significance with growing emphasis on culture and collaboration, which were reflected in this research.

**The Participants**

A heterogeneous sampling strategy was used to seek individuals with different perceptions and opinions. The individuals were purposefully selected for this study according to their:

- Leadership role in the internationalization process
- Availability
- Expertise in the North American/Ukrainian collaborative developments
- Openness and willingness to communicate on the Canadian-Ukrainian collaborative project.

Each participant was purposefully selected for the study through filtering the governmental and professional university networks in order to identify individuals for
their comprehensive, multidimensional and competent involvement in evaluation of the Canadian-Ukrainian collaborative processes. The maximum variation sampling (Meriam, 1998) with a focus on key-players in the field was used to select participants. This approach provided an opportunity to study a wide pattern of cases and to ensure the presence of a variety and diversity of opinions and experiences. A diverse range of professionals who provided a comprehensive example of their collaborative practices represented two leading Canadian and Ukrainian universities. The participants ranged in age from thirty five to fifty years old and had from five to seventeen years of experience in international academic collaboration. The Ukrainian participants-administrators, who represented the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine, voluntarily responded to the researcher’s request to participate in this research. I made the numerous contacts with the Ministry through a network of personal connections and successfully negotiated all the necessary preparations for the interviews in Ukraine.

The selection of the countries for this study was motivated by may interest to investigate some aspect of the profound differences of the Canadian and Ukrainian educational systems in their approaches to international collaboration. The results of recent attempts in both countries to activate international linkages with each other were analyzed by taking into account two components of collaboration: (1) theoretical: strategic goals/expected outcomes, planned rules of involvement and roles distribution and (2) practical: set of actions undertaken to achieve these goals, actual dynamics of the collaborative team, and management tactics. I was interested in learning if the Canadian-Ukrainian research data, as Lainede (2000) noted, could share the following essential characteristics:
• The interpretation of understandings and meanings of the cross-cultural phenomenon under investigation was clear and relevant
• The researcher was as a primary instrument of data collection and analysis
• Inductivity
• Richly descriptive findings.

My personal meetings and intensive e-mail correspondence with the Canadian and Ukrainian university departments resulted in a final group of volunteers who agreed to participate in this research. Ukrainians requested that the topic and method of investigation to be compatible with the Ministry point of view as a condition of participation. The tactful and delicate conversations, drawn from the knowledge of Ukrainian cultural specifics, resulted in the university coordinators’ agreement to be interviewed according to my research plan.

The members of the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine who dealt with international education policy on the national level and Canadian University administrators, who played a leading role in construction of higher education internationalization strategies, were selected as one group of interviewees. I called this group of two “administrators”. These individuals participated in policy consultations and discussions with the Ministry units in Ukraine, Ukrainian university departments and faculty about the design and development of international collaborative activities. These individuals began their careers as international exchange coordinators at Ukrainian institutions of higher learning and later were appointed to work at administrator positions within the Ministry. Both administrators had a minimum of five years of experience in international education and, because of their performance, were chosen by the Head of
the Ministerial International Education Division to participate in this study. The administrators showed their interest and later their desire to participate in the study. They agreed to discuss their experience in organizing the international joint venture with the Ukrainian researcher from Canada. I contacted the administrators through e-mail and asked for their assistance in distributing the information about the study to the Ukrainian university, which administered the curriculum development project from the Ukrainian side. This was done in order to secure the Ministerial support in identifying the university project coordinators and in encouraging them to consider participating in the interview process.

The Canadian administrators represented professionals who designed and worked on the implementation of internationalization policy at the Canadian university. Both groups of administrators represented the higher academic echelons in their respected countries. They defined the major directions of the internationalization policy development. The administrator group from the Canadian side consisted of two administrators from the International Department, who had six and nine years of experience in organizing and running international activities at their university. I contacted the University International Relations Department via e-mail and telephone. Two administrators volunteered to participate in the study.

The second group of interviewees included the University coordinators of international activities from Canada and Ukraine who participated in the implementation of the Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development project. I called this group “coordinators”. The coordinators were the “working engine” of the project and ran the project logistics. This particular group of people was of the most interest for me for their
knowledge of how collaboration of the Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture actually worked. There is little research on the perceptions of joint venture activities from the perspectives of collaborators themselves. Therefore, developing cross-cultural research methodologies on the basis of human interaction, analysis of interview data and review of what participants shared in the non formal environment (when they were reluctant to disclose their views during the interviews) must receive serious practical and theoretical considerations.

Five people from the Ukrainian side, two administrators and three coordinators, and four Canadians, two administrators and two coordinators, were interviewed. The interviews were arranged in Canada and Ukraine. Informed consent forms were sent to all participants prior to conducting the interviews with a copy of the research questions to be used. This was done in order to give the participants an opportunity to prepare for their responses before the interviews. Open-ended, semi-structured interviews ranging from sixty to ninety minutes were conducted with each participant in person.

The Ukrainian university participants/coordinators were identified through professional contacts of the researcher at the Ministry of Education and Science in Kyiv. I approached my contact persons directly in Kyiv/Ukraine. The Ukrainian participants were asked to volunteer for participation in the research. I prepared a short description of the study and contact information for the participants. The Ukrainian participants were asked to contact me via e-mail if they wished to participate.

Three coordinators agreed but asked the researcher to arrange the permission from the University Department Head to conduct this research. Because the research topic was perceived by the Ukrainian University International Relations Department Head as
sensitive and was going to be conducted by a Ukrainian researcher who represented a Canadian university, the Ukrainian university administrators contacted the Ministry of Education and Science for their permission to participate in the study. The Ukrainian university administrators’ justification included the description of their earlier experiences with some foreign researchers when the interpretation and reporting of data was in their view awkward and damaged the reputation of the Ukrainian university.

After receiving the permission from the Ministry to participate in the study, they agreed to be interviewed on the condition that the interviews would not be tape-recorded. The Department Head informed me that he had decided to be present in the room during the interviews. He explained that he wanted his colleagues (the project coordinators) to feel “calm”, will not go “further than they are supposed to” in their answers and he himself “would probably add some important details about the missing facts of collaboration”.

Shah (2004) describes a similar case in Pakistan. She was arranging interviews with Pakistani college students, who studied in Britain and later were sent back to Pakistan. The principal of the college informed the researcher about his decision to be present at the interviews, as he would not allow the British interviewer to talk to his students in private. His argument was that “the British researchers presented our culture and values coloured by their misconceptions and false assumptions developed from a very limited knowledge of cases exploited in media” (Shah, 2004, p.513). The presence of the department administrator at the interview turned the whole process into a careful and official conversation, where every word was carefully selected. It is interesting to analyze such cases further and participate in the methodological debates on their effect on further research.
I sent the invitation for the Canadian project coordinators to participate in the interview via e-mail. Two participants, who were directly working on the project with Ukrainians, agreed to participate. No additional preparations or permissions were necessary.

Some of the participants were quite open during the interviews and described their experiences in policy and practical management positively and honestly. Other interviewees distanced themselves from the researcher by giving reserved and general answers as though they considered the researcher as a tourist in their system.

Data Analysis

A number of topics and themes, which emerged during the discussion with the participants, were quite unexpected and later thoroughly analyzed in the data analysis. Interviews, which I was able to tape record with the Canadian participants, were transcribed and draft copies of the transcripts were sent to the participants for validation and editing and, subsequently, returned to me. The Ukrainian data were assembled during my two trips to Ukraine though I was unable to receive a permission to tape Ukrainian interviews. The Ukrainian interviews’ major themes and topics were written down during the interviews and later in a separate room immediately after the interview were reproduced in writing in an attempt to retrieve the important details (Appendix 2). A qualitative analysis strategy was used to organize and sort a large amount of the received information. It was systematized according the benchmarks/key-themes of the conceptual framework to “challenge theoretical assumptions held” (Merriam, 1998). The Canadian-Ukrainian participants’ “case description” (Yin, 2003) and analysis of the received data
built a system of evidence to theoretical propositions for this research. All nine interviews were coded. Silverman (1985) believed that the coding is the central process from which theories are built from data. The research questions served as a navigational tool for identifying themes in the data. After rereading the Ukrainian notes and the Canadian interviews transcripts broad concepts were identified, reviewed and compared with the literature review and conceptual/theoretical frameworks. These initial concepts included globalization and internationalization of higher education, conflicts and resistance to foreign programs, personal responses to collaborative initiatives and understanding of offshore joint venture procedural rationality.

The cross-case patterns were identified and clustered in accordance with the indicated research questions. Grouping similar events, concepts and actions under the same label based on the research questions led to emergence of the categories for analysis. Within each category I tried to find similar patterns and then combined them into a theme.

The final list of themes was compiled, employed for data analysis and organized according to the conceptual framework categories. It included:

- Internationalization of higher education and the specifics of internationalization processes in both universities
- The Canadian and Ukrainian policies on joint curriculum development project collaboration
- International project management procedures: definition, understanding and implementation of the Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development project goals, results, decision making, role distribution, and results dissemination
• Images and influence of power and institutional culture as the major engines for promotion of internationalization at both universities.

Some responses did propose the extended interpretations of the tools and mechanisms of internationalization of higher education in the Canadian and Ukrainian academic systems, unusual strategies and tactics of academic institutions in their implementation of international programs. Although it was a detour to the research theme it led to the emergence of new, interesting trends for future analysis.

Data contrast, as I suspected, did occur by comparing content that appeared within two research international settings, acknowledging the common and particular reasons why and how the institutions of higher education in two very different countries planned and realized their collaboration. The new themes emerged within the identified Canadian-Ukrainian project management categories. They were highlighted and organized as a separate entry into the basic categories of the conceptual framework.

**Limitations**

It is always exciting to work with professionals. We are interested and “drawn to people who have a good understanding of themselves and their responsibilities because those people tend not to screw up. They tend to know what they can do. They tend to know what they can't do. And they tend to know where to go if they need help” (Gardner, 1997, p.96). The question was how to identify those people. It was not an easy task. The accuracy of the interview data was limited by the willingness to be open and honest.

Another peculiarity of the cross-cultural site was the spontaneity of an interviewee. Some Ukrainian participants tended to over-exaggerate the situation in order
to be appreciated as professionals. Shah (2004) mentions that variability in social and interpersonal behaviour is understood along the dimensions of association-dissociation and subordination-superordination. The actual state of affairs could be very different, but different types of behaviour during the interview provided a useful model for further analysis and interpretation of the received data.

My access to relevant information and project documentation was another issue. This was an issue of the communication peculiarities on the Ukrainian side. Some routine project documents were not open for discussion with me, as they were “exclusively for internal usage”. The decisions on some project issues/challenges were approved at closed meetings of the Ukrainian participants with the Ukrainian administration. The origins of those specific project problems and the chosen methods to solve them were not discussed with me. Expertise, tact and tolerance proposed to me from the Canadian side helped to resolve tensions concerning unclear project managerial issues and deviations in the project communication content.

This was a qualitative study of the Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture located in Kyiv/Ukraine. Its conclusions cannot be generalized and used as a model for resolving the academic cross-cultural collaboration issues in different transitional East European countries. Ukraine is a specific case and has its own social and relational influences on academic collaboration with Western universities. The suggested conclusions of this investigation cannot be used as a panacea for management challenges in developing academic settings. However, some general phenomena and conclusions may be useful for those in similar situations and for further research implications. For those who conduct qualitative research of this type it may give them an opportunity to identify the issues and
learn from them.

Questioning and challenging the dominant discourses of the Eastern European academic environment and joint project management reflect the complex issues of cultural interpretation of collaboration, subordination and collaboration, center and periphery dynamics etc. The Canadian and Ukrainian professionalism and dedication that I witnessed led to the conclusion that collaboration is an appropriate field to overcome misunderstandings and develop an appreciation of diversity.

I acknowledged that the Canadian-Ukrainian insider/outsider status created some suspicion from the Ukrainian side about someone who may not interpret the project results in the Ukrainian’s favour. As to Canadians, their openness and interest in the researcher’s methodology and project goals were evident and encouraging.

**Ethical Considerations**

As this research included human subjects, it followed the procedures outlined by the University of Toronto Ethical Review Committee. All participants took part in this research as volunteers. Participants were asked to sign the Letters of Informed Consent, understanding that they could withdraw their participation from the study at any time. The research participant identities were kept confidential and their anonymity was guaranteed. As the research involved an international setting and multicultural collaborative team, every effort was made to avoid a potential conflict of interest. Interviews, where it was possible, were audiotaped and data retrieved from the Ukrainian participants were translated. Tapes, transcripts, interview notes, consent forms were stored in a secure place in a locked cabinet. Every participant received a copy of
transcribed interviews for verification of accuracy and was given an opportunity to make changes. Those who indicated an interest will receive a copy of the dissertation.

In the next chapter I provide the analysis of data collected from the interviews with the Canadian participants in Canada and from the Ukrainian administrators and coordinators during my trips to Ukraine. My dialogues with the participants contributed to my understanding of how individuals constructed their own stories of collaboration, which were focused on relationships in their joint venture. The participants’ multiple voices and solutions, hesitations and assumptions, hopes and achievements were central to this investigation. The interorganizational theory constructed the “why and how to collaborate” framework and served as a vehicle to “operationalize” Canadian-Ukrainian collaboration. The participants’ personal interpretations of joint teamwork illuminate the processes of collaboration in which they participated.
CHAPTER V: INTERNATIONALIZATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The Canadian-Ukrainian Perspectives on Internationalization of Higher Education

Mental programmes do change, but slowly and not according to anyone’s master plan. Changes take decades, if not centuries. If the inheritance of the Roman Empire still separates Belgium from the Netherlands, two countries in intimate contact for over 2000 years, one should not believe one can change the minds of Serbs, Russians or Albanians within a few years… we better take mental programmes as given facts. (Hofstede, 2001, p. 11).

In this chapter, I discuss the peculiarities of internationalization of higher education in Ukraine and Canada. The Canadian and Ukrainian project administrators and coordinators reflected on the current state of internationalization at their institutions and discussed the Canadian-Ukrainian joint-venture. I invited Canadian and Ukrainian administrators and coordinators to consider their role in the process of internationalization, discuss their options and interpretations of the current collaboration policy directions and reflect on what influenced their decisions. I anticipated their individual reflection on the unexplored aspects of academic internationalization and explored their understanding of the purposes of internationalization at Canadian and Ukrainian universities.

I begin my analysis with the description and definition of higher education internationalization in Canada and Ukraine, as understood and performed by the participants in the Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development project. I continue with the specification of the key experiences discussed by the Canadian-Ukrainian team while running the project. Here, too, I analyze different interpretations of the Canadian and
Ukrainian internationalization policies, the obstacles of their implementation and risks taken through the project process.

I describe the main characteristics of academic internationalization as perceived by Canadians and Ukrainians and explain the origin of Canadian and Ukrainian collaborative action. The partners also shared their assessment of the peculiarities of the Canadian-Ukrainian joint-venture organization, defined necessities for such a joint venture formation and described the ways Canadians and Ukrainians had chosen to perform their collaborative functions.

**Policies on Collaboration: Contrasts of Comparison.**

**Internationalization of Ukrainian higher education**

The Canadian and Ukrainian systems of higher education are different on many levels. They differ developmentally in their policies and values. They are unlike politically with regard to regulations for international education and training. They have a different infrastructure in their capacity to consider options for sustainable development. They also differ in their attitude to foreign aid and investment, their overseas program content and their mandate for change.

The Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine’s (the Ministry) Doctrine on the International Education Policies (2008) aimed to compare the main tendencies of their university outreach policy development and its contribution to the Ukrainian higher education system. According to the Ministry’s instructions “On International Cooperation in Higher Education (2008), Ukraine puts the proper “Inter-Nationalization” policy accents on educating the majority of Ukrainian students within the academic frames of the national system. The Ukrainian Ministry’s instructions highlight:
The development of international cooperation activities in higher education confirms the determination of the Ukrainian state to prepare internationally qualified graduates in the area of education, science and professional training. Such activities are grounded in the state standards of national cadres preparation in the spirit adequate to the needs of Ukraine. Trained according to the international requirements with the acquisition to the broader worldview a Ukrainian specialist should be able to participate in the national economy development taking in consideration existing challenges of the current transitional period. It can be done through the connection with educational institutions, government authorities of other countries according to the priorities indicated by the Ukrainian competent administrative bodies (2008, p.4).

A well-developed network of almost eight hundred higher educational institutions in Ukraine and the leadership role of the Ministry of Education and Science created a somewhat idiosyncratic mechanism for preparing national cadres within the walls of home universities. The “adequate to the needs of the Ukraine” (the Doctrine on the International Education Policies, 2008, p.7) system of the national cadres preparation can serve as a classic example of internationalization via continuous focus on nationalization. This assumes the further development of a “global consciousness” paradigm through amendments to the existing national curricula and accelerated student adaptation to the emerging paradigms of international content without leaving the country. The focus on the national dimension, particularly the operational parameters of the national system’s capacity to internationalize the contemporary Ukrainian curricula, constitutes the key educational goal for training the Ukrainian future working force. The current Ukrainian educational concept represents the political and ethical variation of the famous slogan from Soviet Industrialization: “National Cadres (trained at the national academic institutions) Decide Everything”.

However, a growing number of the Ukrainian political and economic elites are preoccupied with their aspirations for more openness to international integration. In order to have information and access to the international markets and business opportunities,
they try to influence the Ukrainian government to open its borders for partnerships and collaborations. Though, until recently, the international integration of various Ukrainian academic structures has been largely confined to the policy declaration just to “test the waters” rhetoric rather than actual internationalization initiatives. The International Renaissance/Open Society Institute and Soros Foundation Network mention the following:

In order to enhance international integration into Ukrainian higher education, it is recommended to the Ministry of Education and Science to implement a range of initiatives and events (round tables, conferences, discussions, dialogues) directed at systemic changes in the system of national higher education; drawing up of changes to the Law "On Higher Education" to establish a proactive dialogue and cooperation between Ukrainian universities, public, government authorities and international educational institutions. (International Renaissance Foundation Initiatives, 2007, p.17)

Various political technologies, including the proposed academic grassroots interactive discussions with the Ministry, created a facade of state policies. The democratic procedures were formally observed, but made largely meaningless through the sophisticated manipulation of terms and visibility of the “progressive innovations in international education” to preserve the status quo. In these circumstances there was a mismatch between the declarations for internationalisation and the real lack of the domestic transformations. The country’s elites lacked the ability to effectively initiate reforms that would facilitate a dialogue with the West.

Massive corruption in the Ukrainian higher education system is a serious obstacle for the development and implementation of international initiatives at Ukrainian universities. Those who have the resources to buy their diplomas at home or to pay for a semester of academic tourism abroad may by themselves “internationalize” their diploma without even knowing their alma mater’s language of instruction.
Internationalization of Higher Education in Canada

Canada, by contrast, makes every effort to brand Canadian education abroad. Canadian universities “develop ongoing student and staff mobility strategies” and modify policies “to enhance Canada’s competitive position in the world” (the Canadian Bureau for International Education/CBIE Advocacy Statement, 2008; Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada/AUCC Mission, 2007 p.3). The aim of Canadian international education is to educate Canadian citizens as globally competent professionals (Manning, 2008). The CBIE Annual Report (CBIE, 2008) highlights:

It is important to support a forum for new ideas and innovating programs on internationalization of Canadian education, to continue research on developing training programs and ethical standards in the field of international education. Canadian universities lobby for new policies and bring forward new programs on internationalization, to sustain developmental assistance across the globe with a focus on governance and civil society development, and to ensure access to education in all its forms (p.7).

Canadian universities view internationalization as one of their current priorities. New international responsibilities and strategic partnership development remain among the important policy directions at Canadian universities. It is a Canadian “institutional aspiration to see themselves as leaders in internationalization and to provide students and faculty with opportunities to gain international experience to act as true global citizens” (Evans, 2005, p.12). Canadian universities conceptualize their academic content with the challenges of globalization and include internationalization in their contemporary reforms, which are paradigmatic by their nature.

A Canadian university administrator, who is the Canadian-Ukrainian joint project participant, evaluating the development of international activities at his university, admitted:
Our university, responding to the challenges of an increasingly interdependent world, seeks to develop new and effective approaches to existing programs and policies. Internationalizing our main functions, we expand our collaborative activities with universities and partners abroad, increase the number of student and faculty exchanges with different countries, work on internationalization of our curricula and participate in offshore research initiatives in order to prepare graduates to function competently in any part of the world.

The Canadian university considered fostering global consciousness among students and scholars as its main aim and function. Canadians believed that the Canadian-Ukrainian initiative would help the faculty and students at both universities understand the relations of interdependence between peoples and societies, to develop student appreciation of other cultures, and to ultimately develop a greater respect for pluralism (Gacel–Avila, 2005). Such developments, however, tend not always to be reciprocal and present enormous challenges, as well as opportunities for both partners.

Emergence and growing attraction of new, unknown destinations require an awareness of the fact that exploration of new forms of collaboration may open bright but unclear horizons of building partnerships. Vague perspectives of collaboration or insufficient cultural knowledge may threaten instability and undermine trust in future partnerships.

