International Faculty Collaborations:

Social Learning through Professional Communities

Authors - Leslie A. Cordie, Anne Graham Cagney, & Lucas Adelino

Abstract

Collaboration in learning communities at an international level allows for individual growth in faculty members and develops the profession and practice of teaching. This qualitative study interviewed ten Core Fulbright Scholars, exploring their perceptions of the Fulbright, the support for international experiences, and the formation and sustainability of professional collaborations. We contribute to the literature on international scholarship, collaboration, and support for faculty learning and development. Lastly, we discuss the need for future research on further faculty opportunities that broaden understanding of the critical importance of international connections and communities of practice in the 21st century.

Keywords: communities of practice, collaboration, professional identity, scholarly partnerships, social learning

Introduction

What does it mean to be faculty in today's global world? It is truly a complex question, as there are many dimensions to the faculty member role. Adding to role complexity is the reality that faculty work happens in an increasingly interconnected world (Sá, 2007; Holley, 2009). In today's higher education environment, it is important for faculty—as any professional—to work with others, within and across their disciplines. This drives a need to understand internationalization and the engagement of faculty in collaborative, social learning (Finkelstein et al., 2013; Kwiek, 2018).

Faculty engage in work naturally with others within their discipline or subject area during meetings, conferences, and other professional collaborations. In this article, we consider the term professional to encompass experts or practitioners who are skilled in a discipline or field. For those working in research-intensive universities, increasing patterns of interdisciplinary research collaborations are becoming more common at national and international levels (Van Rijnsoever & Hessels, 2011). Global networks or communities of practice (COP) comprised of research-active faculty share knowledge, skills and scholarly publications across national boundaries through scholarly literature (Goode et al., 2014; Kochanek et al., 2015; Lundgren & Jansson, 2016).

The importance of global collaboration is illustrated in the faculty tenure process. In most higher education systems in the United States and internationally, promotion to full professor or scholar requires evidence of both a national and international reputation (Hardré & Cox, 2009; O'Meara, 2002; Stohl, 2007). Global networking also brings benefits to the institution as a whole, as faculty research productivity and international reputation are part of global rankings of higher

education institutions (Collins & Park, 2016; Hazelkorn, 2011). Yet, many faculty members can find it difficult to develop external connections, often due in part to specialization of their field of expertise, and, in some cases, a perceived lack of support by their home institution (Dewey & Duff, 2009).

Increasing faculty collaboration within academic communities requires scholars to develop a capacity for thinking and researching beyond disciplinary boundaries, nationally and internationally. In this context, our study investigated faculty who were awarded Fulbright Core Scholarships. Our findings relate to Communities of Practice, social learning experiences, and professional identity, all informed by the international context.

Theoretical Framework

The framework chosen to support this research was Communities of Practice (COP) (Wenger, 1998a). In this section, we will outline what communities of practice are and how they allow for an understanding of social learning networks and professional identity. We will then briefly describe other studies that have focused on Fulbright scholars to support the concept.

Communities of Practice and Social Learning Networks

Social learning networks and collaborative practice are informed by Wenger (2009) who proposed that learning occurs in the context of lived experiences and participation in the world. Communities of practice (COP) are defined as groups of people who share a concern or passion for something they do, and learn how to do it better through intentional interaction, guiding each other through their joint understanding of their areas of mutual interest (Wenger, 1998a). Three main characteristics shape the context for learning and collaboration under the COP model: (1) an area of interest that allows for group identity; (2) the community where social

learning occurs, through interaction and membership; and (3) a shared set of skills and resources that create knowledge, practice, and relationships (Wenger, 2009). COP are collaborative and interdisciplinary in nature, develop through a variety of disciplines and structures, and influence (and are influenced by) the professional identity of its members (Pyrko et al., 2017). For these reasons, it is possible to study the Fulbright program as a COP, since it connects individuals who share a common interest (international scholarly pursuits) and provides resources and knowledge related to the practice of that interest.

The Fulbright program is, thus, a scientific, social network. In a study of a similar network, Santonen and Ritala (2014) found a complex pattern comprised of close, powerful clusters. These clusters were comprised of key well-connected scholars, often from similar disciplines and from institutions in close geographical proximity. Well-connected participants enjoyed more benefits than less well-connected ones, and were critical for the development and sustainability of any COP, no matter the field or discipline.

In general, professional identities are socially produced and maintained in a variety of communities of practice (Wenger, 1998b). Professional identity for faculty generally relates to teaching and research activities that are discipline-based, yet professional identity can be related to organizational identities, such as a COP. Each discipline may have its own concept of identity, but there is a common set of norms and values for being a faculty member (Clarke et al., 2013; Jawitz, 2009). Faculty not only need to manage their relationship in their home institution, they also need to negotiate their expertise and credibility across these diverse values and organizations (Clarke et al., 2013).

Selected Prior Research on Fulbright Program Participants

Key research on Fulbright Scholars in terms of faculty perceptions and learning experiences was reviewed prior to our study to develop a holistic view of the program. The Fulbright program is one of the earliest and most distinguished competitive grants aimed at fostering cross-cultural understandings among students, teachers, scholars, professionals, scientists, and artists (CIES, n.d.). Fulbright scholar programs create powerful connections through exchanges in higher education systems throughout the world.

Fulbright experiences can lead to transformative learning when individual faculty members reflect on their international learning experiences. To enhance that learning, faculty development opportunities should be provided in advance of the exchange (Eddy, 2014). Faculty learning experiences created through Fulbright can be transformative not only for the faculty member, but for sustainable collaborations for the development of partnerships between people and organizations (Miglietti, 2015).

Similarly, Meyer-Emerick (2010) detailed the process, issues, and lived experiences of a Fulbright Scholar program. She again confirmed the importance preparation for the faculty member before the learning experience. Although each project and faculty member is unique, successful collaboration requires the participant to be flexible and value the social learning experience.

Finally, research on Fulbright scholars (Pope et al., 2017) discovered that the major outcome for those participating in Fulbright Programs was increased cultural understanding and improved learning, with respect to pedagogy and scholarship. They noticed indications of impact on scholarly collaborations, yet little was discerned about how these faculty relationships were created and sustained over time.

Thus, study builds on the implications from Pope et al. (2017) for research related to international relationships and scholarly collaborations to decipher the factors that contribute to collaborative sustainability. In addition, our study examines the social supports and professional expectations that contribute to ongoing professional relationships.

Methods

Our aim was to study the Fulbright Scholar experience with a focus on participants' perceptions related to being a Fulbright, the international experience, and scholarly collaborations**.** The method used for this study was a qualitative, phenomenological approach as it allowed the themes to develop from the actual participants in the study and their perceptions of the experiences (Yin, 2016). This qualitative research analysed the data for the patterns in the conceptions of the Fulbright Scholars to discern the themes. The main questions that guided this study were:

1. How do Fulbright Scholars describe their experiences in developing international scholarly collaborations?

2. How do Fulbright scholars develop and maintain international scholarly collaborations?

Participants

Purposeful selection of Fulbright Core Scholars from a large, southeastern, research institution was made to broaden the past research at other Research 1 universities in the U. S. Participant information was derived from the freely accessible Fulbright Core Scholar information web site. Using "home institution" as the initial filter through the Scholar Directory, faculty were identified who had held a Fulbright. At the time of the research study approval, data in the directory listed only five

potential participants for the study. Thus, data prior to 2010 was explored through the Fulbright Scholar Archive to achieve a participant sample of at least six. Sixteen Core Scholars (more than 2 weeks in length; faculty, not students) were available in the data, over a 12-year timeframe (2004 to 2016). An individual email request was sent to these 16 faculty, inviting them to take part in the study. Of the 16 potential participants, 10 participants elected to participate. Descriptive information about the interviewees is shown in Table 1. Fulbright locations were across the globe, including Asia, Europe, and South America.

Table 1
Demographic Description of Interviewees

	Discipline	Fulbright Length	Fulbright Type	Title at time of Interview	Gender
1	Engineering	5 months	Lecturing	Associate	F
2	Engineering	5 months	Research	Professor	M
3	History	8 months	Research	Research	F
4	English	6 months	Lecturing	Professor	M
5	Agriculture	4 months	Lecturing	Emeritus	M
6	Education	6 months	Lecturing/Research	Professor	M
7	Architecture	4 months	Lecturing	Professor	M
8	Biology	9 months	Research	Professor	M
9	Communication	9 months	Lecturing/Research	Associate	M
10	Management	4 months	Lecturing/Research	Professor	M

Note. Information limited to protect identification of individuals (no locations).