A Canadian administrator continued:

I would like to compare our international programs with our Faculty of Education building: a nice clean façade, flowerbeds. Every morning it has to open, on time, its glass doors and welcome visitors. Pedestrians looking at this idyllic picture have no idea about the processes which are going on inside the building: students and professors running back and forth, debates and discussions at classes, seminars, staff meetings and training, oral exams ... Management and logistics are the key things. They keep the building in proper shape. If something new is proposed –well, with any change or risk the façade should always remain attractive and clean.

The Canadian administrator believed that true collaborative partnerships should benefit her university, add to its professional reputation and strengthen the positive opinion about the university among different stakeholders allied to it. Any overseas involvement is
expected to energize the university’s potential and contribute to the improvement of its structures, obligations and actions to maintain respectful negotiations. Carefully crafted international agreements benefit the university’s international and local image by nurturing a culture of mutual respect. The administrator considered collaboration as a powerful tool to approach transnational turbulences, turning contrasting understandings into collaborative responsibilities.

**Key Issues to Consider**

Interconnectedness and the Canadian-Ukrainian team members’ systemic influences on each other highlighted the uniqueness and of the Canadian-Ukrainian project practices. A Ukrainian coordinator, who for two years served as a consulting scholar for the University International Relations Ministry Department, addressed the Ukrainian faculty’s desire to collaborate:

What we really need is to discuss the perspectives of international education with our ministry officials. We are dragging behind Canadian universities and we are already late for “a date” with them. If the things will be developing at a current speed we do expect neither chemistry nor a bottle of wine at this date. We are out of their radar; the Canadian openness to the outside world is amazing. The Canadian international education charisma looks somewhat frightening for the policy people at this side. With the Ukrainian tempo of the collaborative relations development we can lose important strategic connections, time, and enthusiasm. But what dies the last is our hope. If the ministry doesn’t care we will run for the date with a Canadian university out of an ajar window.

International collaboration and exchanges as perceived by the Ukrainian coordinator took place and were effective because of the university staff that initiated them. Such initiatives had a strong impact on the Ukrainian university development and reputation. The vague Ministry directives on “sharing information and communication with foreign academic institutions” distanced universities from actual collaborative priorities and divided Ukrainian universities between those with an “advancement in internationalization” and the “other”, which were not as active in international affairs.
University enthusiasts participating in new international initiatives established personal connections with Canadian university faculty, trying to use every opportunity to persuade the management of international programs at their institutions to participate in exchanges.

In order to upgrade curricula, investigate new markets, borrow progressive methodological approaches, and build new offshore partnerships, the influential Ukrainian universities lobbied the Ministry to develop a state policy on internationalization. Abrahamsson (1993) noted that “changes in external conditions will affect the organization’s internal conditions” (p.107). Ukrainian professors believed that their university success stories about their participation in international projects, international conferences and fairs and the emergence of new international academic joint ventures can serve as a countermeasure to the Ministry dominance in the field. Creativity to think and possibly act “outside the box” in the generation of strategies, actions and commitment to the relationship for the particular purpose brings potential partners together and makes a difference in the system (Sinclaire & Perre, 2001).

There was one challenge for Ukrainian universities to consider in this matter: the Canadian university’s insufficient knowledge of the Ukrainian academic inspirations and local initiatives could seriously weaken collaboration. Ukrainians realized that inadequate cultural knowledge of their academic realities could substantially slow the process of the Ukrainian market investigation.

A Ukrainian coordinator mentioned:

Canadians were polite and intelligent partners. They were good learners and tried to be diplomatic in what they said and did. However, the minor details of their behaviour and specifics of their advising showed that they were incapable of grasping the holistic
Ukrainian project management picture. They did not know our rules well, probably they were shy to be actively involved in our “doing business” specifics or maybe they simply thought that our themes were different from the negotiations tones preferred by Canadians.

It was important to place the Canadian plans for higher education in international development within the Ukrainian cultural context and attempt to establish an insider’s knowledge of the Ukrainian project development priorities. Canadians did a serious job of learning more about the Ukrainian internationalization trends and came to Ukraine with necessary knowledge about their Ukrainian collaborators. The Canadian team had some knowledge of Ukrainian academic schemes and frameworks as well as the strengths and weaknesses of their international project managerial tactics.

Usually, Canadian universities build their international networks carefully. They choose their partners thoroughly preferring to work with stable, reciprocal and predictable joint ventures. A Canadian coordinator noticed:

Our major interest is to continue collaboration with our Asian markets. They are strong and responsible partners. We also expressed some interest to the Eastern European countries in transition and may further investigate our Ukrainian possibilities. Though we experienced some challenges in collaboration with the Post-Soviet states, our curriculum development joint project over there is a good opportunity to possibly develop new similar initiatives.

The growing “Asian Tigers’ interest in access to the Canadian educational market and Canadian recruitment achievements in the region turn Asia into the major port of entry for North American universities and private educational services providers. Altbach and Knight (2006) reveal that George Washington University is “seriously considering a South Korean branch, since the South Korean government has changed its regulations to permit foreign academic services providers. Syracuse University, in conjunction with Sejong University in Seoul, offers a specially designed MBA program for Korean students. The Canadian International Management Institute (CIMI), as a private
postsecondary institution that represents the recruiting interests of ten Canadian universities and colleges, signed a memorandum of understanding with the Chinese Scholarship Council in 2004 to offer a foundation and credit transfer program to students in China wanting Canadian university degrees” (p.7). Those movements are popular and serious. They focus on complex functions of academic networks and illuminate global patterns of knowledge development and distribution.

The Post–Soviet countries with their “transitional economies” (Aslund, 2007) try to find their spot on the global academic chessboard. However, they suffer from a lack of resources and do not have the opportunity and capacity to generate within their own boundaries the intellectual and research capability to negotiate as equal partners. The logistic challenge proposed by the Ukrainian partner makes its Canadian counterpart think twice before initiating a partnership.

The Canadian collaborators talked about their readiness to meet challenges in Eastern Europe. As the Ukrainian coordinator mentioned, “Canadians probably expected to be met in Ukraine with the knowledge, insight, and expertise they needed”. However, the Canadian team came well prepared to act appropriately in unpredictable situations.

A Ukrainian coordinator noticed:

At our pre-project meetings in Kyiv, the Canadians asked the specific questions and wanted our answers via e-mail before bringing the project to Ukraine. I think they tested the waters to see if we possess knowledge and abilities to be compatible. They were interested in the history of delivering our promises, they asked about our previous international project management experiences and our openness to accept and share. It was clear they had some knowledge about the Ukrainian system and knew about our insufficient ability to appreciate the expertise of others, meet deadlines and handle responsibilities. I can admit that such a situation exists at some Ukrainian universities. However, we do realize that these challenges exist and they are the serious obstacles which could influence Canadian productivity at our university and can sink collaboration.
The assessment of the “intellectual and professional compatibility” has an intuitive component. Usually, in collaborative partnerships “if you are careful and analytic, your first impressions are likely to be right” (National Center for Technology Innovation, 2005, p.9). Collaboration in the Canadian-Ukrainian case took time and effort from both sides to mutually assess the partner’s project management capacity, professional habits, and trustworthiness. The focused collaborative work happened only when the partners came to know and understand one another. Confidence in the joint venture may be seriously undermined if the partners work in isolation, without necessary data, management and communication skills to assess what is going on with the partnership on a certain project stage (Kushnarenko, 2002). In this case, partners may lose confidence in their initiative.

Often academic collaborations occur in a context of turbulence, political uncertainty and detours caused by market-driven interests and increased demand for accountability from the governance structures. All those challenges make it imperative that collaborators find efficient and effective strategies for supporting their own partnerships, joint activities, research and learning (Lafleur & MacFadden, 2001).

At the project final stage, the Canadian participants referred in their comments to the possible “further investigation” of the Ukrainian market. This might be a good sign for Ukraine. In the future, Ukraine would be able to participate in the internationalization of their higher education as a decent regional player.

The activation of private academic service providers in the Eastern European developing countries was an important addition to the configuration of key international education players in the region. The Canadian administrator reported:
Private Western companies penetrate the Eastern European educational market with their own understanding and interpretation of the local educational policies agenda. Their commercial activities can influence international university partnerships because those providers propose their own collaborative schemes to the Ukrainian government, local authorities and Ukrainian academic institutions. Such actions limit a university partnership capacity for maneuvering within its boundaries.

The private services providers’ vision on how to navigate national governments in further educational developments and to persuade those governments to accept the proposed services clearly has a commercial aim. The Ukrainian government provided an opportunity for the transnational private academic service providers to influence current Ukrainian national educational policies. Ukrainians accepted the role of those providers as the legitimized policy players in Ukraine. Ukrainian organizations and academic institutions and the national government of Ukraine did not propose an adequate response for such a brave penetration of the unknown private entities into their academic territory.

A Ukrainian coordinator continued:

Now international education initiatives in Ukraine are associated and go like brother twins with foreign private academic providers. Coca Cola, Microsoft and Siemens bright marketing campaigns attract more Ukrainians than Sorbonne or Oxford. I am amazed how active these companies are here and wonder what Canadian universities think about that?

It was not clear whether Western private educational service providers considered the equity driven principles, regular assessment of their services quality etc. when proposing academic services to Ukrainian students. Emerging as new and active policy players in national socio-economic and educational agendas with a capacity to influence national governments, private corporations were expected to adapt their policy-making mechanisms to satisfy the needs of local policy players and educational service recipients (Bhanji, 2009). If the corporations intend to do that, the local governments may wish to assess the degree of such adaptation to local needs, structures and equity issues. It would
be interesting to trace how a Canadian university as a professional partner of a Ukrainian academic institution would achieve and sustain its mission, considering itself, according to the Canadian administrator, “a major contributor to a successful performance of developing academic systems including less attractive international markets with activities of private corporations on that market”.

**Internationalization: Main Policy Objectives**

Mutual benefit in internationalization of universities, according to the participants of the Canadian-Ukrainian project, could be achieved through different joint activities, creation of new structures and collaborative institutions.

A Canadian administrator identified some major international activities at his university:

Analyzing the international activities pursued by our university divisions and centers, I would like to name a few of them:

- International curricular development activities
- Staff and student mobility
- Collaboration in nontraditional fields
- Establishing networks of scholars and the increasing of multilateral research programs
- Delivery of international educational services on campus
- Recognition/portability of credits, joint/dual degrees
- International education research staff/student exchanges
- Joint corporate activities with private academic services providers
- Provision of education programs in the third country via a consortium of Canadian universities.

Such developments remain open-ended and are a contested categorization of regular university international activities. The Canadian university had chosen some of them as the core tools for achieving its internationalization mission. Traditionally boxed into the university internationalization framework, these categories represent the key ingredients of the internationalization mechanism, the conception of multilevel international
involvement, which engaged international, national and local actors. For the Canadian university that collection of activities became a foundation for a complicated, competitive-collaborative matrix of international outreach.

Echoing the Canadian international department administrator’s categorization of key international activities, a Canadian project coordinator reflected on the necessity to function competently within such structures, promoting the university international activities at the local level.

The scope of our international activities and their forms varies. It depends on university objectives, traditions, and resources. We understand it is not enough to be engaged locally or nationally; we have to be international in our orientation and remain fully competitive and effectively promote our own educational model. Though it is a challenge to sustain such activities…we need to be prepared with clear mechanisms and strategies for making sense of international partnership, its improvement, its value and new skills it provides. We need to be sensitive to the local needs and inspirations. We are still learning how to do that…

The Canadian university recognized international collaboration as a core component of its institutional strategies. “To remain fully competitive” and effectively promote “our own (Canadian) educational model” amongst overseas recipients require the development of persuasive policy and effective international education management mechanisms. The Canadian coordinator agreed that internationalization for the Canadian university means remaining a primary site of knowledge production, which was a product of collaborative work with an international partner. The coordinator’s comments on the challenge of developing and sustaining such activities at the institutional level are important and reflect the need for new and effective institutional mechanisms for achieving internationalization goals.

A challenge may exist in developing a regulatory sustainability framework for international collaboration at the Canadian university level. Although the actual choice of
internationalization strategies is a departmental prerogative, the university policy plays a major role in navigating international activities. The Canadian project coordinator mentioned his university’s ability to manage locally delivery of the main policy components. This was a very delicate task which depended on the local infrastructure, linguistic, intellectual, and policy flexibility. International collaboration goals could be declared, highly skilled teams of Canadian professionals could lead their way to a distant institution but the recipient university’s capacity to adapt its institutional and managerial mechanisms for new academic and organizational models could remain quite problematic. Another Canadian coordinator highlighted:

Observing the professional activities of our Ukrainian colleagues we tried to capture if the proposed collaboration content and style suited their way of working. I mean, it really has to be “chemistry” on the professional level. Different skills, resources, time limits and habits should come together and harmonize in the collaborative, non-conflicting pattern. It shows whether we are able to work productively with foreigners as a team, to adapt and implement our plans to local conditions.

Compatibility was not easy to achieve but according to this coordinator hard work and desire to share and learn brought good results. It was reported, as well, that one of the major goals for internationalization was to legitimize the international project goals to meet local requirements. To employ effective project running mechanisms in order to operate within the specifics of the post-Soviet academic environment was not an easy task for Canadians.

The establishment of certain requirements and development of skills in working with Ukrainian regulatory mechanisms, according to the following remark of the Canadian administrator, led to the transition from liberal to more restrictive educational services provision and adaptation of the managerial framework to local challenges:
We worked with our Ukrainian colleagues on the mechanisms of the compulsory registration of foreign international education projects and their content at the Ukrainian Ministry of Education and Science. We fulfilled all the requirements for the process of its accreditation. Through a number of quite specific local assessment mechanisms, our curriculum development model was carefully considered by the Ukrainian authorities for the possibilities to be introduced as a pilot project at our Ukrainian partner institution. We hope that our product is of good quality and other universities in Ukraine may use it as a foundation for their own curricula.

Quality assessment of an international academic program is a serious thing. It usually starts with an evaluation of the content of the provider’s delivering services. According to Knight (1999), “quality depends on the eye of the beholder” (p.47). There is a serious debate about assessing and monitoring the quality of internationalization. It was the decision of the Ministry of Education and Science on what degree to be involved with the quality assessment at the Ukrainian university and how to help them with their self-assessment procedures for international projects.

The majority of the Post-Soviet Western Independent States understand “internationalization” as synonymous to “westernization”. Commenting on the perspective of western orientation toward academic content, Knight and de Wit (1995) note that internationalization contributes to the homogenization of world culture. However, according to the Ukrainian Ministry official, internationalization was conceptualized as “the harmonization of the Ukrainian educational standards with the selective approach to the proposed by western institutions’ content and methodologies. This is a voluntary process and no one can impose on us what to choose”.

The Canadian university did employ the Ukrainian quality assurance procedures for services delivery in the joint project and remained open throughout the whole process to meeting the partner’s requirements for evaluation and curriculum content. During the two-year period of joint work, the Ministry of Education and Science assessed the project
through mid term local student examinations and staff performance assessment. The evaluation had been done with the aim of accessing the workload and delivery modes, as well as checking student and staff adaptation to the new curriculum.

A Ukrainian administrator emphasized:

We believe in the potential of international exchanges with Canadians, but not at the expense of academic quality. We support with our absolute understanding the Ministry assessment teams’ visits to our university international division and the international project management team.

The Ukrainian media reported that an unrecognized and rogue international curriculum model delivery was spotted in Ukraine over the last couple of years (Yurii & Saveliev, 2008). Such reports from the Ukrainian universities made Ukrainians believe that the Ministry’s professionals should seriously review any foreign proposal and prepare an academic services evaluation report.

A Ukrainian project coordinator admitted:

We had a lot to share and were proud for quite a long time that our system of higher education in many cases is more organized and focused than the Canadian one. I have the impression that the Canadian project participants were chosen in the last moment before going to Ukraine, their teaching is chaotic, fragmentary and their methodology or so-called “group work” is ineffective and strange in our classroom.

Communications and methodologies across the academic, political and cultural divides are never similar (Kurbatov, 2005). The Canadian pedagogies and “group work” according to the Ukrainian coordinator looked strange in the Ukrainian classroom because they were based on Canadian understanding of academic behavioral patterns and values. Communication with Ukrainians was not based on similarity of assumptions about the nature of academic discipline and understanding of the philosophy of collaboration. Some shared values facilitated understanding of the Western concepts,
perceptions, conversations or pedagogy. Such approach brought Ukrainians to the conclusion that their pedagogy is better, while a Canadian coordinator claimed:

We encountered different approaches to meaning making in our collaboration with Ukrainians specifically in discussing certain professional topics with cultural outsiders. Our Ukrainian colleagues were quite open to share their best practices with us.

In this case the topic for a dialogue among project partners was the “Western” concept of global citizenship, which was actively discussed not only in groups, but also during the extracurricular activities with Canadians. The global citizenship concept was not new for Ukrainians, but they were interested in expressing their own point of view on this theme.

The project administrators and coordinators identified the major global citizenship components (Appendix 3) and described their dynamics at the different stages of Canadian-Ukrainian collaboration. Ukrainians often did not recognize these components as the elements of the “global citizenship” concept, but later emphasized the necessity of their implementation in international classroom discussions. A Ukrainian coordinator noticed:

Later during our discussions with colleagues, we talked about the Canadian approach to global citizenship. Responsible discussions on global citizenship, in the classroom and during extra-curriculum activities, demonstrate that the Canadian team brought to Ukraine a wide spectrum of content and methodological approaches to discuss the serious global challenges with our students. It is absolutely necessary for us as instructors to begin our thinking in some new, wider categories about living in the global city.

Using the term “global city” instead of “global village” which is more often used to characterize global developments in the West, Ukrainians put more “urban” values on global citizenship. They insisted that HiTech parks, innovations, vibrant industrial, academic and social projects happened to exist in a global city, which represented the contemporary world more precisely, rather than the global village. But probably the most important feature of talks about global citizenship highlighted by the Canadian-Ukrainian
project participants was the readiness of global citizens for change. Desire to engage in a more collaborative paradigm, openness and readiness for sincere discussions with Canadian colleagues about global consciousness were brave and new for Ukrainians. Both sides were involved in such conversations and the challenge of risk and courage connected with the readiness for change intertwined with the emerging ability to express disagreement. A Canadian coordinator mentioned:

At the project level, change is necessary to facilitate the content, methodology and general project routine... At the policy level, we felt it was necessary for our Ukrainian colleagues to adequately react to new emerging issues and their challenges. It is not a smooth and predictable process, we take time to reflect and evaluate our past initiatives, learn the professional habits of our colleagues and move forward with new more sophisticated proposals.

The collaborators from both sides were aware that change is the major process of internationalization. When representatives of both teams talked about change, they mentioned that their attempts were not about change of the partners’ institutional values, but of personal attitudes, communications and reactions. However, some comments were about change as a necessary component of the institutional operational framework for internationalization.

A Canadian coordinator highlighted:

We need to consider some major organizational changes within our university in order to sustain internationalization activities like this one. We have developed certain organizational structures to coordinate the process and need to work on new effective policy initiatives at national and local levels to navigate it in the right direction.

International partnerships for curriculum development involve a profound change in the organizational patterns of a partnership member institution. Kurbatov (2005) claims that “the fundamental thing for running partnerships is that both organizational structures and systems of the participating institutions, as well as academic planning activities, are involved in change” (p.23). This differs from the following remark of the Ukrainian
administrator, who put more emphasis on specific sporadic activities rather than on the initiation of profound change at all levels

With colleagues from the Canadian university, we wanted to design a high quality curriculum. We believe we have achieved this through understanding, support and vision of our administrative structures, our professionalism, dedication of our people and students. I admit it was not a challenging task. Canadian help and tolerance were amazing. We were oriented on the quality of our joint product, hard work and flexibility and we believe we achieved them.

Both Canadian and Ukrainian approaches to internationalization were connected with the process approach, which was often based on “explicit goals for internationalization and their relationship to outcomes” (Knight, 2003, p.11). The project participants from both sides reported that the process of collaboration was never smooth. Power imbalances and conflicting interests of different groups involved “lurches forward and back, uneven advances frequently counterbalanced by slippage and regression, and periods of marking time” (Burn, 1996, p.3).

In that context, a Ukrainian coordinator highlighted some productive and counter-productive tendencies of internationalization:

…To run an international project is not an easy task. I do not exactly remember the name of the Western scholar, but he said in his book about organizations that a joint venture as a collective organizational model exists because this kind of organization is a way to increase the power and the special-interest group influence. It does not matter if those interests are based on the narrow goal of rationality, altruism or commitment. I was always wondering if the results of our joint curriculum would be introduced to our colleagues from other Ukrainian universities under the Canadian flag.

The Ukrainian partner referred to the Ukrainian translation of the Bengt Abrahamsson’s book “Why Organizations?” written in 1993, where Abrahamsson analyzes power influence in organizations and describes a link between power and collective action. However, according to the Ukrainian coordinator’s explanation, their Canadian counterpart supposedly used some “soft power” mechanisms to influence the results of the Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development joint venture.
For years, suspicious and cautious attitudes to everything connected with Western education were cultivated in the Ukrainian mind. Obviously eighteen years of independence was not a sufficient time to overcome this suspicion. The powerful performance of the Canadian team with its financial resources, managerial competence, strategic planning and advantages in communications technology strengthened the Ukrainian suspicion. It made Ukrainians conclude that the Canadian university group could gain control over the joint Canadian-Ukrainian collaborative product. A Ukrainian coordinator mentioned:

I personally think that our project will give our Canadian colleagues food for new creative thought. We would like to read an analysis of our project activities but most probably it will appear in some Western journals under Canadian names. This project is an excellent academic exercise for the Canadian future research and other knowledge dissemination activities.

Hernes (1976) reflecting on the relationship between power and joint academic venture knowledge ownership, says that in order “to analyze power relationships we must study the different interests actors have, and the degree of control they have over the further realization of these interests” (p.23). The problem is probably not as complicated as it may seem, and the answer to the Ukrainian question of whether internationalization/collaboration in higher education is a soft power tool can hardly be anything other than ‘yes’. However, out of the material international education provides, one could model a future strong public diplomacy based on mutual understanding and sustainability.

The aid didn’t come to Ukraine solely under the Canadian flag. Ukrainians put their own financial, human and administrative resources into the project development and were recognized by the Canadian project coordinators as “professional and experienced partners, with the necessary skills to perform a good job. What they did, and they did it
differently, in their own way and how they responded showed their interest for growth and change”.

During the evolution of the Canadian-Ukrainian working relationship, Canadians saw the enthusiasm and passion of their Ukrainian colleagues. Without a doubt the collaborative work on the joint project enriched both sides. It was especially beneficial for Ukrainians and their international project management practices. It is important to mention that the major directions of Ukrainian collaboration with Canadians were closely connected with their governmental priorities. Although implementation process of the International Cooperation Department of the Ukrainian Ministry of Education and Science mechanisms for those policies were not clear, the Ukrainian university tried to implement the Departmental policy design in a way that reflected the government’s views on international academic relations. The Ukrainian university employed the local resources and professional experience of local players.

Paying tribute to the leading role of the Ministry, a Ukrainian administrator said:

To make our conversation productive, I want to show you these two documents: the Presidential Decree on the Development of International Cooperation in Higher Education and the National Doctrine on Education (2002). The Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine designed and structured the Doctrine. It is our action plan in the current conditions of “the European and world cooperation, globalization and development of global informational technologies”. Its international concept is broader than a simple cooperation and educational ventures development with foreign academic institutions. In order to attract private capital, build a solid banking and financial network we need competent Ukrainians with the best international experiences. And we need these people to function at home and for home.

The Ministry documents not only stated the principles and ideas of collaboration, but also defined what kind of values and interests the government considered important to pursue. The government’s task was to depict in their policy documents the national development goal for Ukrainian universities to pursue. The university goal in
international education should reflect the objective government aims to “attract investments, build a solid banking and financial network, and develop a strong economic and human system” (Nikitin, 2006). The government took the initiative and proposed policies. Ukrainian universities could possess different interpretations of those policies, but the general governmental navigation was obvious.

The Ukrainian administrator continued:

We’ve distributed the documents among our universities for their approval and implementation of a plan for action. It is our national policy in academic international cooperation and every university is responsible to follow the Ministry agenda. Our Universities showed unanimous support of the Ministry’s initiatives and we will continue to encourage them for their feedback.

The first reaction from the regions was satisfactory.

It was difficult to imagine how international project coordinators could possibly find time or energy to read all the Ministerial policy and other instructional documents. It must be a real challenge for them. Busy with their packed teaching and research schedules Ukrainian university professors probably had very limited time to provide any feedback for the Ministry’s requirements.

A Ukrainian project coordinator admitted:

Instructions, papers and letters from the Ministry fly down to our international relations departments so often that we are curious about the abilities of the capital bureaucrats to manage the direction of this paper flow. We even do not bother the Ministry with our feedback, as they are already annoyed with their daily paperwork overload. Our ruling elite is busy inventing new policies which never reflect the real situation and problems at our universities.

Ukrainian bureaucracy had learned how to imitate democracy and capture the discourse. It proclaimed its progressive intentions and through the necessity for change rhetoric and slogans did its best to keep the things as they were (Nikitin, 2006). Authority in the Ukrainian variant was in the hands of the group of people whose daily work was to confirm their right to transfer orders to the subordinates. In the Ukrainian case, according
to Weber (1968), the bureaucratisation process in their hierarchical academic structures was stronger than the basic principles of democracy.

**Conclusion**

This chapter presented a complex interplay of influences and processes connected with internationalization policies and activities in Canadian and Ukrainian higher education. The donor’s insufficient knowledge of the recipient’s academic system, activization of private educational providers in the region, peculiarities of the Canadian pedagogy in the Ukrainian classroom, the joint curriculum global citizenship components, resistance to change, “soft power” mechanisms etc. are among the important factors that influenced the Canadian-Ukrainian collaborative activities.

The Canadian and Ukrainian participant explanations of policies on internationalization and peculiarities of their understanding of international project management could be grouped under the broad internationalization principles of their home institutions. The specific examples of the management dynamics of the Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture and actions of its members are described in the next chapter.
CHAPTER VI: THE CANADIAN-UKRAINIAN PROJECT PARTICIPANT

PERSPECTIVES ON PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

Interorganizational Dynamics: Data Analysis

In this chapter, I introduce four Canadian and five Ukrainian curriculum development project participants and their interpretations of a variety of collaborative actions. They describe their relationships with other partners and their own actions with a focus on the description of the project managerial tactics. The components and sub-components of the theoretical and conceptual frameworks introduced in Chapter III navigated the interview data analysis. These components structure the analysis and focus the investigation on particular issues of Canadian-Ukrainian collaboration. The categories that I use in this chapter emerged from the themes and patterns discussed with the participants. They are combined in the major theme blocks/dimensions which are chosen as the final categories for the analysis.

The most significant characteristic of the Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development project is its members. Their intentions, actions and perspectives have been featured prominently in their project practices. They were the designers and promoters of the formal relations in the Canadian-Ukrainian collaborative activities and viewed their input from the position of active players in the interorganizational project negotiations.

The data reported by the interviewees are organized along the following key categories:

- Identification and understanding of international collaboration aims
- Discussion of the project results
- Decision making procedures and their dynamics
Distributions of key players’ responsibilities

Dissemination of the joint project results.

In this chapter, I describe the Canadian-Ukrainian project as an inter-organizational collectivity, where partners join and act together to attain the specific joint-venture objectives through setting a common agenda, joint planning, and collaborative performance. I finish my analysis with the description of the Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture as a knowledge producer and distributor which spreads information through different local and international networks.

The section also contains a description of the challenges of the Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture organization identified by the participants. They talk about their key joint activities and major management tools. Specific attention was paid to the partners’ terminology usage and their interpretation of the Canadian-Ukrainian team joint achievements.

Goals of Collaboration

A partnership that has as its purpose the creation of a partnership rather than the accomplishment of some ultimate goal is inevitably doomed to early failure.

(Clark, 1999a).

Collaboration is an action system designed to attain a specific objective by “performing a set of goal-directed behavioral acts towards expectations of partners” (Borthwick, 2001, p.152). The collaborators search for a model of “how to act meaningfully in creating partnership understanding, foster commitment and meet expectations depends upon setting clear goals” (Gates, Duffield & Stark, 2001, p.56).
Leadership, organization and achievements of Canadian academic institutions foster international interest to set cross-cultural collaborative models with Canada. For the Ukrainian team, the major goal of participation in the Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture was to explore a possibility to become acquainted with the Canadian university system, to borrow the curriculum development methodology and specifics of its content, to negotiate with the Canadian colleagues and develop connections for future joint initiatives.

A Ukrainian project coordinator reflected on the growing Ukrainian interest in the Canadian “systematic goal oriented teamwork”:

There appears to be a wide interest in the Canadian educational brand, especially after some successful Canadian-Ukrainian vocational education projects in Kyiv. Though we do not know our partners quite well yet and are a bit cautious about their cultural and professional habits, we are interested in the collaborative project participation and hope that (1) the Canadian contribution will improve our existing curriculum and benefit from participation in the joint venture creation will be reciprocal; (2) we hope to borrow from Canadians their international project running management skills necessary to initiate and sustain our mini organization: the Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture, (3) it is an excellent opportunity for us to make an experimental investigation of our current human relations experiences in the field.

The Ukrainian partners see the goal of their membership in the Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture as “an opportunity to borrow Canadian competency in running international projects”. Another important goal Ukrainians claimed was “the improvement of the Ukrainian existing curriculum”. They understood that positive results would be achieved through the reciprocal process of learning and analysis of the best experiences in curriculum design and pedagogy. Taking the first step in defining and establishing appropriate and reasonable aims for the partnership, the Ukrainian project participants realized that they needed to make important cognitive transformations.
Ukrainians began their project journey from a local understanding and interpretation of “our/Ukrainian” curriculum and continued with the decision to implement some “suitable” components of “their/Canadian” curriculum. Ukrainians tried to organize Canadian-Ukrainian project management according to the traditional way of thinking and prioritizing their national “way of doing things”. However, they were open to considering the Canadian rational approach to project organization, which does not tolerate separation and isolation in collaborative relations. Ukrainians realized that they needed more knowledge about the Canadian academic culture and professional habits of Canadian partners. The lack of such knowledge, as Ukrainians noticed, slowed the tempo of the project beginning from the initial stage.

A Ukrainian project coordinator described the specifics of the Ukrainian involvement in the project:

We understand that we should use every opportunity to learn something new from our Canadian colleagues. It is a great opportunity to analyze the peculiarities of the Canadian curriculum and to borrow the best of it. We perfectly understand that we are not profoundly changing the core of our curriculum as it was tested and worked just fine for a long period of time, but we’ll broaden our horizons and receive the unique ability to compare.

Ukrainians sincerely hoped that their participation in the Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development project would turn into a real partnership where they were free to propose their changes to the curriculum and to experiment with their own innovative ideas. Ukrainians received an opportunity to elaborate and refine their understanding of what the modern curriculum should look like. Canadians helped them to develop a language in which they could share and clarify their professional ideas and concerns. The “broader horizons” for Ukrainians in this case were the ability to speak out and critique the norms of the existing Ukrainian curricula. Ukrainians were sure that the Canadian
colleagues would listen to them. Collaboration in the Canadian-Ukrainian joint project case served as an excellent tool for developing independent curriculum content-development strategies.

Analyzing educational partnerships, Intriligator (1986) found that “if the joint venture goals/benefits are so small that members of the partnership do not believe that there are any skills to be derived from their investment, they will withdraw” (p.48). The “ability to compare”, according to Ukrainians, was the major benefit of the project. It gave the Ukrainian participants an opportunity to consider some different interpretations of their accepted and tested Ukrainian curriculum and create a different and original curriculum design. Ukrainians had the opportunity to choose between two different types of academic contents and methodologies.

In the goal-setting stage, Canadians were quite responsive to the Ukrainian desire to accept new ideas. A Canadian coordinator described mutuality and acceptance during the important early period of collaboration:

The open and broad discussion regarding our goals and expected outcomes came first. The members of both teams shared and did their best to understand each other’s position regarding the important project objectives. Though we are involved in the project with our own combinations in mind, which slowed the tempo of the project a bit, our mutual aim was synergy, I believe…We tried to work as a team, respect each other’s point of view and continue to be involved in the collaborative activities with stronger empathy for the Ukrainian academic culture.

Ukrainians noticed the Canadian tolerant attitude and respectful behaviour towards them and discussed “their professionalism in communication amongst each other and with us”. Their professional and considerate attitude toward their partners created necessary pre-conditions for effective collective and personal changes within the group. Their focus was not on the creation of a ‘give-and-take’ structure but on understanding that, in order to work effectively, the partners must act reputably on and off the team.
Before committing to the Ukrainian venture and establishing its goals, the Canadians paid serious attention to the importance of gathering opinions at the pre-goal setting stage. The Canadian side ensured that all stakeholders were included in communications. While setting the aims of the joint venture, the Canadian team encouraged active input from the Ukrainians to match project expectations with their Ukrainian partners’ priorities. Canadians carefully planned curriculum development by encouraging frequent exchanges of information on content with Ukraine. The future patterns of curriculum content were carefully considered and discussed after e-mail contacts with the Ukrainian counterparts.

A Canadian coordinator described this process:

We were responding to the numerous e-mails putting each founding brick of our joint future construction in its proper place. We tried to set our priorities according to the existing academic norms and approaches. We tried to be attentive to every remark within our group and from the Ukrainian colleagues regarding the nuances of the future curriculum design. Though it took time and energy. We made an inquiry within the Ukrainian Ministry regarding the regulations and existing rules of the joint Ukrainian-Canadian curriculum recognition, fulfilled all the necessary requirements from the Ukrainian university and tried to ensure at this planning stage that no voices were missing.

Ukrainians acknowledged that Canadian’s scrupulous attention to project e-mail correspondence seriously influenced the Ukrainian attitude towards future communication and other organizational details. The Ukrainians tried their best to eliminate any technical misunderstandings which could jeopardize the partnership. The Ukrainian team was supported and encouraged by Canadians for individual and collective acceptance of responsibility for certain segments of the project. It became the distinguishing feature of the emerging Canadian-Ukrainian partnership. However, it was quite a challenging task for the Ukrainian side to organize themselves to support the Canadian rhythm of work. They noticed that it took time and effort to answer the
Canadian e-mails upon their receipt, to listen to Canadian proposals without interruption and to give the Canadian team an opportunity to propose, develop and implement their managerial tools. Step by step Ukrainians were approaching tolerant and team spirit collaboration to support the Canadian clear agenda for moving ahead.

**Types of Goals**

The responses of Canadian and Ukrainian project participants produced three major categories of goals, which I have coded as personal, professional, organizational. It was evident that, through participation in collaboration with Canadians, Ukrainians acquired higher social status and improved their professional and personal image.

A Ukrainian coordinator said:

...I hope that I will be included in the list of the Ukrainian staff exchanges with the Canadian university because I want to learn more about Canada. I want to see the quality of education and communicate with those who create it. Also, I need to admit that I was working hard during the project preparation period. I want to go because I think I deserve to go. A visit to Canada will work for my professional prestige, respect from my colleagues and will open doors to my possible participation in future European projects, which will need experienced people who are acquainted with the Western academic norms and standards.

Participation in the project and a possible visit to the Canadian university provided an opportunity for this Ukrainian coordinator to grow professionally, gain “prestige and respect from the colleagues and possibility” for future involvements in new international projects”. Ukrainians valued the opportunity to collaborate with the Canadian team. They believed that the project was a powerful driving force in the Ukrainian decision to continue with internationalization of their university system.

A Canadian participant’s reaction towards personal inspirations was as follows:

I’ve already visited the Ukrainian partner university. I have the Ukrainian roots and know the system. Participation in this project gave me another opportunity to visit Kyiv and meet my colleagues. I was looking forward to participation in the project, help with their
curriculum development and follow the changes which the Ukrainian academic system currently experiences.

The following example coupled the Canadian professional goals with personal ones indicating reciprocal gains for Canadian and Ukrainian professional exchanges. The Canadian coordinator noticed that the professional inspirations of the Canadian side were compatible with the Ukrainian pedagogical and methodological approaches:

We had a series of meetings with our (Canadian) faculty and discussed their proposals for Ukrainian curriculum development. It was exciting to know that the Ukrainian side raised the issue of a Joint Curriculum Handbook. Also, after the Ukrainian faculty visited Canada in early September 2004, we were pleased to see new Ukrainian international education leaders emerge as a result of such trips. And, of course, such experiences greatly benefit our understanding of the Ukrainian teaching specifics, some aspects of which may be interesting for us to borrow.

The Ukrainian organizational goals rested on the seriousness and pervasiveness of solving the existing organizational problems. Ukrainians believed that establishing and maintaining the partnership with Canadians required better understanding of their own administrative mechanisms, provided an opportunity to evaluate their weaknesses in the international project organization and gave a unique chance to prepare new leaders in the field of international education.

A Ukrainian administrator claimed:

As the University administrator and the Ukrainian-Canadian project participant, I would like to admit that such international initiatives develop and improve our own organizational structure. They definitely enrich us with the deeper understanding of efficiency and effectiveness of international joint venues operation and equip us with the knowledge about different organizational techniques. I said “different”, not better or worse. I know that we have the substantial differences in our capacities, structure and financial abilities, but after our visit to Canada (and I’ve discussed that with my Ukrainian group) we may wish to borrow a lot. I mean a deep reform of our international outreach system based on the holistic formation of the effective organizational structure.

The Canadian organizational goals were clearly identified by the need to adapt to the project realities and meet the objective of greater openness to Ukrainian university
structures. Canadians considered their involvement as a resource for exchange and convergence.

A Canadian project coordinator indicated:

This is significant for making sense of our functioning as an open system. Our intercultural academic conversation, the partners’ patterns of behavior and participation in such joint activities define multiple variables like multicultural knowledge, attitude to differences, commitment to change. This leads to the “brain gain” in the major fields of our collaboration. It plays a significant role in developing our international activities’ sustainability and subsequent changes in our own organization. Each international project gives an invaluable experience having a strong impact on our university mission abroad.

Three types of goals, personal, professional and organizational, were intertwined. Their identification indicated what issues needed to be solved and what mechanisms needed to be launched to secure a productive team spirit. Some of the participants emphasized short-term objectives with a focus on immediate aims. Some expressed excitement about participating in and contributing to future dynamic partnerships and others emphasized that participating in the current project routine interactions was most important for them. The participants told their own stories about their individual goals and expressed their own vision about the project present and future activities.

As Canadians and Ukrainians worked together to create a joint venture, they expressed their desire to articulate their own personal and professional aims. What was said and planned was done at the goal setting stage. The specifics of the goal setting procedure required developing a project roadmap, major benchmarks to evaluate outcomes and discuss possible managerial tools to achieve desired mutual balance. The partnership had taken on a life of its own.
Outcomes: Expectations and Achievements

The ability to achieve appropriate conditions and results at each project phase reflected the partners’ potential for cooperation. It was important for both sides to work on positive attitudes and commitment through the partners’ similarities and differences. Borthwick (1994) reported that the members’ reasons for staying in a joint project include a belief that the expectations and outcomes will be met. Projects that demonstrate success in achieving established goals make a unique impact on team members and their home university systems. As the Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development project at the time of interviews was in its operational status, the partners’ outcome descriptions defined project achievements at certain operational stages.

The Canadian project coordinator shared how the Canadian team constantly was seeking for new ways to assess quality and share aspirations for the expected outcomes:

Closer to the end of Phase I, we have found out that in many aspects we have similar approaches to project routine procedures about which a lot has already been said. Through the first curriculum drafts, joint class performance measures, data gathered as part of the early evaluation design, we saw that what all we were doing was important to our partner’s management skills improvement, their curriculum delivery techniques, and their understanding of collaboration dynamics.

The participant referred to the questions about the development of an effective collaborative structure after the initial phase took root. The purpose of Phase I of the project was to get to know each other, identify best ways of setting expectations and goals and distribute roles and responsibilities. This focus later shifted in Phase II to joint work on the curriculum drafts. At that time, Canadians reflected on their capacity to participate in the development of tools for project activity assessment. They placed high value on the importance of cultural differences and respect for the partner’s traditional ways of communication and attitudes.
A Canadian coordinator continued:

Now we are working more on our differences rather than similarities, taking into consideration in the later project phases, our different organizational visions and social environments. Our big outcome is probably our answer to the questions: how far does our capacity fit our understanding of developing and implementing the idea of a cross-cultural curriculum and how appropriately did we respond to cultural differences? How is the meaning of a “cross-cultural curriculum” phenomenon made across our borders and how successfully did we change ourselves to manage our partnership?

As the participants reflected on their experiences and evolution of joint work they noted that new questions and themes appeared along the way. The issues of cultural differences and their influence on the project dynamics, the role of culture in international curriculum content and the organizational factors related to culture were important issues for partners to address in a timely and sensitive fashion. In order to balance the collaborative relationships, Canadians and Ukrainians often redefined the nature of their relationships according to cultural differences and action preferences. The partnership became more heavily based on trust and professionalism.

Another Canadian coordinator noticed:

From the very first meetings with Ukrainian colleagues, we tried to get the project up. Presenting ourselves, we were trying to build a foundation of trust and respect. We tested our ability to establish a common vision and structure time for defining roles. Building upon clear expectations, assessment and personal reflection, we expected to cement commitment as an outcome of the project’s initial stage. We were making adjustments to our style of running international projects and encouraged our Ukrainian colleagues to take ownership of their professional development.

The coordinator highlighted commitment to create conditions to ensure project quality. Knight (2001) discusses two important aspects of international project quality. The first relates to how a certain international initiative contributes to the improved quality of higher education as a system. In this matter, the Canadian project coordinator highlights specifics the Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum adds to the quality of Ukrainian education.
The second aspect of international project quality relates to how one assesses, enhances and maintains this quality.

Analysis of the project outcomes and their quality at a certain project phase confirmed that the participants relied on their “own capacity of making a quality product and to evaluate it”. Routine operational tensions, overcoming obstacles and achieving outcomes provided a tool for characterizing the quality of the project achievements. From time to time, the partners stepped back and jointly analyzed the flaws without pointing fingers at the other side or blaming the partners for problems.

A Ukrainian project coordinator stated:

I am sure that our project is an example of how effective partnerships should operate. After the analysis and discussion of the previous project portion, we had a clear idea where we were going and what we did wrong. We knew everything about a particular situation with its unique set of challenges and were ready to apply these experiences in the similar situation in future.