For continuity and consistency, only one of the authors conducted the interviews, which were approximately 1 hour in length. All interviews were recorded with a recording app on an iPhone or iPad. A question template was used as a guide for the interviews, with the questions being adapted and refined as the interviews progressed with each individual participant (Yin, 2016). The five key areas explored were during the interview were as follows: (1) main project (2) social supports, (3) personal and professional expectations, (4) research agenda, and (5) relationships. The use of open-ended questions allowed the researcher to build rapport during data collection, provided space for the participants to freely share, and developed rich

reflections by the participants. The interview recordings produced audio files that were downloaded and transcribed by the same interviewer; again to provide continuity. Pseudonyms were provided for each of the participants to protect their anonymity in the data transcriptions (Yin, 2016). All participants had the opportunity to review the written transcriptions and provide corrections to the data documents.

Analysis

The qualitative data collection was robust as the information was self-reported and filtered through the participants' views (Yin, 2016). As participants had the opportunity to review the written transcriptions, and additional reflections and comments were added to the data from several of the participants. Drawing from the COP framework allowed data analysis to focus on the ways participants leveraged their social networks to forge new connections, solve common problems, and transform their professional identities. The final themes for this study emerged from capturing the data during the interviews with notes and comments, transcribing the interviews, reading the transcripts and notes, using the theoretical frameworks for consistency, and analysis of the data for patterns through contrast and comparison.

Limitations

Several limitations should be considered when drawing research and practitioner implications from this study. None of the interviews were conducted in the actual Fulbright experience location. In addition, the population sample was gender-skewed, and not all participant interviews were equally articulate or perceptive.

Findings

Three themes emerged from the interviews following data analysis: (1) the impact of ongoing relationships versus new collaborations; (2) the types of support

that Fulbright scholars received, and; (3) further development of their identities. We will now describe each of these themes in detail.

Ongoing Relationships versus New Collaborations

The first theme developed from the data emerged from the expansion of relationships and collaborations through the participants experiences. We discuss the concepts of ongoing relationships, new collaborations, and the importance of technology in facilitating connections.

Ongoing Relationships

When examining the reasons why participants sought a Fulbright Scholar award, five participants expressed a general interest in the award, but did not necessarily have specific professional plans. The other five, however, had already decided on a particular project or a certain country, and begun to develop relationships with key people abroad before the award. For these participants, receiving a Fulbright Scholarship was a means of furthering pre-existing plans and research. Thus, connections and associations appeared to be significant to the Fulbright process initiation.

Mark, for instance, "first became interested in [the host country], and then backtracked into Fulbright." Mark's pre-existing relationship with his host university allowed him to return there and teach again after his Fulbright. He eventually developed a hybrid class format, which he was still teaching at the time of his interview that continued his collaboration.

Oliver digitized medieval manuscripts due to supportive relationships he had made at the host country. Upon returning to the US, he set up an online course to continue teaching internationally. Through these experiences, Oliver achieved his goal of building lasting scholarly relationships.

"I didn't want to go in a classroom or talk for an hour and then go home and do my stuff … I wanted to have contacts that would last a long time. So, that part of the experience is the most rewarding part for me. That I keep in contact with those professors … whenever I'm there, I go to see them—we have coffee together, we are in conversations together. The contacts are so long lasting."

Patrick had a pre-existing relationship developed from a successful exchange program he had developed, which led to the host university repeatedly invite him back. As a means of sustaining the relationship and continuing to fund the program, Patrick applied for his Fulbright scholarship.

New Collaborations

For the participants who did not have well established pre-existing collaborations, the process was much more complicated. Emma was disappointed that the faculty at her host university "were nice but they didn't really reach out to me. I mean, they were all busy with their lives." She attributed this lack of relationship in part to cultural factors. Emma ended up, however, building connections with business and private companies. These collaborations had the most impact on her research agenda, allowing her to continue her research and establish herself as a global expert.

Kyle did not complete the project that he had originally set out to do, nor did he publish while he was abroad. His work, however, led him to make connections with people whom he still stays in touch after more than a decade. After his Fulbright, visited the host country again for several conferences as a guest speaker.

Types of Support

Social support or collaboration emerged as a key component of the learning experiences. Participants identified that support originated from differing agents, and

was mostly related to preparation for leaving the U.S. or relocation assistance in country.

The work that Fulbright entails can be challenging, even with the help of many sources. Some participants, having no such help, dealt with this challenging transition largely by themselves, with little or no help from the home university's administration. This was the case of Kyle, who "did not get any assistance" and did "most of" the paperwork by himself. He had assumed he would need to do so, and was equipped to deal with the challenge because he had previously worked in the host country and understood the key regulations and contacts.