Each phase of the project was jointly analyzed. A description was proposed for the operational steps on each curriculum development level. At the end of the project’s first year, the project team decided to launch an interactive Web site to share the joint experiences with other Ukrainian professors and universities that conducted similar projects with international partners. The website received recognition from Ukrainian colleagues all over the country and served as a forum for open discussion and critical remarks about international project organization.

A Ukrainian coordinator described his experiences with Internet correspondence:

I have experienced a new and interesting form of cyber communication where the project participant responsibilities and experiences were discussed. We did the analysis of the risk taking steps and shared the evidence we gathered regarding the commitment each person brought to the task. It was a collegial and professional discussion. Feedback from other Ukrainian critical friends and colleagues in academia was the most valuable. We felt that we were helping others to initiate their own inquiry and improve their own practice in international collaborations. Of course, it was possible due to the Canadian
technical assistance to our university. The Canadian project will leave a good, productive academic trace and not only at our university.

The international team was constantly striving to share their experience in learning new skills and tools. The achievement of collective responsibility for fulfilling a mutual goal through trust, patience, determination and desire to share was one of the main project’s outcomes.

Talking about the project’s impact on the Ukrainian faculty, the Ukrainian coordinator put a strong emphasis on the collaborative inquiry through the international project cadre’s preparation:

In Ukraine, we have no university/college program which prepares specialists for international project management. Our main achievement is that we’ve constructed a joint scheme and learned from Canadians about the mechanisms to manage joint international projects. To prepare a competent and professional Ukrainian international educator is quite a challenging task for us to fulfill. Due to the Canadian financial support and help in the project organization, we filled the gaps in our knowledge of the project logistics, our knowledge of the world in general and we are a couple of steps closer to the Canadian standards in teaching. Also, Canadians hold quite high standards of collaborative professional relations. For us, it is a professionally and personally meaningful outcome.

Successful collaboration is an educative enterprise that results in professional and personal improvement. It empowers those who participate in collaboration and helps them to analyze what they did (“we’ve filled the gaps in our knowledge on the project running”) and how they could do it better (“the main achievement is that we’ve constructed a joint scheme, an effective plan…”). Collaboration has the potential to transform individuals into active agents of change (Kornfeld & Leyden, 2001).

The openness of members to discuss constraints on their productive participation and their acceptance of collaboration was jointly appreciated. A strong effort was exerted by both sides as they sought to meet the needs of the counterpart. This resulted in the strong sense of mutuality.
In order to consolidate the joint work and conceptualize the project outcomes, a Canadian coordinator discussed the idea of creating a post-project manual for international educators in Ukraine/Eastern Europe:

As an outcome of our partnership we thought it might be important to prepare with our Ukrainian partners a manual on how to develop international curricula projects. We wanted to make our joint experience available for our colleagues at other Ukrainian universities and reflect on our collaboration. We wanted to be part of the professional curricula development conversations and saw a manual as a useful project outcome.

Given the limited time and the current status of Canadian-Ukrainian project, it could be difficult to produce a manual on collaborative activities that would be truly satisfactory for both sides. Thus far, written project reports dealt with work or tasks in progress. Planning and producing a manual consumes a great deal of time and effort. It is a serious process that requires respectful negotiations and opportunity to meet deadlines (Lafleur & MacFadden, 2001). However, closer to the final phase of the project the participants began to work on the manual chapters independently at their home institutions. If the manual was produced as a result of the participant post-project collaborative efforts, it would be, undoubtedly, an important contribution on the part of both universities to the study of collaborative professional relationships.

The Canadian-Ukrainian project coordinators described the blending of two professional educator groups into a workable joint international team. The most important feature of this team was an opportunity to communicate and exchange ideas on the topics of mutual interest. As an outcome of such communications, a Canadian coordinator reported about the opportunity to compare the Canadian and Ukrainian systems communication as “collaboration with Ukrainians gave an opportunity to identify similarities and differences in international project organization”. At the same time the Ukrainian coordinators paid attention to the opportunity of getting information “about the
Canadian educational system to contribute to the improvement of our own international education policy and international curriculum practices”.

The acquaintance with the partner’s expertise and work style was important for both sides to develop a broader perspective of international curriculum design and discover new ideas for a curriculum framework, which probably were omitted at the planning phase.

A Canadian coordinator continued:

At each project phase, we tried to achieve consensus as a result of our own curriculum development models. Through sharing, we became acquainted with the partner’s expertise and habits of getting involved in business with us. If Ukrainians needed more time or just one of us to sit beside and talk, we understood and tried to do what they asked. Their cultural habits may be quite different from ours.

Ukrainians talked about their new knowledge of the national and global society acquired as a result of such conversations with Canadians. They remark that it was a stimulus to think about the relationship between “national” and “global”, recognizing their own Ukrainian norms that still grounded each Ukrainian participant. They especially highlighted the importance of “the potential for our graduates to maneuver on the global labour market”.

The project participants established a new, Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture communication culture, which incorporated the goals of the project taking into consideration the cultural peculiarities of each participant.

A Canadian coordinator reported a deeper understanding of challenges within the partner’s system:

To run an international project with a foreign partner, you need to do your home task diligently. However, with all the knowledge about Ukraine we brought to the project, the real profound understanding of the local conditions you receive after participation in its routine operations in Ukraine. The project analysis of outcomes was a way to identify problems and issues in our own system as well.
One of the major interests for Ukrainians was to learn from Canadians about global competency and global citizenship. Canadians did view the curriculum development project as an effective mechanism for a conversation about global citizenry and global responsibility. Global competence, acceptance, mutuality, and multicultural awareness were important categories that made Ukrainians re-think their traditional approaches to their curriculum.

A Ukrainian coordinator highlighted:

I personally think that our project with Canadians is a modern liberal project. It is a mutual process, which is opposite to our hierarchical model that features international project running. It is based on experiences of Canadian society and transfers knowledge-skills-values attitude to our environment. …I ask myself what is global citizenship? Is it a value category? The joint activities with Canadians helped us to make one more step to understanding what it means to be a competent and tolerant global citizen.

I systematized the components of global citizenship and combined them into themes which were proposed by the Canadian and Ukrainian collaborators. The participants discussed their meaning and worked on their conceptualization via a collective, collaborative discussion.

Some of the Canadian and Ukrainian coordinators talked about their professional transformation from being the project managers to becoming its leaders. They mentioned different styles of leadership and highlighted leadership elements which dominated in the Canadian-Ukrainian partnership. The collaborative project was initially planned as a Canadian integrated approach to the Ukrainian curriculum content and was unfolding as a profound restructuring and reform-based Canadian technique of project leadership.

A Ukrainian coordinator talked about leadership:

Work with Canadians was a good lesson for me. I am impressed with so many aspects of it. It was a constant evolution and growth for me personally. As a professor and a project coordinator,
I understood what it means to be a leader versus a manager in international education when inclusiveness matters, competence and stability are required. We had a unique example here of “multilayered” leadership. The Canadian inclusiveness was working hand in hand with the Ukrainian “the boss is always right”.

Canadians brought to the project their belief that the Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture could not depend on one person or group. Such limited involvement could threaten the partnership. An attempt to attract as many participants as possible to inclusive project decision-making, according to the Canadian and Ukrainian opinion, was a productive step. The Canadians tried to create a structure where decisions were made through group consensus. The success of hard work was shared and accomplishments were honoured. Later in the process, the Canadian and Ukrainian project leaders discussed the project tensions and disagreements with participants and did their best to understand and support the members’ needs and aspirations.

A Ukrainian coordinator claimed that the major project outcome was the professional growth of Ukrainians and support for the managerial techniques used to move partnership forward:

This project gave me tremendous feedback of what a partnership in international education means. That understanding caused a desire to learn and explore different educational system values and views. I am really interested in Canadian academic life, Canadian research on comparative education and want to test my potential in managing the future joint initiatives with Canada.

Both sides raised many important questions about the joint curriculum content. The partners talked about the advantages and disadvantages of Canadian and Ukrainian pedagogies, analyzed how certain elements of curriculum worked in both university classrooms, and proposed that the best elements of the two systems’ content be included in the joint curriculum draft. Such discussions, according to Noah (1985), describe educational processes and outcomes, assist in the development of institutional practices,
highlight relationships between systems, and establish generalized statements that are valid in more than one country.

Canadians were specifically interested in the processes that determined the Ukrainian internationalization policy influences on their joint project’s results. A Canadian coordinator tried to figure out:

…How the Ukrainian internationalization strategy is developed and implemented at the institutional level, how the Ukrainian international education development policies differ from the other developing countries in the region, to what extent is the post-Soviet independent state internationalization program based on equity driven principles.

The Ukrainian socio-economic and educational environments, as well as external pressures, had a serious influence on the local internationalization policy. Knowledge of the local political and institutional nuances acquired from participation in the project helped Canadians to construct mechanisms to navigate their communication vis-à-vis the key Ukrainian policy players. As result of the Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development project the Ukrainian coordinators considered lobbying their university administration and the Ministry for change:

The project was absolutely helpful. We discussed the possibility to create a group and initiate a significant move towards Peremogy Avenue (the Ukrainian Ministry of Education and Science address) that would hopefully bring serious changes to the international education policy. Canadians gave us the resource support we needed to take risks. They sharpened our new vision towards collaborative curriculum development programs.

Taking into consideration the diversity of the Ukrainian university institutional and political responses, the devolution of powers to the grassroots level in Ukraine is unlikely to happen in the near future. The limited institutional funding is a major obstacle to any internationally significant movement. However, the important thing was that the project
coordinators began to talk and think about changing the situation and creating a critical mass for such changes.

Participation in policy talks with Ukrainian partners enhanced the Canadian internationalization profile, as well. Canadians gained more knowledge of the local educational specifics and practices. Through the reconsideration of the Ukrainian current policies, engaging in collective responsibility and personal commitment, Canadians shared their confidence, connectedness and ability to create change and influence the administration. However, such developments were not always a straightforward matter.

**Decision Making and Distribution of Responsibilities**

The Canadian-Ukrainian collaborators tried to create an environment where both parties would benefit. To achieve expected results the Canadian and Ukrainian participants employed shared decision-making. Joint project activity was an opportunity for opinions to be exchanged, which in turn enhanced belief in the mutual benefit of the collaborative actions. Managerial mechanisms of sharing authority were initially introduced by the Canadian side and then were successfully borrowed and used by Ukrainians at later stages of the project.

A Canadian coordinator explaining the decision-making techniques employed by the Canadians noticed:

> We tried to create an environment where no one dictated or dominated; a sense of confidence and efficacy was our aim. Our partnership was not dependent on any one person. The project participants enjoyed a significant degree of autonomy, which rested on active, dynamic decision-making design and delivery.

At the initial stage, the project’s tempo slowed because of the cautious attitude of the Ukrainian team to the unknown decision-making techniques used by Canadians.
Ukrainians engaged in persistent work to learn how Canadians organized the project decision-making process.

A Ukrainian coordinator mentioned:

I know there was some tension and suspicion in our communication at the initial project stage. Everyone knows that Canadians are more experienced in curriculum development and have a reputation as strong international project managers. But they seemed so open and human. My idea was that a Canadian project coordinator might be paired with a Ukrainian one at the pre-project stage. They should be given an opportunity to create a team at the earlier stage. Then the Canadian leadership and Ukrainian administrative supervision would have created a “managed democracy” type of organization necessary to run the project.

It was important that “both parties understand and respect one another”. Ability to share and respect “are not always quantifiable but they are, nonetheless, essential in collaboration” (National Center for Technology Innovation, 2005). The coordinator mentioned pairing and sharing of knowledge at early project stages. The Canadian and Ukrainian partners understood that real collaboration could happen when the participants worked side-by-side with appreciation of what each team had to offer to the partnership.

A Ukrainian participant noted:

We worked together with Canadians to achieve what was intended to be achieved at each project phase. Maybe for the first time in my life I felt that I was treated as equal. Our numerous conversations, meetings and personal talks made me feel that my opinion is of interest to someone. Usually my more talkative and more sophisticated Ukrainian colleagues perceive me as a threat to their “progressive” international initiatives. Though some Canadians who participated in the project came to Ukraine with little knowledge about our culture, they turned out to be the best in their inclusive and fair decisions.

The necessity to solve project problems through diverse lenses of multicultural understanding and convergent professional perspectives was a priority. However, there was some tension and confusion from both sides in accepting the models and norms of collaborative decision-making. The need to negotiate the project according to the jointly approved standards was central in the collaborative decision-making scheme.
The Ukrainians were challenged, when some colleagues were perceived as more progressive than the others. They tried to accommodate their approaches and views to Canadian inclusiveness. At the same time, the Ukrainian partners understood that their project with Canadians was an opportunity for change and sharing. Such understanding enhanced the balance within the Canadian-Ukrainian group.

Reflecting on the evolution of their collaborative work, a Canadian coordinator recognized the role of collaborative decision-making:

Collaborative decision-making is an excellent tool to reject premature decisions. We had a choice, took the actions needed to sustain the relationship, we respected different points of view and acknowledged the necessity to learn all together. It greatly enhanced our professional learning.

Collaborative decision-making comes to maturity through reaching consensus in differences of opinions and experiences, through the joint assessment of needs and opportunities, concentrating in conflicting issues, which influences the project practices (Borthwick, 2001). The Canadian-Ukrainian project enabled its participants to be professional learners through making an informed choice among the alternative proposals, actions and discussions of expected outcomes. It enabled the international team to generate joint group creativity and personal responsibility. It gave the opportunity for the participants to defend their relationship from imperfect actions and pressures.

A Canadian coordinator continued:

As any working group our international team had no perfect ideas. Every suggestion was thoroughly considered and analyzed. The whole project can fall apart and people would suffer if there is no inclusiveness in decision-making. I should say that every international project needs clear mechanisms of shared decision-making and the management process must provide some professional reminders of interests and benefits for its participants. When faced with several choices of action, decisions and results, people usually achieve what they believe in. Such creative atmosphere is likely to have the best overall outcome. Efficiency and effectiveness of operation was our ultimate aim.
The process of making choices and reaching conclusions was not easy. Any problem in an international project can significantly affect the joint team’s performance if the most appropriate solution is chosen (Kurbatov, 2008a). The coordinator talked about “the reminders” of interests and benefits for the project participants. The Canadian and Ukrainian partners came to the project with different objectives. However, through shared decision-making all were involved in the collaborative action to retain what they felt were important benefits to the project.

The Canadian-Ukrainian project managers in a collegial manner tried to identify and resolve problems by highlighting and evaluating the group’s actions with a focus on quality and effective performance. Borthwick (2001) wrote that if partnership representatives needed to seek authorization from top-level management, this could serve as a barrier to their full participation in the decision-making process. Action planning served as a method for determining the Canadian-Ukrainian project operational steps.

Bringing together representatives of diverse cultures can create dissonance, conflict and anxiety (Maldonado, 1994; Fullan & Miles, 1992). However, shared decision-making and joint action planning can eliminate such challenges. The collaborative Canadian-Ukrainian team saw benefits over a certain period of time and felt that their contributions were balanced with careful selection and exchange of the decision-making techniques at each project phase. The project operational focus was clearly identified at the initial stages of collaboration and proper organizational steps sustained committed participation. The very fact that the project participants had a professional responsibility and obligation to perform their functions nurturing the culture
of acceptance and mutuality turned the decision-making process into a meaningful professional communication on how to improve things.

In conceptual, as well as practical project matters, the Ukrainian side relied heavily on their administration. The Ukrainian participants often experienced the need for seeking authorization from their top-level management. Ukrainians, however, never considered artificially created bureaucratic procedures as barriers to full and open participation in the project decision-making process.

As a Ukrainian participant indicated:

The Ukrainian academic identity and pride always motivate the Ukrainian followers and inspire their administration to lead them. It is important to look at the nature of our professional relations and understand why we trust our leaders. We inherited quite an effective educational and organizational system from the USSR. They can suggest grouping amongst the participants or act alone according to your knowledge and intuition. But they always can warn us about a potential risk to avoid frustration.

A “sense of institutional belonging”, trust in their leaders drew Ukrainians to repeated negotiations with their high-level decision makers whom they rely upon and show their subordination. Initially it looked like the authoritative Ukrainian educational managers with their ability “to warn about risks” seemed to be more attractive to Ukrainians than the inclusive Canadian project leaders.

The recurring demands for action and constant reconceptualizing of preferences produced a catalytic rather than a stabilizing Ukrainian response to the project organization. The Ukrainian organizational culture dictated that subordination should be performed according to the established norms. The boundary between authority and followers was vivid and never faded. The ministerial and institutional groups, which controlled the Canadian-Ukrainian project, signaled that “the people from upstairs” were interested and curious about everything what was going on “with Canadians”. Their
special interest, in particular, was a list of the Ukrainian exchange participants who were
to travel to Canada.

A Ukrainian project coordinator asserted that the leading role of the Ministry of
Education and Science as the idea generator and policy developer was crucial:

…And returning to your question about the Ministry. Professionals usually follow and
trust their managers. It is obvious and it is a normal process. Anarchy in such serious
projects as North American-Ukrainian academic exchanges and curriculum development
projects is unacceptable. Somebody should take full and competent responsibility and
control the possible external turbulences. The successful operational steps depend on
competent decision-making. The Ukrainian high administrative echelons are capable to
do that. The threats of risky situations and disorganization require subordination and
elementary discipline.

According to the project participant’s opinion, subordination in the Ukrainian
academic system is a serious thing. It was inherited from the USSR and people took it for
granted after independence. The above comment confirms the Ukrainian belief that
discipline and order can be maintained through trust in the government professional
decisions. In addition to subordination, a number of Ukrainians comments were
connected with a risk as a threat for inclusive decision-making. Risk was a category of
concern for Ukrainians. A Ukrainian administrator shared that until the last stage of the
project, he experienced cautious mistrust towards some project activities. Taking a
cautionsary stance on the amount of risk involved, he claimed:

You ask me to describe what kinds of feelings I have…to my mind the involvement in
the academic exchanges with Canadians is risky. What kinds of risks can I anticipate?
The Canadian democratic manner of directing the project and governing the activities can
to my mind replace our discipline, strict subordination and may propose results which
will not be quite practical in our reality. …Risk does not have a specific structure in
present. It is a future issue: a tree, which roots on the ability to attract and persuade, will
have its fruits some day, but those who have planted it will not taste them.

Risk according to the above interpretation was synonymous to the probability of loss.

The Ukrainian coordinator explained that risk connected with the international exchanges
could be coupled with the “soft power” concept (Nye, 2004). In this case, the Canadian
“soft power” decision-making manner concerned the Ukrainian participant. Some Ukrainians are still under impression that a number of western academic projects with developing countries look like a result of the “opportunity to get what you want through attraction rather that coercion and payments” (Nye, 2004, p.17). The Canadian decision-making mechanisms were more sophisticated and elegant, according to the participant. It could threaten the status quo of the Ukrainian institution, where they are more direct and say what they think.

A Ukrainian coordinator continued:

Though risk can be manufactured artificially and it is a manmade category, I am expressing here my feelings regarding our Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development venture. I probably would define it as an organized irresponsibility to affect the behaviour of others. Though international collaboration perfectly fits in the national objectives of many developing countries. We are dealing here with the preparation of a new generation of Ukrainian citizens and I will be clear here: Ukrainians by origin who are attracted (for sure) and affected by the “Canadianess” which is nice, but quite a different piece of design on our moral fabric.

An “organized irresponsibility to affect the behaviour of others”, according to the Ukrainian opinion, was counterbalanced with an “unorganized and unexpected” feeling of trust and effective professional communication with the Canadian partners. When it was difficult to communicate and act effectively, Ukrainians tried to find out why it happened and asked Canadians for advice. The Canadian team, recognizing the norms of the Ukrainian culture, tried to understand and discuss the specifics of Ukrainian attitude through direct communication with them.

Although not everyone contributed to the project equally, or in the same way, all were invited to voice their issues and concerns at the project discussion desk. When the partners united their voices and discussed their challenges and successes, it enabled them to understand how their professional experiences had contributed to their respective roles
and responsibilities (Nikitin, 2006). Canadians and Ukrainians placed an importance on the value of synergy when “what you really need, if you are going to have a dramatic interchange of ideas, is gathering people sitting around a desk or a table together, or going out in the evening with a bottle of wine over dinner, talking about their enthusiasms, showing their enthusiasms. It is not just exchange of information, structures. It is the chemistry of people who provide the energy, become a motor force for these sorts of things. But strategic connections are important because, to some extent, those are the links, those are the instruments of intellectual mediation” (in Oleksiyenko, 2008).

The initial Ukrainian belief that Canadians came to “convert their graduates into Canadians” changed into the understanding that collaborative projects could offer new and different approaches to people’s relationships, commitment and partnerships.

A Ukrainian participant noted:

Among the Ukrainian project participants we clearly identified people who were well suited for collaborative activities. These people can be an excellent resource of information and experience for future collaborative projects. Canadians worked a lot with those people. However, there were people who were not suited well for the collaboration and by mistake were put into situations which required a full commitment to them. The Canadian rational practice of decision-making and the configuration of the general project management made us learn and try to understand as much as we can.

The decision, behaviour and communication tactics had a direct influence on project participants. The Canadian action planning and shared decision-making required a sharing of trust and commitment where no partner dictated or dominated in the collaborative process. The Ukrainians project coordinators were caught by a dilemma of “home made” subordination versus foreign inclusive decision-making. No doubt the Ukrainian higher echelons influenced project grass roots members with their attitude and status. However, the Canadians persistently displayed their inclusive decision-making methods, negotiating in the Canadian way, as one of the Ukrainians noted “we were
walking the kilometers in Canadian shoes two size larger”. It was impossible to predict
the shoe sizes for all the Ukrainian participants but gradually, step after step, Ukrainians
appreciated what each of the Canadian participants had to offer and realized how
important was to listen and hear.

**Member Roles**

There was a need for Canadians and Ukrainians to articulate clearly the roles and
to understand the responsibilities of joint venture members. During the project the
administrators and coordinators became “shape shifters” serving their roles as a “leader,
follower, director, facilitator, listener, speaker, information provider, challenger,
protector, counselor, designer, learner etc (Simmons, Konecki, Crowell, Gates-Duffield,
1999).

A Ukrainian coordinator talked about the new project roles that emerged along the
way:

In the collaborative process, we created new roles for ourselves and distributed our
responsibilities in order for everybody to show their organizational talents to the best
advantage. We were trying to create a democratic setting where everybody’s commitment
was greeted and encouraged. We counted on Canadians in the role distribution process
and felt they would lead and carry a serious load.

Borthwick (2001) describes that project groups or planning teams serve as “idea
generators, oversight providers, policy developers or strategic planners” (p.79). The
participation in project activities at the grass roots level (e.g. the project logistics and
activities coordination) was also considered and carefully examined. Each Canadian and
Ukrainian participant was responsible for a certain segment of project implementation
and was expected to share the role of project leadership if the situation required doing so.
Every strategic move of the Canadian team was a lesson for Ukrainians. The Ukrainian
group predicted that it would be a serious test for Canadians to equally distribute the
project load. Ukrainians also expected that the partners would operate as peers in a desire to establish sound working relationships, paying attention to work load and partner input.

A Ukrainian administrator noted:

It was important for us to trace how the Canadian main project players were selected, what major groups/individuals were included, and how inclusive those decisions were. We did a lot of consultations on those issues with the Canadian partners.

Intriligator (1986) points out that members need to learn about other members’ place and activities in a project and demonstrate interest, support and personal commitment to one’s own functions. Canadians and Ukrainians mutually assessed the capacities of each other and established “commitments at both the personal and institutional level” (Maeroff, 1983).

The Canadian and Ukrainian coordinators consulted each other on the managerial issues which influenced the project activities. Both sides considered those consultations as an excellent opportunity for continuing educational and professional growth. Ukrainians tried to borrow the Canadian techniques on team creation and role distribution. Canadians did their best to create a stimulating learning environment for both parties to experience the full range of the project responsibilities and exchange of professional experience.

A Canadian coordinator described the working relationship at each phase of the project:

Going through each stage of the project and ensuring that its key issues were manageable, we demonstrated smooth working relationships and identified proper human resources to be tapped. Through individual and group development and understanding of what portion of a project each of us was expected to be responsible for, we noticed that strengths and expertise were often related to adequate and properly chosen functions of people in the project. As we were collaborating in a non-hierarchical setting, some new roles and responsibilities were created.
That may be easier said than done. A proper matching of expertise with role distribution in the Canadian-Ukrainian project involved time and effort. The complementary diverse project roles were expected to add strength to a partnership in conceptual as well as practical matters (Padak et al, 1994). Effective functions and desire to achieve the best performance according to the assigned roles indicated that the Canadian-Ukrainian partnership was an organization of the balanced contributions and benefits.

A Canadian participant highlighted:

The combination of hard work, proper team dynamics, sufficient time and competent responsibilities’ performance led us to the true partnership. New roles within the existing and new responsibility frames were created at both the decision-making level and functional responsibilities of the members. This happens because the participants collaborate in a non-hierarchical setting, the leaders were always ready to share their role, and the synergy of all level contributed for the collaboration to proceed successfully.

Both sides agreed that a stable and productive project environment could be created when joint venture participants clearly knew what kind of results to expect and what progress to anticipate. The participants realized that the project provided an opportunity for continuous learning about the role distribution process and the effective collaborative environment.

The discussion about the project responsibilities and participants’ roles was a serious professional development activity. The partners informed each other about their experiences and practices in order to take actions on the partnership improvement.

However, there were some frustrating moments on the role distribution activity.

A Canadian participant warned:

I must admit that there was some kind of frustration when we, at some project stages, were not able to learn what other project sub-teams were doing, not having sufficient time for our own team to get together to plan and discuss each others’ roles and achieved progress.
It was true that time constraints were a serious problem at almost every project stage. It often resulted in dissonance and anxiety. The participants did their best to avoid an uneven workload due to the time frames and possible lack of communication because of that. Professional responsibilities in the partner’s home universities required concentration on the home issues, as well. It pressed both sides to schedule their time properly, act effectively, focus on the project priorities and plan in advance.

A Ukrainian project coordinator stated:

While working on the project with Canadians, we carefully evaluated our potential and ability to fulfill responsibilities. We wanted the project members to receive an adequate workload and perform according to their abilities and expertise. The group dynamics variations were difficult to predict in the forced relationship atmosphere, such as those required by our negotiations with the Ministry of Education and Science. Subordination and dependence, which we usually felt as a result of negotiations with our administration in the Canadian-Ukrainian case, was substituted by the opportunity to freely express our opinion and to see the partnership results over the long term.

In the case of the team building strategies Canadians and Ukrainians relied on their own expertise. Carefully crafted schedules, evenly distributed roles and responsibilities, feedback from the group and frequent consultations with partners led to participant commitment and mutual benefit. It took an ongoing effort to carefully define roles and establish relationships that reflected the joint team’s desire to contribute, courage for change and responsibility.

Project Results Dissemination

The creation of an ongoing system of project result dissemination was an essential element that contributed to knowledge creation and its distribution. The evaluation of project performance at certain project stages and effectiveness of its implementation in the Ukrainian classroom helped the partners to examine their joint methodologies and share the project’s achievements with external parties. It was clear that the project results
could not suit all the Ukrainian academic ambitions for the “perfect” international curriculum. However, it was a major step forward towards a new and unique curriculum. Its creation was a time and energy-intensive process and the project results were open to sharing with the Ukrainian, Canadian and international academic community. The regional Ukrainian universities expressed interest in the Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture results. This was reflected in the following Ukrainian coordinator comment:

At our university, we have created an initiative professor group with our colleagues from different Ukrainian universities who were interested in our international curriculum development activities. Canadian project members actively participated in sharing and disseminating the curriculum development project results. Of course, there were surprised eyes and disagreement, but the general perception was positive. A lot of our colleagues were interested in beginning collaboration with foreign universities in their own departments.

The Canadian-Ukrainian activities questioned the existing curriculum priorities and provided a general outline to help the Ukrainian educational institutions and faculty to establish and carry out curriculum development strategies. The Canadian-Ukrainian partnership gave more weight to productive analysis of the international collaboration results and helped to build a bridge between the project activities and curriculum development initiatives at Ukrainian academic institutions. The Canadian-Ukrainian project contributed to a better understanding of international cooperation in higher education.

Borthwick (2001), Padak et al. (1994) note that examination and dissemination of data by those involved in the partnership suggest that “meaning is socially constructed and context dependent” (pp. 29-30). The Canadian-Ukrainian project attracted attention to the dynamics of Ukrainian perceptions of international collaboration, created the agenda for future collaborative developments and initiated adaptive and flexible planning
for results dissemination. In Ukraine, Canadians created the Canadian Resource Centre, conducted curriculum development project seminars for local academic communities, initiated the creation of the Ukrainian curriculum development expert groups and enhanced the acceptance of an international partnership as a valuable enterprise worthy to pursue.

A Canadian coordinator believed that:

The feedback about this curriculum development partnership, the project’s results dissemination mechanisms may be a topic of the Ukrainian colleagues’ regular meetings, or even a conference. The shared opinion of the Canadian and Ukrainian colleagues about our project and their help in dissemination of the project results made the post project activities quite popular among the Ukrainian academic communities.

Paying attention to the collaborative post project activities, Clark (1999a) recommends that it is important to have documentation of a sustainable partnership’s work. The relevant project documentation would be included in the Canadian-Ukrainian Joint Curriculum Development Recommendations, published by the project participants in a Handbook for International Project Managers. The project participants were looking forward to collaborative work on the Handbook.

Havelock et al. (1982) address the issue of funding the post project activities if they are not included in the project budget and how to provide editorial and logistical support for publishing documentation about project arrangements. He concludes, “that it (the post project publishing) is rarely done without third party assistance” (p.xv). It was problematic to find studies or research reports on evaluation of university partnerships as a collaborative act across subject areas, including the analysis of goals, outcomes, needs and resources, interactions and stages of the collaborative activities. On that matter, a Canadian administrator suggested:
We should open more effective communication and develop more vibrant working research relationships. We can identify criteria to measure collaboration as a joint activity, or the extent to which a higher education institution is internationalized via collaboration in the curriculum development. Partners may not wish to publicly share information about what may turn out to be unsuccessful partnerships, but we should encourage our colleagues to identify the problematic spheres and describe the collaborative projects’ needs.

Collaboration is a set of important themes which may serve as barriers or promoters of international partnerships. In international collaboration, the situation may be complicated by the diversity of opinions involved in it. The participants of the Canadian-Ukrainian collaboration learned, as well, that some project participants were not ready to perform their full commitment to the project. It was obvious that Canadians and Ukrainians would prefer to keep such information within the team. The path of the Canadian-Ukrainian project often involved movement forward and back, uneven actions frequently counterbalanced by retreat and withdrawal of some members. There were tough periods of disagreement and disappointment. This was normal. A dialogue was the way out for both teams. When the going got tough the project members increased communication and time for the discussion of project problems.

The project members believed that the Canadian-Ukrainian partnership had brought reform-based changes to the field of international curriculum and its participants did experience profound personal and professional change. Those project achievements were shared with the local colleagues and the project results were effectively disseminated. Different perspectives and opinions on the Canadian-Ukrainian project results enriched the field and developed an action plan for the Ukrainian university’s future international education initiatives. The post-project open discussions, wide dissemination of results, joint Canadian-Ukrainian extra-curricula events, and online
portfolio arrangements provided valuable evaluation of the reasons, bases, and concepts of Canadian-Ukrainian collaboration.

**Interorganizational Dynamics**

It is difficult to determine where individual organizational activities end and interorganizational activities begin (Slater, 2001). Academic partnership is created by joint venture members and can be considered as an interorganizational unit, which according to Borthwick (2001), consists of two or more institutions or groups. These groups join together through collaborative acts to attain a specific objective of a partnership. A created unit develops behavioral expectations of each of the partners regarding the rights and obligations of membership in the collectivity. The Canadian-Ukrainian partnership reflected a number of similar important themes, which the Canadian and Ukrainian partners brought to the joint venture.

A Ukrainian administrator reflected on the sense of mutual coordination and joint venture model development:

In future, thinking theoretically about our partnership and making conclusions out of our mutual activities, we will specifically share our experiences with those who are interested in developing something similar. Our expectations to create a unique interorganizational model were implemented in an effective partnership. We’ve crafted a model, which includes equality, a shared conceptual understanding of working with a different value system (by the way, a lot of us had problems with that), attention to different institutional political considerations, and mutual trust. At the final stage of our project, we are still learning how to conceptualize and implement that.

Canadian-Ukrainian collaboration, which began with the minimum knowledge of those particular types of negotiations, grew into a strong interorganizational commitment and confidence in receiving a mutually beneficial product. A Ukrainian administrator described the Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development model as an “effective partnership” indicating that not everybody accepted the partnership as a “value system”.
It was an achievement of two international academic institutions with their traditional views and experiences on how to run an international business. The Ukrainian system was more inclined to support the bureaucratic model of collaboration, whereas the Canadian one was innovative and supported more inclusive type of collaboration. Ukrainians and Canadians were sure that each system was right and effective. The achievement of both systems was their attempt to understand each other, to work collaboratively for improvement of the existing curriculum standards, to tolerate differences and transform their ideas of change into joint practice.

A Canadian administrator indicated:

Progressing through the final stage of our project, our international teams believes that collaboration is the ability to achieve mutually agreed goals, persist irrespective pressure with the task, have determination and tolerance and demonstrate respectful behaviour. We shared commitment and accepted our roles and responsibilities while distributing power. Respect for diversity and inclusive leadership tactics are our biggest achievement.

The Canadian-Ukrainian project participants talked about the emergence of the newly designed collectivity that engaged members from both sides to transform their practices and create commitment to “demonstrate respectful behaviour” and inclusivity. New collective behaviours and values emerged as personal attitudes and characteristics had changed and progressed towards collective values and new interorganizational possibilities.

The collaborators talked about the key limiting factors, which constrained the relationship. The collaborators identified five major challenges that influenced the effectiveness of the joint venture. Those challenges were: language, effectiveness of tools for professional expertise and advice, expertise in inclusive leadership, ability to accept change and time constrains. The professional expertise and collaborative model for curriculum delivery was at considerable disadvantage due to the usage of English as the
main language of communication. Although the project coordinators’ English was quite fluent, the language level of other members of the partnership. The most complex portions of the new curriculum development were performed through simultaneous interpretation. Some project management issues at the administrative level were also resolved with the help of interpreters.

The Canadian coordinator elaborated on this:

The key-limiting factor was a language problem and our low Ukrainian language communication capacity which considerably influenced the project’s quality. Our principal project mission was the joint curriculum development and its teaching and outreach. We couldn’t do that effectively, because we paid too little attention to a possible language barrier. Success in delivering educational programs abroad does depend on foreign language knowledge. If I can make recommendations for future collaborative initiatives, universities have to be highly selective in the international programs they pursue and language resources they possess.

The Canadian team had a couple of Canadians with Ukrainian roots who joined the project at different phases. They negotiated with Ukrainians in Ukrainian and helped their Canadian colleagues to function properly with the curriculum development and project organizational issues. The ministry communications were all in Ukrainian and Ukrainians invited interpreters from their university to help Canadians to communicate with the Ukrainian government officials. It was critical to have people within the Canadian group with knowledge of the Ukrainian language. It was important and wise to include the services of the local interpreters in the project budget.

Other challenges, according to the Ukrainian coordinator’s remarks were mostly connected with the ability to work together as a group. Ukrainians noticed that the challenge of working with Canadians sometimes had the tendency to turn to working parallel:

Quite challenging was, for instance, to distribute the workload in our group. We (Ukrainians) tried to receive the roles according to our abilities and expertise. Such issues
as involvement, trust, conform level and time required for functioning as a professional group were not easy to turn into a team-oriented issue. It is not easy for us to fulfill our responsibilities to work together as a group according to the Canadian understanding of what is a collaborative group. Sometimes even a random conversation could spark misunderstanding.

Canadians tried to ensure that everybody’s voice in the group was heard and each person’s contribution was important. It worked as a blending of beliefs, experiences and values. Ukrainians were learning how to be inclusive and respect a partner’s need to articulate a problem. However, it caused some difficulties for the Ukrainians to understand the Canadian manner of project running and perform accordingly. It took time and effort to create the right collaborative conditions before the true partnership could take root.

Through collaboration, each person’s contribution resulted in recognition of the whole team’s contribution. This meant that all parts belong together, and all parts participate (Sosin & Parham, 2001). The Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture as an international interagency relationship was a complex educational and learning process, which emphasized the real value of collaborative work.

Collaborators agreed on several key factors which were crucial for making a partnership successful. Ukrainians highlighted a joint agreement on “shared vision”, which to their mind was their big step forward: “We had treasured our small successes, but shared vision was our biggest achievement. It helped us to see the big picture and evaluate the project achievements”.

Ukrainians and Canadians accepted the notion of their joint venture as an interorganizational collectivity. They agreed as well that their collectivity existed in an interconnected relationship, where shared vision and joint planning were in the center of their activities. They built a cognitive-based joint construct (the Ukrainian participant
called it as “a big picture of the small project”). This construct was flexible, new and responsive to jointly identified project needs.

The Canadian side was struggling with the conflicting schedules, time and language constraints. They had problems with the fixing of the general structure of the joint venture. Ukrainians particularly emphasized the Canadian efforts to put together the emerging partners’ commitment to work as a group. Canadians and Ukrainians worked hard on the “jointly agreed form of communication” as one of the most meaningful ways to support smoothness and enhance the team-oriented activities.

A Canadian coordinator highlighted the challenge of the “development and maintenance of the project organizational structure within the Ukrainians partner home institution in order to move the partnership ahead”. Canadians praised Ukrainians for their “willingness to take risks”, while a Ukrainian coordinator pointed out “the Canadian respect to Ukrainian organizational values based on the recognition of shared and differentiated responsibilities and peculiar expertise”. Such mutual understanding and tolerance led to acceptance of the project as a manageable, personally meaningful and relevant enterprise for both sides. Another Canadian coordinator advised the project participants to “select the key issues at each stage that need to be resolved. The priorities should support real tasks and responsibilities. The discussion of a list of concerns was important”.

The culture of collaborative behaviour, according to the Canadian professional standards, included mutual respect, trust and open communication. Canadians asked the team to systematically reflect on what was happening that could potentially influence
future collaborative actions. Both groups emphasized the necessity to structure time for reflection on collaboration.

The feeling of being respected and considered by the Canadian partner as equal was important for Ukrainians:

We moved through all stages of collaboration. It was a multiyear emotional process and it was a mutual ownership of the project results. We moved through it together with our Canadian partners. It was not an easy process. The project has changed us. They developed long-time personal friendships. They have grown a Ukrainian sunflower from the original Canadian seed: a joint Canadian–Ukrainian curriculum in physics which is now in the approval process of the Ukrainian Ministry of Education and Science as a pilot curriculum for Ukrainian universities. They had different experiences and different values, honoured each other’s professional expertise and knowledge, and respected each other’s style of work and personal qualities. The Ukrainian sunflower has developed into a strong plant protected from the winds and snow in the shade of the strong Canadian maple tree. Ukrainian never had a doubt that new plants out of the project seeds would grow quickly and the Canadian-Ukrainian sunflower would radiate acceptance, trust, respect and readiness to share.

The Canadian-Ukrainian team had been given an opportunity for its members to work together and create a collegial and professional interorganizational collectivity. They believed they did it well and in retrospect they all would agree that the initiative had been worth doing. The Ukrainian participants have developed serious, professional relationships with Canadian colleagues. They achieved effective results through shared vision, frequent ongoing communication, readiness to take risks, flexibility, tolerance, etc. Commitment and trust drove the Canadian-Ukrainian project to its desired expected results. Step by step, each project participant grew professionally and personally from the
initial foreigner in the Canadian–Ukrainian relations to real, committed partners. The project administrators and coordinators received unique knowledge necessary to implement change on a policy-making level as well as to build new and effective partnerships at their home universities.

**Conclusion**

This chapter described how the Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture’s goals and outcomes, decision-making, role distribution and results dissemination were designed and performed by the Canadian and Ukrainian partners. The collaboration was growing into a Canadian-Ukrainian interorganizational collectivity and developed into a real partnership overcoming institutional habits and cultural differences. The Canadian and Ukrainian visions were compatible, the personalities were able to respond to the challenges of change in the joint venture, and the joint team’s performance validated and actualized common vision. In the next chapter I will report the research conclusions and discuss practical and theoretical implications of my study.
CHAPTER VII: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

I hate quotations. Tell me what you know.
(Emerson, 1862).

The Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development project study examines the experiences and perspectives of the Canadian and Ukrainian academic collaborators while planning, organizing and running the Canadian-Ukrainian university joint venture. The purpose of the investigation was to explore how two universities in Canada and Ukraine collaborated with each other on the initiation, development and implementation of the curriculum development project. Data were generated from the project participants’ accounts of their experiences with joint venture organization and functioning. The project administrators and coordinators reflected on their experiences as project managers and members throughout the joint venture’s evolution. The research data revealed the major reasons for Canadian and Ukrainian collaboration on curriculum development and highlighted significant issues arising through joint venture management. It also described the group/self motivation dynamics and the Canadian-Ukrainian team efforts to accomplish the project’s mission. The administrators and coordinators also defined the institutional and individual project goals and outcomes, decision-making tactics, role distribution tools, project results dissemination, and the complex influences of power and institutional culture on the dynamics of the joint venture.

The institutional missions and visions of two universities in Canada and Ukraine indicated that academic internationalization was one of the major institutional goals in the near future. The Canadian and Ukrainian project partners acknowledged that curriculum
development programs were crucial in developing and sustaining their universities’ internationalization activities. In particular, the Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development initiative was important for both universities because, as the participants mentioned, it was intended to provide the upgrading of student and staff skills for the Ukrainian curriculum content, enhance cross-cultural understanding and develop the project members’ ability to collaborate on curriculum development with their partners. The joint venture members highlighted their interest and appreciation of the partners’ expertise and knowledge on curriculum development techniques, the opportunity to enhance the English language program at the Ukrainian university and test the Canadian international curriculum development expertise in delivering such projects in Ukraine.