Mark was a tenured professor that, at the time of his Fulbright, served in an administrative role. This situation was unfamiliar to the home university. By Mark's estimation, the university had just started to encourage its faculty and staff to take on Fulbright scholarships or any international collaboration. Mark (as an administrator) was the "first person in a non-faculty position to apply, so they didn't quite understand." The home university Provost, who understood the importance of Mark as not only an administrator, but also his value as a faculty member; thus, assisting him navigate the unfamiliar territory.

A second participant, Helen, faced similar challenges when she was awarded the Fulbright. Initially, she assumed that once she got her scholarship, she would get strong support from the university. When she met with her Dean, he told her she would have to go on unpaid leave in order to go abroad. Among other financial issues, this meant Helen would not be able to guarantee health insurance for her family. It was her department chair, who subsequently aided Helen, who:

"Took it on, slowly filtering through and gathering information from other people who had received some funding and building up a case for the scholarship… I was going to quit. And he says, 'let's just slow down here.'"

William had an easier transition process with external support from outside his university. For him, the Fulbright program did "everything they could to make sure that we were ready." Most important to him was a Fulbright employee who served as an in-country intermediary between local universities and prospective Fulbright scholars, making sure that both parties were a good match. This employee presented William with three universities to choose from, outlining both the pros and cons of each. William credited this Fulbright employee with easing his anxieties, and expressed gratitude for having worked with him.

Lastly, in the case of Ethan, the chair from the department of his host university introduced him to the rest of the faculty and arranged his housing and transportation. Although this department chair was not connected to Fulbright, she was "adamant about having Fulbright on her campus." The chair understood the value of the partnership between institutions and the potential collaborations that might develop in the future.

Developing Identity

Some participants described that the experiences during their time abroad led them to critically reflect, and ultimately transform, their personal and professional identities.

Emma's Fulbright was the first time she lived outside the U.S, which she described as both scary and rewarding. The experience taught her that she could live with fewer possessions than she thought:

"Because we could have so much stuff over here … but [there] the apartment was pretty basic. We didn't have a lot of clothes. We rented this old car and had this old style TV. Actually when I came back, I'm like 'I just don't need all this stuff!' I still have too much but I started actually streamlining. I feel more free and if I hadn't had that experience, I would not have done that."

Kyle's experience in the host country made him reflect on the nature of collaboration. He described the host country society as extremely reliant on the interchange between people, which was markedly different from the environment he grew up in:

"The culture is personal… people make a lot of sacrifices for each other and they spend time making these sacrifices… the personal connections were the most import thing for me, and, you know, being a white male, not a necessarily sensitive person… [it was a] very social, interconnected environment … Which is far more than where I grew up - the people are pretty cold. I grew up without hugging everyone… I was taught I was the most important person in the world… so I have learned sometimes you make a lot more progress as a part of a team and interacting with other people's ideas, instead of thinking you have the best idea all the time."

Blake's Fulbright involved working on a large collaborative project on nuclear research. This project was initially born out of voluntary work and professional connections outside his field of expertise. His unique opportunity – learning from "the world's best leaders in nuclear waste management" – led him to develop scholarly competency in a new discipline. Blake stated that he hopes to use that knowledge to write grants and contribute to U.S. nuclear waste management, which he described as a "big, big need."

Discussion

Concerning the support theme, we established evidence for some of the sources of support described by Pope et al. (2017). Namely, our participants received support from the host institution, the Fulbright organization, and individuals in the host country. However, this study also encountered an additional source of support: the administration of the home university. Mark and Helen received critical support from the university provost and a department chair, respectively, which helped them take care of the needed paperwork. This support was critical, with Helen noting that she would have not gone on a Fulbright at all without such assistance.

These findings suggest that, to some participants, doing the necessary work to leave the home country might be as difficult as establishing themselves in the host country. One way to overcome this challenge would be to draw from the expertise of a COP. Faculty and staff from the same institution make up a COP as they have a common interest, are subject to similar expectations, and share knowledge of how to manage those expectations (Wenger, 2009). Mark and Helen depended on others from their COP for crucial help with the administrative specifics of their Fulbright scholarships. Without such a community, individuals might have to rely on their own previous experience, such as in the case of William, who had previously lived in his host country and was thus better equipped to deal with the paperwork of his Fulbright.