The project participants built a unique interorganizational system of collaborative relations. They claimed that the Canadian and Ukrainian partners had created a mini international organization with its own rules and developmental dynamics. The Canadian-Ukrainian project offered an academic joint venture model where two different academic cultures secured financial support from the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), created a Canadian-Ukrainian project team, coordinated its member activities and worked together to fulfill their goals for developing new international curriculum and achieving beneficial outcomes for project participants and their institutions.

This chapter highlights the reasons for involvement in the Canadian-Ukrainian partnership and discusses the participants’ reflections on the creation, development, achievements and challenges of the joint venture. The research provides data on how the Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development project evolved as an organization and how
it affected those who participated in it. The chapter culminates with the description of the transformation of the collaborative project into a true partnership. The personal qualities and joint actions of the Canadian and Ukrainian participants are discussed in the context of their importance “for enhancing the commitment and professional growth of collaborators” (Borthwick, 2001, p.233). Specifically, the chapter discusses participant attitudes and personal acceptance of the challenges of collaboration, their behaviours that protect their beliefs and expectations, their commitment and courage to make fundamental changes in the modes of their parent institutions’ international operations and their own perceptions of international academic activities. The participant narratives gained insight into the academic collaboration organization considering their roles and responsibilities in the process of project evolution. The analysis of those narratives helps to answer the main research question of how two universities in Canada and Ukraine organize their collaboration and manage its sustainability.

**Canadian-Ukrainian Partnership: Reasons for Participant Involvement and Limitations of the Theoretical Paradigm**

Collaboration is a relationship in which members participate for various reasons, contributing their resources to a new structure and reaping the benefits together (Heffernan, & Poole, 2004). According to Kanungo (2005), two-thirds of cross-border academic alliances run into serious managerial or compatibility troubles within the first two years of project activities. The Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development partnership, with its issues of the external environment influence, internal “testing the waters” period and true commitment at the later project stages, illustrate “the messiness,
as well as, the exhilaration of the complex and empowering nature of academic collaboration” (Lafleur & MacFadden, 2001).

Internationalization of higher education was the major topic to elaborate for almost all Canadian-Ukrainian project members. They described it as a foundation for changes and a major source of current developments at both universities. The project participants knew what to say about internationalization, how to explain its main features and functions, and were able to identify the internationalization components and developments at their universities. Often they used the term “internationalization”, sometimes “international education”, and rarely “cooperation”, but in all cases the project coordinators and administrators meant that “internationalization” was the inclusion of international components into their domestic educational content and academic services.

The project participants claimed that the Canadian-Ukrainian collaborative project idea emerged from major internationalization principles and goals of both universities. Besides international curriculum development, the project participants revealed that participation in the Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture happened mainly because of the Canadian desire to improve the Canadian university offshore operations’ size, quality and capacity. The Ukrainians participating in the project wanted to polish the Ukrainian curriculum content and pedagogies. Their intention was to balance Ukrainian managerial mechanisms in order to run new international partnerships. The Canadian project team hoped to receive feedback that would be useful to include in the analysis of the level of Canadian involvement and assess its institutional adequacy for possible future engagements in Eastern European initiatives. The available capacity for international project administration in Eastern Europe was also an issue to test. Ukrainians trying to
internationalize their basic curricula were interested in borrowing the managerial tools and tactics for organizing and running the international projects with Canada.

Interorganizational theory along with some components of dependency and modernization models was proposed as a theoretical framework for this study. The interorganizational model acquired some additional characteristics and features along the way. The dependency theory predicting constant disadvantage for developing countries due to the “brain drain” was questioned with the opposite arguments of “brain gain” from the Canadian and Ukrainian team members. They claimed that the curriculum development project was a major content and methodology advantage for both partners and provoked further exploration of the Canadian curriculum specifics by Ukrainians.

The Ukrainian desire to modernize their curriculum system via the content and methodology borrowings brought not only significant improvements to the Ukrainian curriculum, but created a unique opportunity for personal and professional growth of the project members. Instead of adaptation and accommodation predicted by the modernization processes, the project participants displayed a freedom of thought, and worked on their words and actions in an atmosphere of trust and acceptance.

The Ukrainian project leaders who emerged in the process of collaboration did not possess the assimilation qualities predicted by modernization theory. Instead, they transformed themselves and their environment towards inclusiveness and change by participating in the co-construction of members’ competence and responsibility. According to the project coordinators, the emergence of new behaviours, strategies and expertise in the joint project management was a serious advantage for both sides. The Ukrainian team’s subordination to the Ministry of Education and Science did not lead to
the project participants’ hesitation in the developed joint strategies and values. The Ukrainian project participants openly shared the project results with their colleagues at other local universities. They were proud to overcome personal and professional challenges of new professional identity. Ukrainians shared their accomplishment and openness to innovation and change.

Using the interorganizational theory terminology, the project coordinators characterized the joint-venture developments in terms of participatory decision-making, fair and equal responsible distribution, shared belief in the value of the joint task and commitment to working together. There was no dramatic dependency on Canadians in decision-making and role/responsibilities distribution expected by Ukrainians at the project initial stages. Although there were some remarks from the Ukrainian participants on the potential Canadian supremacy in the project results dissemination and publication issues. However, the professional style, personal responsibility, inclusive managerial decision making and respect for Ukrainian expertise shown by Canadians resulted in trust and commitment to achieve the expected benefits.

The interorganizational theoretical construct turned out to be a productive theoretical approach for studying and analyzing the processes within international collaborative units. Though it had some limitations, especially in analyzing the multiple voices and configurations of the joint team’s dialogues, it played a central role in the construction and co-construction of the joint venture themes.

As a classic interorganizational unit, the Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development project began to operate after a series of preparatory pre-project activities where its members claimed that their main goal was to unite their efforts in the creation
of an effective partnership. Its members were committed to test their home institutions’ practices of collaboration, improve their tactics for running international projects and share unique experiences acquired from other international activities.

The interorganizational theory warns about risks and frustrations along the way such as challenges of breaking institutional habits, the specific influences of the home work environments and the risks to cultural norms. However, Canadians managed to predict the numerous dangerous moments and guided the project through quite challenging times. Two different systems created a joint venture, where one side was open to dialogue, change and improvement, while the other was driven by bureaucratic standards and routine behaviours that perpetuate the status quo. The representatives of these two systems managed to overcome suspicion and hesitation. Moreover, the collaborators employed their partnership mechanism to overcome obstacles and show the results they expected.

It took a lot of patience from Canadians who, as one Ukrainian participant reflected, worked like “ants” to build bridges of communication and create a new collective identity with the Ukrainians. New values and beliefs emerged. These unique values modified the members’ personal and collective ability to act as a group where everyone felt useful, and where strategies and actions were appropriate.

It took time and effort to restructure the home systems of attitudes, cultural stereotypes, individual assumptions and habits of working together. The Canadians created new dialogues and tried to find new opportunities and ways to effectively communicate. The Ukrainians proposed a more flexible vision of their values, professional control and cultural beliefs. They showed their readiness to accept change
and share. The Ukrainian team members realized that they could initiate and make their own improvements because they had enough knowledge and expertise in their field. The Ukrainians enthusiastically accepted the ability to change their professional and personal destiny and no longer act as quiet followers. They realized that they were able to create a collaborative environment where they were trusted and respected as professionals and individuals.

According to the project data, the major goal for the Canadian team was to collaborate with Ukraine in order to obtain experience in running a curriculum development project in the Post-Soviet environment. Operating in the Western Transitional Post-Soviet States, the Canadians, with their interest in diverse international academic practices, planned to help with the creation of a new curriculum, test their mechanisms for effective brand-name building in the region, as well as to develop different and unique approaches to international project joint coordination.

The Canadian partners performed via the enhancement of their managerial strategies in Ukrainian conditions by acquiring additional knowledge of the partner’s particular academic and cultural context. It was an opportunity for Canadian creativity in thinking outside the traditional academic markets, mediating between the Post Soviet bureaucratic structures and praxis, and extending the Canadian expertise in curriculum development initiatives beyond the established collaborative norms.

The Canadians were interested in seeing how the project results would enhance the reputation of the Canadian university among the Ukrainian partners, as a reliable and professional North-American institution, committed to working together with people who were competent, but may resist change. Canadians considered their participation in the
project with Ukrainians as an opportunity to engage in professional dialogue with the Post-Soviet colleagues who have a strong sense of identity and are proud of personal and professional achievements even though some of them could expect to perpetuate the status quo. Through their involvement in the joint venture with Ukrainians, Canadians tried to diversify the size and scale of their overseas operations and create a collaborative environment without changing the partner’s core beliefs. Canadians hoped for new international project management experiences, using the project as an opportunity to better understand, anticipate and plan the collaborative process with Ukrainians. Canadians tested their managerial and budgetary models, satisfying the need “to achieve, contribute, create, and improve” (National Center for Technology Innovation, 2005, p.5). The Canadian team understood that they would be operating in a different system where they relied on their own competence and professional intuition. The Canadian side knew that their partners would closely watch their performance. Canadian behaviour, formulation and performance of their roles were inspiring for the Ukrainians and created the language of optimism and desire to envision a collaborative environment, where commitment and improvement would prevail.

The Ukrainian partners did their best to properly contribute their piece to the Canadian-Ukrainian interorganizational puzzle. The Ukrainian team considered their participation in the joint initiative as a tremendous step forward in their acquisition of curriculum development skills. The Ukrainian hope for institutional and personal/professional growth was realized in this venture. The Ukrainians increased their university’s prestige, gained respect from other Ukrainian colleagues and students and provided an opportunity to compare individual achievements with Canadian standards.
However, it was clear that after the completion of the project, the Ukrainian participants would remain in the same system and would be expected to operate in the same mode, which was previously believed to be an effective practice. The majority of the Ukrainian participants were sure that the participation in the Canadian-Ukrainian project changed their professional and personal attitudes to university collaboration and to Canada. Ukrainians claimed that the project provided a powerful push for the professional growth of Ukrainian staff, prompted new and unique responses for the standard curriculum development situations and created opportunities for systemic change at the organizational level. The Canadian-Ukrainian collaborative relationships were seen by the Ukrainian side as non-threatening and built on trust and safety. Such relationships were compatible with the Ukrainian emerging commitment to life-long learning and appeared to fulfill their initial hopes for growth. It exhibited a genuine Ukrainian desire to understand and assess “the Canadian professionalism” (Ukrainian participant, 2007).

**Stresses and Challenges of the Canadian-Ukrainian Collaboration**

It is important to highlight some of the challenges of the Canadian-Ukrainian collaboration. The Canadian-Ukrainian team confronted a number of issues, which were considered by both teams as obstacles in the building of a true collaborative partnership. Probably the most important among these challenges was the initial lack of knowledge about the cultural and professional specifics of the partners at the goal setting stage. Although commitment to the project was quite high from both sides, the partners temporarily experienced differences in their communication styles, time needed to make
decisions and different attitudes to actions that were necessary to receive authorization from the Ukrainian university and Ministry administration.

Cultural misunderstandings about basic collaborative actions on how to create a partnership slowed the tempo of engagement and dialogue between two teams of collaborators. Although the participants were operating in their own traditional/institutional norms and expectations, they were attempting to create a platform for change. They did it through an ongoing discussion about reform in the structure of the partners’ collaborative practices, rules and regulations. Different professional and ethical approaches to concrete collaborative issues and not sufficient time to plan and reflect caused delays in effective decision-making.

The project participants acknowledged that their joint venture required support from the Ukrainian Ministry of Education and Science. The imbalances in the Canadian-Ukrainian academic exchange regulations and the vagueness of the Ukrainian international academic collaboration rules added some complexities to the project management. The specifics of the Ukrainian approach to institutional collaboration highlighted the need to promote Ukrainian academic achievements in the national leaders’ preparation. These specifics were oriented to Ukrainian national and academic values, which resulted in the partners’ sometimes parallel work at different stages of the project. The participants claimed that it took time to achieve professional balance and mutual understanding as the partner’s specifics on working on project issues did not always make sense to the opposite side. The collaborators also admitted that there was not enough time to spend observing each other’s professional behaviour, accessing their
own capacity to accept changes and researching the partner’s history of collaborative project management.

Canadians did not expect to encounter work habits that complemented their own style. They tried to adapt their personal and professional practices to the new collaborative conditions, whereas Ukrainians, especially at the project early stages, consciously exhibited their belief in the perfection of their own pedagogies and had reservations about the Canadian innovations. The amount of stress and “brain drain” suspicion Ukrainians experienced could have been reduced if the proposal for collaboration with Canada had been taken seriously by the Ukrainian university administration and preparation for joint communication had begun long before Canadians arrived in Ukraine.

The prerequisites of a successful project, according to the firm Ukrainian belief, were not personal contacts and dedication of the project initiators, but the commitment of sufficient time from administration for meaningful conversations with the opposite side at the pre-project stages. Ukrainians did not know their partners well. They believed that to succeed in the partnership each party from the earliest project stages “should be ever mindful of the ultimate, joint goals that they will establish working together, as well as the infinite complexities and potential pitfalls in the future relationship” (Kornfeld & Leyden, 2001). Hard work and desire to receive the optimal results made Ukrainians restructure their attitudes and navigate the project in an effective way for the both parties.

The partners admitted that usage of unclear and vague terminology slowed the project tempo. Ukrainians expected to operate with sound and clear project language, believing that the Canadian side would take the initiative in this development. Although
the Ukrainians invited Canadians to collaborate on Canadian terms, they expected more
terminology clarification of the curriculum improvement path that the Canadians had laid
out. However, at the initial stage the Canadian team introduced unclear terms and
sophisticated definitions, which impeded project progress. Nonetheless, the Ukrainian
desire to learn and the Canadian capacity to envision application of simpler vocabulary in
more useable forms resulted in the manifestation of the clearer project language at the
later stages.

Ukrainians described the process of role distribution within the Canadian-
Ukrainian team as an important lesson for the Ukrainian side. A Ukrainian history of
lack of agreement on division of labour and clear role distribution was a major flaw in
Ukrainian international project management. The Ukrainian side experienced the
Ukrainian tendency to perceive bright and disciplined teammates as a threat, as
competitors for their own growth, which put the project at some risk from time to time. In
the most problematic situations, Canadians employed moderate intrusion with proven,
tactful managerial tactics and advice on how to fix the problem.

Supporting the Ukrainian participants with ongoing organizational and
professional advice on the imbalance of power prompted Canadians to critically examine
their own tactics that led to managerial change and improvement. To counterbalance the
Ukrainian hesitation about possible loss of control over the project and the potential the
future project publications under the Canadian names, Canadians emphasized their strong
commitment to professional behavior and integrity and displayed tact and willingness to
engage with partners in frequent communications about the project publications.
The Ukrainian partners were willing to learn and tried to borrow elements of the Canadian conflict prevention skills, professional behaviour in risky situations and expertise in inclusiveness. Such mutuality resulted in nurturing the relationship of openness and trust.

Although the Ukrainian and Canadian schools of international academic relations interpret in profoundly different ways the motivation for academic internationalization, the Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum model successfully overcame the pessimistic theoretical predictions of its possibility for moderate results. Ukrainians, systematizing their knowledge about the Canadian educational and managerial specifics, relied on their professional judgment and strong academic background. They found the name of their university on the Eastern European list of finalists for international curriculum development initiatives with Canada and welcomed this collaboration. They did their best to make the project effective and useful in spite of initial project complications. They fulfilled what they had promised and overcame the risk of an open engagement in a dialogue with the strategically and tactically stronger Canadian counterpart.

The Canadian team realized that project relations with the Ukrainian authorities could sometimes be problematic because of the partner’s subordination to the rules of the Ministry of Education and Science. Nevertheless, the Canadian partners believed that the project could be productive due to professional collective performance and member individual capacity, the Ukrainian partner’s strong networks in the region and commitment of the Ukrainian participants. The Canadians continuously leaned upon the Ukrainian professional judgments and tried to find sufficient time for meaningful and quality communications at all levels. The Canadian team encouraged motivation and
commitment. The lack of compatible programs at the partner institution and the insufficient analysis of the Canadian-Ukrainian institution-to-institution relations prompted the Canadian side to develop flexible tools to improve the existing Canadian-Ukrainian collaborative image.

The Ukrainian partners were seriously concerned about the Canadian attitude to managerial issues and devotion to the project goals as possible tactics of “soft power” and hidden mechanisms for “brain drain” manipulations. According to the Ukrainian administrators, the Canadian partners presented their case in a perfectly organized way, bringing to Ukraine “a product of power and attraction” (Nye, 2004, p.15). This product, the Ukrainian colleagues believed, was nicely planned and thoroughly integrated within the project’s intellectual framework. It was not easy for the Canadians to act as those who “spread” the “Canadian/Western ideology” being simultaneously open and trustful professional partners. Mutuality was being built slowly and persistently, as the partners participated in the routine project activities, discussions and planning. It took energy and time from both sides. The partners gained important understandings and brought their own interpretations to the purpose of working together.

It was not easy for Canadians to lead and learn at the same time. Shared belief in the value of the mutual task made the Canadian participants become diligent students. They learned about the cultural peculiarities of Ukrainian academic negotiations, political turbulence and external pressing. They tried to comprehend the specifics of increased demands from the Ukrainian side for accountability from international projects and active interest of the university administration in the project activities. All these processes
caused Canadians to develop different and efficient strategies for supporting their Ukrainian mission and commitment to their own learning.

In the early project stages, Ukrainians had built strong defensive walls around Ukrainian curriculum content and counter-attacked the proposed Canadian methodology and project management from their trusted post-Soviet content and pedagogy trenches. It was a period of testing the waters from both sides, dealing with uncertainty, assessing capacity, professional habits, and judgments. The project’s tensions offered a promising conceptual tool to enhance the partners’ understanding of the nature of collaboration; they suggested a way of developing conflict prevention skills and capturing complex relational dynamics (Dasko, 2002). Canadians were tolerant and calm. They demonstrated their curriculum content innovations, methodological and organizational approaches and afterwards analyzed possible advantages and disadvantages of the Canadian and Ukrainian models of curriculum development. The Canadian partners realized that building true collaborative negotiations would take time.

Ukrainians developed a sense of confidence in the project goals by questioning their isolation and indigenous practices. They felt the necessity for additional consultations with their Canadian colleagues. The ongoing frequent contact with the Ukrainian team, knowledge of the Ukrainian particular needs, creativity, commitment to the project goals, calmness and integrity helped the Canadians to succeed in building trust. Trust later grew into confidence and professional friendship. However, friendship was not a focus of the project. The partnership was aimed at establishing professional relationships not only with goals to be accomplished related to curriculum but also to ask:
“How we are getting along as colleagues?” In academic partnership these two issues are inextricably linked (Kornefeld & Leyden, 2001).

**Achievements of the Canadian-Ukrainian Partnership**

Shared vision, commitment to develop an effective joint Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum, mutual respect, appreciation of the partner’s experience, ability to share, effective communication were among the essential achievements of the Canadian/Ukrainian collaboration. The personal characteristics of the project participants (shared commitment to clearly articulated desired outcomes, understanding of personal responsibilities, understanding of the need to contribute, create and change) and actions (to improve, learn, initiate, share, clarify, stabilize) contributed strongly to the success of the partnership, although they were not being achieved easily (Borthwick, 2001).

According to the partner comments, those characteristics were necessary for effective collaboration. Ukrainian project practitioners admitted that the most valuable achievements for them were the respect and consideration as equals by their Canadian colleagues. Strong commitment to the project and trust in the Ukrainian expertise positioned the Canadian partners as those who were worthy of collaboration.

The Canadians had chosen a tactic of individual support for Ukrainian colleagues, working with them on their own project segments by analyzing the peculiarities of their assigned roles. By evolving with the project and changing their roles, the Ukrainians tried to establish a personal responsibility for punctual and effective project management. The Ukrainian performance would have been seriously compromised if Canadians had not been attentive to clarifications of the new Ukrainian partners’ responsibilities.
Canadians affirmed that the improvement of project team morale and dedication happened as a result of a clear agreement on a division of labour. The key strategy used by Canadians was to provide freedom to each project participant to demonstrate the ability to handle responsibilities. The decision-making and role distribution tactics used by the Canadian side secured and cemented a responsible and trustful relationship with the Ukrainian partners and built long-term project stability. Canadians admitted that their partner’s professional ethics were different. Tolerance, compromises, flexibility and acceptance were necessary “to understand each other and to work collaboratively without judging or trying to change the partner” (Handler & Ravid, 2001, p.244). The Canadian key motif was a desire to help Ukrainians to learn by investing time and effort in exchanging of ideas. Both teams investigated new possibilities for sharing, tried to understand and evaluate their partner’s capacity to find ways to design new, more effective collaborative models that were useful in a new way, or to apply existing knowledge to a new use (National Center for Technology Innovation, 2005).

In many ways the Canadian and Ukrainian teams were similar. Both teams were trying to secure enough time for involvement in the project activities. Both teams were tolerant of the expression of diverse points of view and to the means of such expression. The partners noticed that success of their partnership depended on the individual abilities and aspirations of the persons involved. Both teams enjoyed the intellectual excitement that resulted from collaborative actions. If a Canadian partner felt that a Ukrainian colleague was more suited to work on a certain issue, they mutually agreed to let each other take a problematic area under his/her supervision. Canadians were experts in the decision-making and role distribution tactics; Ukrainians were strong at the results
dissemination stage. These dynamics were at the heart of healthy ongoing problem solving and effective self-examination. In this collaboration, each partner brought something essential for mutual success. Each tried to work hard, but none was dominating. The Canadian-Ukrainian partnership included important discussions where partners expressed honest disagreement in articulating ideas. The members accepted that conversation about project business was useful as a forum for accountability and growth “preventing power struggles that can devour the energy needed for running and developing the project” (National Center for Technology Innovation, 2005, p.3).

Personal benefits, which both partner teams gained from working together, were expressed in the team’s commitment and willingness to succeed. People were committed to achieving the project goals and were open to revealing new qualities in themselves as academic professionals and international education project managers. They received practical knowledge for implementing change through planning, reflecting with partners and sharing with each other. They built their plans to develop and maintain the joint venture’s organizational structure, supported each other and moved the project forward. The project taught its participants to take risks and focus on the possibilities as a team effort. The professional dialogue between the Canadian and Ukrainian university teams had the potential to significantly broaden participant understanding of the international joint venture advantages, raise their own professional standards, understand and appreciate cultural specifics and enhance the outcomes of international university collaboration.
Reconsideration of the Conceptual Framework: Issues of Reciprocity

The project’s major investigation benchmarks, the establishment of partnership goals, results and fulfilled expectations, role distribution, decision-making dynamics, knowledge creation and dissemination, were modified according to change in the partners’ cultural perceptions, project organizational developments and power configurations. The project dynamics required coordinators to tailor their initial plans and expectations.

The project goals were modified according to the Canadian aspirations of global citizenship ideals which were not in the initial plans of Ukrainians. The global citizenship values, which Canadians offered to the project, inspired Ukrainians to include multicultural values in their classroom practices. According to the Ukrainian partners, the joint extra-curriculum activities provided additional strength to collaboration making an effective tool for preparing true global citizens and professionals.

Another significant project goal modification was the joint venture concentration on the tools needed to create a unique Canadian-Ukrainian interorganizational collectivity. Along with work on the international curriculum content, the “unintentional” goal of the Canadian-Ukrainian team became the development of mechanisms to create an organization based on collective commitment and trust. The project participants claimed that collaboration occurred as a product of their self-interest and self-expectations. The basis for the project collaborative action was “an opportunity for personal and professional growth”, “respect from colleagues and students”, and an “ability to find common language with foreign professionals”. The individual rationality in this case was the engine, which according to the partners’ opinion, would move the Canadian-Ukrainian organization forward. The individual rationality went exactly to the
point where the organized and effective collective action made sense for individual success. Those individuals who showed a commitment and to the Canadian-Ukrainian collective plans did succeed. Shared individual interests and personal commitment gave rise to effective collective action. The Canadian-Ukrainian interorganizational collectivity, was consolidated, developed and grew even with the lack of coercion at the early project stages.

The Ukrainian acceptance of the Canadian organizational schemes and their developmental capacity made Canadians modify their role distribution and decision-making tactics. The differentiated responsibilities and team building expertise, the focus on the project “result-oriented” efforts, along with the curriculum content development, redirected Canadian attention to working with the individual Ukrainian team members. The new type of emerging Ukrainian international project manager has benefited tremendously by adapting the collaborative culture of the Canadian organizational development and effective time and resources usage to Ukrainian realities. Canadians tried to develop the Ukrainian international education leaders who were able to participate in the decision-making process and were not afraid to take responsibility.

It was important at the decision-making and role distribution stage to recognize the influence of the moral qualities of project participants on the collaborative process. The Ukrainian interviewees highlighted the qualities of Canadians who honoured their commitment to the project. The Canadian team believed that “someday the tactful and professional attitude will be everywhere, as ubiquitous as a blackboard. Because of that, we’re all willing to live on that edge, with its wins and its losses” (Bain, 2001). Though Ukrainians articulated their actions with passion and conviction in their own truth,
Canadians showed their willingness to wait and demonstrated their patience, prioritizing the project’s needs and purposefulness. When the moment was right, the project joint aspirations revived with the previous speed into productive and professional action.

Power and institutional culture were the major navigators that directed and supported the partnership. There appeared to be partner institutional culture nuances in the power distribution dynamics. The specifics of the institutional managerial habits brought an additional spectrum of dynamics to the conceptual framework. According to the Ukrainian participants, initially, power was considered as a prerogative of those who had the financial and authoritative priorities to administer academic developments in the international arena. Ukrainians described on several occasions their devotion and trust in the guidance of the Ministry of Education and Science in international collaboration. However, at the final stages of the collaborative project with Canadians, the power previously balanced towards the Ministry of Education and Science, now skewed towards the competency and inclusive management of those Ukrainians who were trained by Canadians. Ukrainians developed their own initiative in establishing the basis for a strong collaboration.

Ukrainians trusted that participation in the Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development project would result in effective leadership tactics along with their international curriculum development skills. Canadians were automatically expected to be the effective international joint venture organizers. The Ukrainian beliefs became more evident at the later stages of the project when the Ukrainian team openly counted on Canadian curriculum development and international project leadership expertise and
claimed that anything similar to Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum could not have been developed on their own.

The Ukrainian partners could not veto their Ministry’s main requirements for the national curricula. However, they developed a set of useful recommendations on how to improve the existing curricula and how to make them more vibrant and professional. The Canadian and Ukrainian teams acted like equals in their joint curriculum understanding and continued to rely on each other in their peculiar Canadian and Ukrainian ways. The partners realized that in their managerial practices they tried to act not merely as equals but as interdependent equals. Each of them provided nurture, insight and support for the other, while planning and implementing curriculum and maintaining reciprocity along the way (Kornfeld & Leyden, 2001).

The conceptual diagram in its initial version did not reflect the issue of reciprocity. The complexities of reciprocity, balance and compromise in the Canadian-Ukrainian collaboration were all related to the specifics of the participant institutional cultures. Different styles, vision and approaches moved the collaboration to such unexpected developments as exciting project extra-curriculum activities, joint classes conducted by Canadian and Ukrainian professors and local conferences on project knowledge dissemination. Although they contributed much to the professional growth of the partners, these activities were not in the Canadian and Ukrainian initial plans. Although the activities required extra time, planning and extra institutional support, they came naturally out of the partners’ actions.

The project participants highlighted that the international project joint team should seriously consider such a crucial partnership element as time. Time guided and
sustained the Canadian-Ukrainian team especially when the participants developed reciprocity in initial collaborative intentions and worked on shared vision.

Ukrainians admitted that the major curriculum development load fell on the Canadian shoulders. Ukrainians were aware that the imbalance in “more giving than receiving” could happen. Balance was crucial. The balance of understanding between the partners, which allowed them to discuss who was doing more than was originally planned and who was responsible for certain project segments or who was not successful in implementing what was planned. Ukrainians were concerned that they were contributing much less than the Canadian side. Both teams resolved this imbalance situation by finding time for discussions “to overcome the discrepancies of reciprocity that troubled the project from time to time” (Kornfeld & Leyden, 2001, p.199). Canadians proposed that Ukrainians discuss their original ideas on the existing imbalance with the Canadian group and recommended inclusive and cooperative ways to avoid inequality.

Compromise was the major element at the decision-making and role distribution stages. At the initial project stage, Canadians and Ukrainians agreed on the basic curriculum content and main project management techniques. Both parties had their own managerial and project-running strengths, and both teams thought and believed that their approach was right and mutually effective. But the collaborative negotiations evolved and developed in sometimes unpredictable and unexpected ways. The initial diversity of opinions on the project developments was evident and it seemed to be difficult for partners to compromise on them. The project participants persistently continued to maintain equality of voices and managed to keep the balance of power. Canadians had
the skill and experience to maintain equality; Ukrainians had their commitment to learn, progress and grow.

The evolution of the complex relationships between the two teams highlighted an important consideration for the future of Canadian-Ukrainian projects: an ability to arrive at a joint agenda when visions and professional experiences are different and time is severely limited.

**One More Look at the Conceptual Diagram: Additional Dynamics**

The data gathered in this study on the emerging motivators and dynamics of collaboration led to changes in the conceptual map of the study. The major catalysts for collaborative activities indicated by the participants were connected to the project evolution at the three major phases of collaboration. The participants roughly divided their activities into the following phases:

(1) Initial planning/getting together: identification of goals and expected outcomes, assessing, pairing cultural and professional differences with the need to collaborate

(2) Development of collaborative vision: sustaining project activities, stabilizing risks, developing the collaborative vision/agreement on the organizational stance of the project, role distribution, decision making, short term benefits evaluation

(3) Results dissemination: building networks, opening the Canadian Resource Centre, project conference.

The participants described the performance of the project at those three major phases as a true partnership. The performances were based on the ability to engage partners
in intellectual discussion, restructure their old practices, and build an effective collaborative model.

I propose the following summary of the participant experiences according to their three-phase project activities classification.

Phase I. Coherent Initial Planning

In the first phase the Canadian and Ukrainians collaborators defined their goals and discussed the expected outcomes. They articulated clear expectations and put the first bricks of commitment into the foundation of the future partnership. The participants noticed that, at this stage, it was too early to talk about mutual respect and commitment because of cultural differences and the institutional specifics of international project management. However, during the goal definition stage, the Canadian and Ukrainian partners attempted to cement mutual understanding and ability to compromise. It helped them to understand and clarify their core collaborative values and beliefs.

At this stage, honest disagreement about the project’s major goals led to the understanding that in order to progress partners needed to compromise. This planning process resulted in reshaping and clarifying short and long term expected outcomes. The fabric of the main project aims woven at the initial stage was changing and deepening. This fabric was decorated with the constant multicultural and multilanguage conceptual dialogue about the project dynamics.

The Canadian-Ukrainian collaboration progressed because the “different skills, experience and resources come together to make a whole. Strong teams are always built on their diverse abilities” (National Center for Technology Innovation, 2005).
At the initial planning stage, the collaborative action was expected to develop in two directions: professional individual development (Ravid & Handler, 2001; Nikitin, 2008) and collaborative group development (Hodgson & Thomas, 2001; McBurnie & Pollock, 2000). Canadians brought to the negotiations the individual and team change specifics, which, to their mind, could provide a powerful start to the project. They wanted to know how the Ukrainian partners had planned to create an optimum learning and sharing environment and could responsibly deliver their experience and skills to the project. Canadians were interested in the specifics of the local academic networks. The negotiations, a result of collaborative interactions with the different stakeholders and interested parties, changed their beliefs and actions employed to run international projects.

Ukrainians named the risk of losing national identity as the main concern they brought to the negotiation table at all three stages. The Ukrainian participants approached the project with the desire to clarify cultural misunderstandings and to understand what they actually needed to do in order to achieve what they initially wanted. The Ukrainian team named three major fields they wished to improve: their communication skills, decision-making tactics and creative problem solving. They strongly felt that individual change, as one of their expected outcomes from the participation in the project, was the most important result of collaborative interaction with Canadians.
Phase II. Development of Collaborative Vision: Maintaining Dialogue

Both teams were determined to make the Canadian-Ukrainian project a vibrant and effective enterprise. The project coordinators realized that, through the clear role distribution process, definition of responsibilities and effective decision-making, the project would avoid morale-eroding mistrust and promote the members’ enthusiasm and dedication. Participants perceived Phase II to be the most time-consuming stage. Role distribution was associated with the process of learning, assessing professional abilities and building trust. The constant dialogue among the participants on their expertise and practice provided an opportunity to access the professional habits of project members. The dialogue provided a capacity for the Canadian-Ukrainian project group to function as a team of partners. A range of possible roles from consultant to facilitator, from leader to follower, expanded to professional trustworthiness and friendship in Phase II of the project. The partners tested what kind of skills and expertise their counterparts possessed and what knowledge and experience the collaboration could bring to the project. In Phase II, the partners distributed roles, identified individuals and, according to their skills and expertise, assigned responsibilities necessary to fulfill the project tasks.

Partners with a history of successfully delivered international projects often demonstrate their ability to fulfill the responsibilities connected with their assigned roles (Kurbatov, 2008b). A participant’s personal agreement to deliver certain services and belief in their own potential was the key. The role distribution stage/Phase II was a test for compatibility. Canadians tried to make sure that the Ukrainian team experience complemented their attempts to build a new curriculum structure. Ukrainians tried to secure timely and on-target reaction. It was important to comprehend if the role content
and manner that Ukrainians expected was clear and understandable for the Canadian colleagues.

It was obvious that there was not, and could not be, complete compatibility. Although both teams previously functioned in their own different cultural and professional environments, they did their best to understand and appreciate the professional and personal habits of the other side. In general, the establishment of a collaborative structure that brings international colleagues together characterizes Phase II as “learn, access and build inspirational collaborative surroundings” (Borthwick, 2001, p. 37) stage.

Phase III. Project Results Dissemination: Implications for Practice

The participant descriptions of the final stage of the Canadian-Ukrainian joint activities indicated that the collaborators paid serious attention to knowledge dissemination. They began Phase III by articulating the practical benefits of the project for the local academic networks.

Joint curriculum applications in Ukraine and possibly in the Western Post-Soviet Independent States can work if they are personally and professionally meaningful to those who work with similar international projects and are relevant to the region’s institutional priorities (Nikitin, 2006). Ukrainians had plans to share a great deal of their joint Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum with the Belarussian and Moldovan colleagues and provided descriptions of its improvement acquired from collaboration with Canadians. Ukrainians spoke about possible barriers to widespread regional dissemination including corruption in higher educational sectors, conservatism and numerous protocol requirements from the Ministries of Education and Science for contextual and structural
characteristics of the curriculum. Canadians proposed the following assistance to their Ukrainian colleagues at this stage:

- Ongoing frequent contact after project completion
- Support for Ukrainian professor publication initiatives on the post-project developments
- Coordination of activities at the Canadian Centre in Ukraine
- Canadian encouragement for an extended curriculum development through further professional relationships.

Any international project inevitably heads towards the modification of expected results. If the Canadian side highlighted the institutional and policy correction benefits as a result of their participation in the joint project, Ukrainians talked more about individual change and personal/professional growth. The partners’ belief in the mutual benefit of collaboration was reinforced, morale improved, and pride in the team effort increased because both teams understood that the project agenda was worth pursuing. Getting together was sometimes a protracted process and relatively quick in some phases of the project. But while collaborators are taking those first steps as partners, they need to take a close look at one another. They need to be honest in presenting themselves, maintaining an equality of voice, respecting the other’s sovereignty (Kornfel & Leyden, 2001).

The Canadian university and its team were not intending to make a profit from this partnership beyond highlighting research and acquaintance with the peculiarities of the Post-Soviet educational transformations. Ukrainians perceived it as an opportunity to polish their curriculum development skills and satisfy their demand for international experience. Commitment that resulted from this process gave the Ukrainian staff freedom
to make decisions. The Ukrainian team saw a unique opportunity to obtain resources, which helped them to move up the professional ladder and enjoy respect from their academic networks. The advancement of institutional international strategies was an important motivator for Canadian involvement in Ukraine. The Canadian side displayed inclusive leadership and tried to improve its strategy for institutional international collaborative in the Post-Soviet region.

Canadian multinational and multicultural aspirations were major values in building negotiations with Ukrainian colleagues. According to Ukrainian comments, the content and pedagogy recommendations made by the Canadian team turned to be far deeper and functioned much closer to their needs and aspirations than Ukrainians had expected. Consultations with the Ukrainian university International Relations Department on further improvement of the management of their future international projects were not among the initial Canadians goals. However, such consultations turned out to be a good result of the Canadian strategy that allowed successful and important project detours, according to the partner’s emerging needs.

Canadian academic standards that were associated with accountability and effectiveness were considered by Ukrainians as strong examples to follow. Ukrainian participants mentioned the interdisciplinary trends in the Canadian curriculum proposal, which was taken by Ukrainians as a major important tool for the future national curricula developments.

The effective process of role distribution and decision-making provided an important stabilizing component in the inclusive management fabric of the project. The partners performing the assigned roles fed on “exchanging ideas, understanding from different
perspectives how people act and learn, finding ways to design something that is useful in a new way, or applying existing knowledge to a new use. Clear expectations came from clearly defined responsibilities” (National Center for Technology Innovation, 2005).

The participants highlighted the importance of benefits from articulation of the assigned roles and mentioned the necessity of patience and persistence in the light of the changing project needs and opportunities.

The Canadian-Ukrainian collaboration worked well because the decision-making process involved balance of different skills, experience and resources. The decision-making phase brought people together to form a whole. Canadians and Ukrainians tried to build their partnership on inclusive decision-making based on the diverse abilities. The Canadian partners performed and delivered managerial techniques which Ukrainians did not possess. Canadians created a network of equal voices that Ukrainians were not attached to previously. The partners understood that the each member’s voice was important and responsible for providing something essential to the project.

As a result of the project, the partners greatly enhanced their university’s reputation. The increased networking opportunities to share the improved Ukrainian curriculum helped Ukrainians to pool their resources and evaluate their new potential. The project brought reform-based developments to the joint curriculum and initiated methodological changes in teaching science at the Ukrainian university. The profound influence on both professional and individual levels initiated critiques of local basic pedagogical principles and assumptions about curriculum content. The Canadian university participants received new information on restructuring their institutional
philosophy on collaboration with Post-Soviet countries and reshaping the future exchanges tactics in the region.

**Canadian-Ukrainian Collaboration: Final Thoughts**

Recommendations from the Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development project can contribute to the success of future collaborative activities between the developed and developing countries. They inform policy designers as they make decisions about the development of the future collaborative schemes. The major actions that can help universities towards international collaboration, according to the Canadian-Ukrainian joint venture participant recommendations are:

**Administrative Level**

- Promote decentralization of the international curriculum development process design
- Support institutional and individual international collaboration aspirations and domestic initiatives on the broadening and stimulation of the modes of collaboration
- Renew the major elements of international collaboration conceptual frameworks, tools and techniques of the cultural and professional knowledge inquiry
- Remodel the size and character of overseas operations according to the structural peculiarities, political conditions and functional necessities of the donor and recipient countries
- Create an institutionally active international academic leadership body, which can effectively perform institutionally and politically significant international collaboration research and managerial functions
• Give more power to the grassroots academic divisions as those who secure the adequate return of the human and financial investments

• Interest donor and financial agencies with more programmatic interdisciplinary variations in international collaboration proposals

• Promote research on international strategies variations, working habits, compatibility and professional coherence with overseas partners.

**Academic Division/Departmental Level**

• Stimulate individual contacts and desire to collaborate with trustful colleagues from international institutions

• Support the desire for professional growth/research interest/open communication

• Research and use the new opportunities to secure an appropriate access to resources

• Promote the departmental prestige as the result of international collaboration

• Use an opportunity to test the local curricula developments and improve mechanisms for their promotion

• Search for an opportunity to improve the international project management tools

• Assist in obtaining the information on the donor agencies interests and requirements

• Encourage broad cultural and professional understanding of the international academic specifics.

**Individual Level**

• Satisfy a staff desire to explore

• Promote individual change
• Stimulate personal professional growth
• Develop trustful communication with international partners
• Question “tried and true” professional actions
• Appreciate what overseas partners posses and try to offer in return
• Reorganize personal understanding about the variety of cultural imperatives.

The study of the Canadian-Ukrainian curriculum development initiative may encourage an interest and critical reflection from international collaboration practitioners and designers of international curriculum development policy. The most important thing to be acquired by anyone aspiring to embark on an international academic journey is the knowledge of what proper questions to ask themselves and what benchmarks to establish in order to guide effectively their research and practice. International joint venture researchers need to know what actions to bring forward to change their approaches and beliefs of the topic and how to evaluate their achievements.

The Canadian-Ukrainian join venture was happy to announce that the project received financial support to disseminate the Canadian-Ukrainian collaborative experience to Moldova and Belarus.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1.