As noted by Santonen and Ritala (2014), scientific social networks often revolve around clusters of influential scholars and institutions. As such, establishing partnerships with scholars around the globe can be a powerful way to extend the scope of one's scholarship beyond their institutional clusters. To that end, COP such as the Fulbright organization are instrumental in that they provide scholars with the means to further expand their scholarly networks, both by introducing faculty to new

members, and by having those members "think together" as they look for ways to solve common problems (Pyrko, 2017). The support of administrators from the home university also show that COP allows participants to leverage knowledge from their institutional social clusters to break free from those clusters and forge new connections.

Interrupting one's research and teaching at the home university, even if temporarily, is difficult. Borgia et al. (2007) found that most Fulbright scholars had a one-semester experience, which Meyer-Emerick (2010) describes as less than ideal, compared with more long-term experiences. Even then, finding the right time to leave presents maybe the first challenge one needs to overcome to obtain a Fulbright. Both William and Emma noted that they were only able to leave because several variables aligned in their careers, and they were able to balance the workload. They got their "ducks lined up," as Emma puts it. Both related that a lull in their research projects enabled them to go abroad. This may be difficult for early career researchers, although the experience may be crucial to them due to the need of developing their scholarly identities and social networks.

There were broad differences in the support offered to individual participants, particularly on the part of the Fulbright organization. William had a Fulbright staffer who helped him extensively, providing logistical assistance and ensuring that William and his chosen university matched each other's interests. Other participants did not appear to receive the same level of support from the Fulbright organization, or relied on individuals in the host country. This stands in contrast to the literature, which generally shows extensive support offered by the Fulbright organization (Borgia et al., 2007; Harris et al., 2013; Fu, 2018), although Meyer-Emerick (2010) recognizes that the diversity in Fulbright experiences. The Fulbright program has commissions in

several countries that are responsible for providing support regarding visas, travel, and accommodation. Each commission is culturally unique, which might explain the differences in assistance.

On a personal level, the experience of living in a foreign country can be simultaneously enriching and upsetting. For instance, being immersed in the socially interconnected culture of his host country, Kyle reflected upon his own upbringing in a culture he described as individualistic and socially distant. Through a similar process, Emma realized that she could live with much fewer possessions when she did so during her Fulbright, which contrasted with her previous way of life. This provides further evidence to a process Eddy (2014) terms "disequilibrium," which is where an encounter with otherness leads one to reflect on their own values and frames of reference, and ultimately transform their personal identities. Their professional identities can also be impacted, as evidenced by Blake, who became proficient in an entirely different field of study.

Conclusions

In this study, we further the research on faculty collaborations in a global, multidisciplinary world. Engagement in learning communities and COP at the global level allow for growth of the individual faculty member, and develops the profession and practice of teaching in higher education. Research on faculty engagement as professional development needs to expand and consider how new interdisciplinary frameworks and fields might develop broader communities of learning (Austin et al., 2013; Holley, 2015; O'Meara et al., 2011). Faculty, at all levels, have the shared responsibility to be the ones to formulate how their discipline and institution will move forward in the 21st century. Developing professional identities through COP and

other experiences will give faculty the skills to connect research to practice in the classroom.

Faculty collaboration as professional development includes the idea of ongoing reflective practice at all stages of career development. Faculty and student learning are intertwined. Thus, fostering and supporting the scholarly work of faculty at the international level can potentially have significant impact by both broadening the educational experience of students, and increasing the development of the global culture within the academy. Expanding faculty development models to include communities of practice that develop professional relationships and networks are clearly ways to enhance research and develop faculty in institutions of higher education.

Implications for Further Research

This study contributes to a better understanding of how international scholar awards can act as the catalyst in supporting faculty development and continued learning. It points to the need for future research on other types of Fulbright experiences, including Fulbright specialists and other scholarship awards, to broaden understanding of international connections and COP. Although Fulbright is a formal program, most would not classify it as faculty development. We argue that Fulbright is a robust program in developing faculty in terms of social learning and collaboration; one that should perhaps be open to faculty earlier in their careers, when their reputation most needs to be established.

Lastly, we suggest research on how to extend international COP and informal types of sharing and professional development without the structure of Fulbright or specific, professional associations. New technologies allow for a variety of ways to connect digitally, such as those that involve social media such as LinkedIn, Facebook,

and other learning platforms. We believe that sharing knowledge and research

through technology is critical to the faculty learning experience in the 21st century,

and thus, to building and sustaining learning communities in the future.