Some Canadian International Development Agency/CIDA Projects in Education for Ukraine/2000-2013

(CIDA’s 2006-2007 disbursements for projects and initiatives in Ukraine: $17.2 million)

Source: http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/CIDAWEB/cpo.nsf/vWebCSAZEn/Ukraine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Decentralized Management of Skills Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Number:</td>
<td>Z020641-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum CIDA Contribution:</td>
<td>$5,027,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executing Agency - Partner - Recipient:</td>
<td>ASSOCIATION OF CANADIAN COMMUNITY COLLEGES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sector: | Public sector financial management: 60%
Industrial development: 40% |
| Description: | This project aims to ensure the successful integration of Ukraine into the global market economy. Its core objective is to contribute to the development of sound governance in Ukraine through contributing to the implementation of the country's decentralization process by assisting in the development of a national demand-driven skills training system. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Regional Training and Consultancy Capacity (Phase I)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Number:</td>
<td>Z020532-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum CIDA Contribution:</td>
<td>$ 2,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executing Agency - Partner - Recipient:</td>
<td>McGill University Office of International Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector:</td>
<td>Business support services and institutions: 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>The project will improve the institutional capacity of Kyiv National Economic University (KNEU) and its network of institutions to support the business community by offering management training. KNEU will be the main regional centre for management programs, transmitting the content of its programs to all its satellite universities through the long-distance education component of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Policy Reform Implementation Support Mechanism (PRISM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number:</td>
<td>Z020692-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum CIDA Contribution:</td>
<td>$9,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executing Agency - Partner - Recipient:</td>
<td>Canadian Bureau for International Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start - End:</td>
<td>2007 – 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector:</td>
<td>Government administration: 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description: PRISM is a project that funds individual initiatives (sub-projects). It limits its activities to those sectors in which the Government of Ukraine has asked CIDA to provide assistance, including Public Administration, Private Sector Development, Judicial Policy, and Gender Equality. PRISM is improving the capacities of selected government institutions to formulate and implement effective, gender-sensitive and reform-oriented policies that are in the public interest and that adhere to international standards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Regional Governance and Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Number:</td>
<td>Z020640-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum CIDA Contribution:</td>
<td>$5,484,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executing Agency - Partner - Recipient:</td>
<td>CANADIAN URBAN INSTITUTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start - End:</td>
<td>2005 – 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector:</td>
<td>Government administration: 70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening civil society: 30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description: This project will assist the government of Ukraine in its plan to decentralize policymaking and policy implementation to regional areas. It will assist in the development of a pilot project for the decentralization process that will entail an integrated regional development process that involves civil society. This project will contribute to democratization and good governance in Ukraine by creating effective, open, and accountable regional self-governments that involve civil society.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Building Democracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Number:</td>
<td>Z020586-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum CIDA Contribution:</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executing Agency - Partner - Recipient:</td>
<td>Queen's University Financial Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Government administration: 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human rights: 75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>The project aims to foster a greater understanding and an enduring commitment to the values of democratic governance, the rule of law, and civil society. It will do so by building a cadre of trainers and self-sustaining programs of training on democracy to provide civil society, as well as current and future government officials, including law enforcement personnel, with an understanding of their responsibilities and accountabilities in a system based on the rule of law and respect for civil liberties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Title:** Promoting Ukraine's Global Integration  
**Project Number:** Z020689-001  
**Maximum CIDA Contribution:** $2,420,064  
**Executing Agency - Partner - Recipient:** YORK UNIVERSITY ROBARTS CENTRE FOR CANADIAN STUDIES  
**Status:** Operational  
**Start - End:** 2006 – 2010  
**Sector:** Government administration: 60% Trade education/training: 40%  
**Description:** PROGINT is a four year project that will work in partnership with the Government of Ukraine to increase the institutional capacity of the country's Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) to effectively promote Ukraine's international trade agenda and manage its international affairs in a transparent, competent, environmentally- and gender sensitive manner.

**Title:** Civil Service Human Resource Management Reform  
**Project Number:** Z020653-001  
**Maximum CIDA Contribution:** $5,610,000  
**Executing Agency - Partner - Recipient:** Canadian Bureau for International Education  
**Status:** Operational  
**Start - End:** 2006 - 2012  
**Sector:** Government administration: 100%  
**Description:** The project supports Ukraine's efforts in developing an accountable and transparent civil service that is in line with European norms (specifically the SIGMA / OECD baseline) by assisting the reform of the Ukrainian civil service human resources management system. In accordance with the request from the Government of Ukraine, key areas of intervention for this project include merit-based selection, recruitment and
promotion (with a specific focus on gender equality); performance management and evaluation; training needs assessment; organizational and individual career planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title: Decentralized Management of Skills Training</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Number: Z020641-001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum CIDA Contribution: $5,027,760</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executing Agency - Partner – Recipient: ASSOCIATION OF CANADIAN COMMUNITY COLLEGES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status: Operational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start - End: 2005 - 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector: Advanced technical and managerial training: 20% Government administration: 40% Employment policy and administrative management: 40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description: This project aims to ensure the successful integration of Ukraine into the global market economy. Its core objective is to contribute to the development of sound governance in Ukraine through contributing to the implementation of the country's decentralization process by assisting in the development of a national demand-driven skills training system. The project aims to support the implementation of a decentralized management model for the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy (MLSP) to coordinate skills training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title: Foreign Policy &amp; Trade Analysts Professional Dev.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Number: Z020251-001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum CIDA Contribution: $2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executing Agency - Partner - Recipient: YORK UNIVERSITY INTERNATIONAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status: Operational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start - End: 2000 - 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector: Government administration: 35% Strengthening civil society: 35% Trade policy and administrative management: 30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description: This four-year project will seek to strengthen the capacity of two key Ukrainian institutions involved in foreign and trade policy, namely, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine and the National Institute for Strategic Studies. The project will assist in strengthening the abilities of the
Ministry and the Institute's personnel to apply modern approaches in analyzing international affairs and trade policy, primarily in their relationship with Russia, to maintain stable regional relationships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Partnership for Tomorrow Program - Phase II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Number:</td>
<td>Z020542-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum CIDA Contribution:</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executing Agency - Partner - Recipient:</td>
<td>ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES OF CANADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start - End:</td>
<td>2003 - 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government administration: 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening civil society: 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business support services and institutions: 25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Through this program, CIDA provides small travelling grants to support activities that build and strengthen partnerships between Canadian and East European institutions, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and businesses. At the end of the five-year program, more than 1,000 travelers would have benefited from this travel grant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Science and Technology Center in Ukraine (STCU) - Phase III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Number:</td>
<td>Z020158-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum CIDA Contribution:</td>
<td>$6,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executing Agency - Partner - Recipient:</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA DEPARTMENT OF FINANCIAL SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration and SALW control: 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The project supports the Science and Technology Centre in Ukraine (STCU) to provide former strategic weapons scientists and engineers opportunities to redirect their talents to peaceful activities. The Centre solicits project proposals from Ukrainian research establishments for evaluation and subsequent consideration by a Governing Board, with representation from the STCU Agreement Parties (Canada, Ukraine, European Union and the United States.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum CIDA Contribution:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executing Agency - Partner - Recipient:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sector:**
Small and medium-sized enterprises (SME) development: 100%

**Description:**
The SBEDIF-Regional Networks (RN) project will establish a major Internet Web Portal at the SBEDIF Business Centre in the city of Ivano-Frankivsk, and develop a network of five satellite business centres in selected regions around the district of Ivano-Frankivsk. The SBEDIF-RN will serve as the hub of a linked network of business centres, each of which will be able to provide business and English-language training, business consulting services, access to the SBEDIF loan fund, and other services with the aid and support of the central office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Trade Policy and Capacity Building in Ukraine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Number:</td>
<td>Z250000-001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum CIDA Contribution:</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executing Agency - Partner - Recipient:</td>
<td>CENTRE FOR TRADE POLICY &amp; LAW CARLETON UNIVERSITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
<td>Operational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sector:**
Trade policy and administrative management: 100%

**Description:**
This project's goal is to facilitate Ukraine's successful entry into the international trading system, principally as a full participant in the World Trade Organization (WTO). The main objectives of the project are: to establish the capacity of Ukraine to provide training, research and consulting services on a fee-for-services basis to domestic and international clients; to increase the capacity of the academic/institutional partner to provide educational programs on trade policy and trade law issues; to increase the growth in Ukraine of a pool of trade policy and trade law specialists for potential recruitment by the public and private sectors; and to build linkages between the trade policy and law communities in Canada, Ukraine and the rest of the world.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title: Policy Reform Implementation Support Mechanism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(PRISM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum CIDA Contribution:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executing Agency - Partner - Recipient:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status: Operational Start - End:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector: Government administration:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:**

PRISM is a project that funds individual initiatives (sub-projects). It limits its activities to those sectors in which the Government of Ukraine has asked CIDA to provide assistance, including Public Administration, Private Sector Development, Judicial Policy, and Gender Equality.
Appendix 2.

Collaboration Through the Voices of the Canadian and Ukrainian Partners

A1. Main constituents of collaboration as understood and performed by both sides:
   - Mutual establishment of the joint venture goals
   - Expectations of the both teams to successfully meet the project outcomes
   - Collaborative decision making
   - Equal and fair role distribution and work load

B: Goals of CDN-UKR collaboration in the curriculum development project

B1 Professional:
B1 (CDN): “share expertise” (participants mention: enthusiasm and dedication for learning, mutual respect, shared commitment, desire to develop a quality curriculum, integrity, strong interpersonal skills, effective communication)
B1 (CDN): “know more about the Ukrainian academic culture and educational priorities” (clarification and reshaping our understanding about the partner, immersion into educational priorities of the partner, confidence and ability to lead change, to perform in a way which is personally and professionally meaningful for all participants)
B1 (UKR): “to borrow Canadian competency in the curriculum content design and methodology” (understanding of the partner’s teaching mechanisms, reflection and improvement, agreement on the curriculum shared vision)
B1 (UKR): “to understand what academic freedom means” (the partner’s freedom to speak according to the norms and standards of scholarly inquiry, to teach without penalty, the freedom of partners to express their ideas in international institution without political or institutional restrictions from their home authorities
B1 (UKR): “to follow the Canadian international project management techniques” (Canadians work cooperatively within their team and with the Ukrainian partners, clarity of responsibilities, agreement on the main techniques to meet the desired result, support of administration from Canadian and Ukrainian institution, clear process of decision making, ability to directly address conflict).
B1 (UKR): “to borrow the Canadian project team characteristics for future practice”: (commitment, flexibility, energy, a mutual respect based on the recognition of shared expertise).

B2 Personal:
B2a (CDN): to visit the partner country (acceptance of the Ukrainian culture, cultural appreciation and sensitivity, realizing that you have something to give)
B2b (CDN): to evaluate a personal potential for cooperation activities (personal knowledge to share, building relationships based on personal professional expertise, having skills to be successful in international career, building relationship on trust and respect)
B2c (UKR): to visit Canada (recognize differences and building similarities, develop understanding through personal and professional contacts, sharing knowledge about Ukraine)
B2d (UKR): to be proud about yourself as a professional and global citizen (opportunity to participate in an international project which can bring world together, recognize the importance of collaboration, working toward harmony among people: everyone matter and every one can learn form each other).

B3 Organizational:
B3a (CDN): to improve the home institutional structure (develop organizational measures which facilitate collaborative process, evidence of decision making in nonhierarchical setting)
B3b (CDN): to investigate joint project organizational developments and strategies needed for collaboration (individual and group development: “forming, storming, norming, and performing”, creation an optimum environment for progression, five strategies of collaborative development: initiation, dependence, disagreement, cohesion, interdependence)
B3c (CND): to practice selective project approaches (risk as a category to be concerned with, ensure that the method is manageable, dealing with uncertainty, practical concerns at the distinct stages of the project should be addresses immediately: real tasks and responsibilities should be sorted out on a regular basis, break the private barriers that result form individualism and isolation)
B3d (UKR): to adopt rational Canadian organizational processes (behave according to the standards of organization, to manage the project team time effectively, mutual respect, trust and open communication, encourage participant to be critical reflectors, creating quality of organizational environment through conversations as forum of accountability, analyze what is occurring in the present and anticipate what is likely going to happen, all voices are heard dealing with temporal issues)
B3e (UKR): to overcome complex organizational conditions (authoritarian style of management, lack of trust, competition and struggle for rewards (moral and financial), lack of commitment).

C Outcomes:
Ca (CDN): to acquire experience in a high quality international curriculum design (help others initiate their own inquiry and improve their own practice, it’s provides foundation for improvement, curriculum discussions are forums for accountability, working with feedback from Ukrainian colleagues is an integral part of improved instruction and the recipient desired curriculum changes, we (CDN) have gathered a variety of data to evaluate continuously the curriculum program, we have developed the sense of confidence and efficacy.
Cb (CDN): resulted in knowing about different cultural approaches to curriculum development (colleagues from developing countries who work in isolation rarely can benefit from it’s own analysis in a sustainable way: gathering data about your own practices, analyzing it is problematic, comparative approach esp. collaboration with international partners is critical for improvement. Reaching understanding in intl setting
is demanding, time-consuming and focused work. It is our professional responsibility and obligation to work collaboratively with international partners.

**Cd (CDN): new mechanisms in managing intl. programs** (partnership is not dependent on any one person, inclusive leadership: empowers those intl. participants doing collaboration to help to come to a deeper, broader, richer understanding of what they do and how they can do it better. Collaboration transforms individuals into active agents of change. Competent project administration from both sides, resources be set-aside for training new participants.

**Ce (UKR):** to develop a clear idea how the curriculum should look like and what academic content should serve as a foundation for national curriculum (to borrow the Canadian experiences in curriculum development and pedagogies)

**Cf (UKR):** to achieve the best results in intl. project management (to develop understanding how an intl. project in curriculum development should run, to analyze main phases of its operation, to develop real expectations).

**Cg (UKR):** to have experience in the post project materials preparation and dissemination (to work collaboratively on the post-project manual and disseminate the project results via Canadian-Ukrainian Curriculum Development Centre, which is expected to be created upon the completion of the project).

**Ch (UKR):** preparation of students-global citizens (understanding of global citizenship, international curriculum development projects as a mechanism to global citizens preparation, global citizens performing at home).

**D: Decision Making**

**Da (CND):** share decision making/sharing authority and delegating responsibilities, collaborative efforts to delineate the process (a commitment to action based on the team effort, unilateral decisions cause premature ideas, shared decision making is a self-correction in which we as partners rejected barriers of different management styles).

**Db (CND):** inclusive leadership (atemp of alteration of Ukrainian partner organization operational routines, navigation the team members that enhances team-oriented activities, a willingness of a leader to take risks of responsibility for other performances, the acceptance of an each team member need and capacity for the project development, international team member diversity added strength to a partnership in conceptual and practical matters).

**Dc (UKR):** authoritarian management as a necessity for intl. joint venture success: a competent leaders /those who serve in a leadership capacity who lead the process and create a strong team of followers add strength to intl. partnership, unilateral decisions from the Ministry navigate the process in the right direction, access to top-level management is not necessary, necessary style of leadership is charismatic authoritarian).

**Dd (UKR):** involvement in open, honest decision making procedure in which partners share and understand each other was practiced during the project: develop ability to adapt, interpersonal skills, critical thinking skills, compare another approach to decision making with the existing one, negotiation skills, conflict resolution skills, organizational skills, ability to deal with ambiguity).
E Roles and Responsibilities:
Ea (CND): *the partnership roles and responsibilities were distributed in a non-hierarchical setting* (ability to find time and people who are willing to share, the project coordinator role consist of the following sub-roles and the responsibilities shift: leader, follower, coordinator, facilitator, listener, speaker, researcher, information provider, challenger, protector, counselor, learner, designer, cultural attaché. The role distribution and project responsibilities demanded from individuals to be reflective, flexible, unafraid of change/confrontation and supportive).

Eb (CND): *the decision making process as learning experience*: the partners must be willing to listen and observe, participate in strategic planning, decision making effectiveness depends on six factors: environment/history of collaboration activities, membership characteristics, process and structure/adaptability, flexibility and trust to make decisions, communication, purpose/stated vision can be perceived differently but important to have concrete goals at each phase of the project, necessary resources.

Ec (CND): *role distribution dynamics* required open and frequent communication among all participants.

Ed (UKR): *roles for high-level decision makers*: idea generators, oversight providers, policy developers, strategic planners. Their role is to negotiate the two partnership worlds and invent new approaches to dissonances, which may appear with a focus on different curriculum priorities, create a shared vision away form individual interests.

Ee (UKR): *ability to consider diverse perspectives for solving the partnership problems*: partners contribute equally and mutually to the joint venture as a new created structure, an ongoing effort of understanding cultures. No experience in joint planning and decision making so far, two academic worlds differ from each other in many significant ways, but it is this very uncertainty which leads the partnership to new and innovative ideas, it reshapes fundamental values, beliefs, paradigms for both partners.
Appendix 3.

Some Components of Global Citizenship That Can Be Promoted Through Canadian-Ukrainian Joint Ventures.

(Original image from NOESIS Management, http://www.noesis.se)

Goals (Project Administrators and Coordinators)

1. Globally competent graduates: to function professionally internationally
2. Responsibility for individual actions and ability to adapt
3. Analytical and critical thinking skills
4. Willingness to solve organizational challenges and ability to deal with change
5. Conflict resolution tools
6. Ability to communicate meaningfully with internationally trained professionals
7. Social justice issues

Results (Coordinators)

1. Knowledge to appreciate difference
2. Understanding of the necessity of life long education
3. Ability to take action, act ethically
4. Participation in academic community activities
5. Desire to study English
6. Awareness of Canadian curriculum development techniques
7. Challenge racial discrimination

Decision Making and Roles Distribution (Coordinators)

1. Open-mindedness attitude of team work
2. Value of own identity
3. Mutuality, respect and responsibility
4. Ability to take risks and skills to engage international team in a dialogue
5. Equality and equity issues
6. Trusting, professional, honest dialogue and shared understanding
7. Willingness to compromise
8. Agreement on principal philosophies of an international joint curriculum

Knowledge Production and Knowledge Dissemination (Administrators)

1. Global citizenship is action, commitment to the mutual relationship, clear purpose that makes people to act and brings them together
2. Global citizens are critical learners
3. Creativity to think outside “norms” and “instructions”
4. Need to push the critical thinking perimeters
5. Openness to new ideas and opportunities
6. Knowledge of cultures and human rights
7. Willingness to share perspectives, policies and practices
8. Desire for resources to be exchanged: exchange of “items of perceived value and mutual benefit”
Appendix 4.

Necessary Contacts to Be Made by the Canadian and Ukrainian Teams to Launch an Academic Collaboration Project in Ukraine

Stage I

\[
\text{CDN University} \quad \leftrightarrow \quad \text{UKR Ministry of Education and Science}
\]

Stage II

\[
\text{CDN University Department} \quad \leftrightarrow \quad \text{UKR University Administration}
\]

Stage III

\[
\text{CDN University Department} \quad \leftrightarrow \quad \text{UKR University Department}
\]
Appendix 5.

A Sample of Participant Interview Protocols

The interviews were conducted according to the results of the phases of the collaborative project and with those individuals who set priorities, developed and implemented the project’s operational steps.

1. Interview with Administrators (the Canadian University International Education Administrators and the Ministry of Education and Science/Ukraine, Division of International Cooperation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related Conceptual Framework Ingredient</th>
<th>Executives and staff</th>
<th>Interview Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Internationalization (Definition and components) | Office of the Canadian University Vice President International | 1. What was your role in the setting the priorities for internationalization of your University?
   - What is your title/position?
   - How long have you been at that position?
   - To your knowledge who else was involved in setting the internationalization strategies?
   - Describe one or two instances when there were disagreements over internationalization priorities?
2. What is your understanding of the aim of the internationalization process?
3. Have the internationalization priorities changed or evolved since they were first developed? |
| International Collaboration Division, Ministry of Ed and Science of Ukraine | 1. What was your role in developing the section VI of the “Law on Education” |
| Ukrainian University Administration/ Office of Intl. Relations | 1. What was your role in developing the international collaboration priorities for national academic institutions?  
- Why did you participate in the process?  
- Were there differences in opinions among the participants of the process at the Ministry? What were they?  
- What major proposal to improve the process has been made by you since being involved?  
- What is your feeling about the importance of the international collaboration for your institution? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. When the section on international cooperation and collaboration was added to the “Law on Education” document?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. What is your understanding of the aim of international collaboration?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                                              | • What is your title/position?  
• How long have you been at that position?  
• To your knowledge who else was involved in setting the international collaboration strategies? |
|                                                              | 3. What is your role in developing the international collaboration priorities for national academic institutions?  
- Why did you participate in the process?  
- Were there differences in opinions among the participants of the process at the Ministry? What were they?  
- What major proposal to improve the process has been made by you since being involved?  
- What is your feeling about the importance of the international collaboration for your institution? |
|                                                              | 5. What is your title/position?  
• How long have you been at that position?  
• To your knowledge who else was involved in setting the international collaboration strategies? |

regarding international cooperation and collaboration in higher education with foreign countries?
• What is your title/position?
• How long have you been at that position?
• To your knowledge who else was involved in setting the international collaboration strategies?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Definition of Goals</th>
<th>1. What is your understanding the goal of the joint undergraduate physics curriculum development project with Ukraine/Canada?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canadian University Department of Physics-Ukrainian University Department of Physics (Project Coordinators)</td>
<td>2. What made you want to participate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. What factors do you believe made your institution to participate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. How do you believe the goal for the project participation differ from the Canadian (Ukrainian) side?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Describe your initial perceptions of the project’s goal and have they changed during the project realization?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. What options were proposed instead of unsuccessful steps towards the initial goal realization?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Results</td>
<td>1. What are the anticipated outcomes of this project as seen by your institution/department?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canadian University Department of Physics-Ukrainian University Department of Physics (Project Coordinators)</td>
<td>2. Describe your views of the final result that is going to be produced?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Are you going to be satisfied with the final product? Why or why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. To what extend do you feel the final result addresses the needs of your institution/department?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. What is your understanding of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>success of international partnerships in education?</td>
<td>6. What is your personal major expectation of this project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision Making</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian University Department of Physics-Ukrainian University Department of Physics</td>
<td>1. How would you define “decision making”?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Project Coordinators)</td>
<td>2. What major decisions have been made during the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Were there any differences between your team and the Canadian one in approaches to the decision making procedures?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Have the decision making dynamics changed since the beginning of the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. What are the main benchmarks in the decision making to your mind?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. What the decision making specifics have you noticed working with your partner?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>