References

Austin, A. E., & Sorcinelli, M. D. (2013). The future of faculty development: Where are we going? *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *2013*(133), 85-97.

Borgia, D. J., Hobbs, B. K., & Weeks, H. S. (2007). The experience of US Fulbright Scholars from business disciplines: 1998–2005. *Journal of Economics and Finance Education*, *6*(2), 15-26.

Council for International Exchange of Scholar (CIES). (n.d.). *U.S. scholar program*. https://www.cies.org/program/fulbright-us-scholar-program

Clarke M., Hyde A., & Drennan J. (2013) Professional identity in higher education. In B. Kehm & U. Teichler (Eds.), *The academic profession in Europe: New tasks and new challenges.* (Vol 5, pp. 7-21). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-4614-5_2

Collins, F. L., & Park, G. S. (2016). Ranking and the multiplication of reputation: reflections from the frontier of globalizing higher education. *Higher Education, 72*(1), 115–129. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-015-9941-3

Dewey, P., & Duff, S. (2009). Reason before passion: Faculty views on internationalization in higher education. *Higher Education, 58*(4), 491–504. https://doi-org.spot.lib.auburn.edu/10.1007/s10734-009-9207-z

Eddy, P. L. (2014). Faculty as border crossers: A study of Fulbright faculty. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *2014*(165), 19–30. https://doi.org/10.1002/he.20080

Finkelstein, M. J., Walker, E., & Chen, R. (2013). The American faculty in an age of globalization: Predictors of internationalization of research content and professional networks. *Higher Education*, *66*(3), 325–340. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23470844

Fu, M. (2018). The Fulbright experience of visiting scholars from Post-Communist China: A qualitative study and a critical evaluation. *ASJ Occasional Papers, 15*. Retrieved from http://op.asjournal.org/the-fulbright-experience-of-visiting-scholars-from-post-communist-china-a-qualitative-study-and-a-critical-evaluation/

Goode, T. D., Carter-Pokras, O. D., Horner-Johnson, W., & Yee, S. (2014). Parallel tracks: Reflections on the need for collaborative health disparities research on race/ethnicity and disability. *Medical Care, 52*(10 Suppl 3), S3–S8. https://doi.org/10.1097/MLR.0000000000000201

Hardré, P., & Cox, M. (2009). Evaluating faculty work: Expectations and standards of faculty performance in research universities. *Research Papers in Education*, *24*(4), 383–419. https://doi.org/10.1080/02671520802348590

Harris, A. L., Allen, J. P., Granger, M., Kaiser, K., & Ward, S. (2013). Be a Fulbright scholar—Lessons and experiences of AIS Fulbright scholars. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, *33*(1), 29.

Hazelkorn, E. (2011). Measuring world-class excellence and the global obsession with rankings. In S. Marginson, R. Naidoo, R. King (Eds.), *A Handbook on Globalization and Higher Education* (pp. 497-515). Edward Elgar. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271505410_Measuring_World_Class_Excellence_and_the_Global_Obsession_with_Rankings

Holley, K. A. (2009). Interdisciplinary strategies as transformative change in higher education. *Innovative Higher Education, 34*(5), 331–344. https://doi-org.spot.lib.auburn.edu/10.1007/s10755-009-9121-4

Holley, K. A. (2015). Doctoral education and the development of an interdisciplinary identity. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, *52*(6), 642-652.

Jawitz, J. (2009). Academic identities and communities of practice in a professional discipline. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *14*(3), 241–251. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510902898817

Kochanek, J., Scholz, C., & Garcia, A. (2015). Mapping the collaborative research process. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 23*(121), 1–31. https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v23.2031

Kwiek, M. (2018). International research collaboration and international research orientation: Comparative findings about European academics. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 22*(2), 136–160. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315317747084

Lundgren, M., & Jansson, H. (2016). Developing international business knowledge through an appreciative inquiry learning network: Proposing a methodology for collaborative research. *International Business Review*, *25*(1), 346–355.

Meyer-Emerick, N. (2010). Teaching management in the Slovak Republic: Lessons learned and encouragement for potential Fulbright Scholars. *Journal of Management Education*, *34*(5), 700–722. https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562910374878

Miglietti, C. (2015). Teaching business classes abroad: How international experience benefits faculty, students, and institutions. *Journal of Teaching in*

International Business, *26*(1), 46–55.
https://doi.org/10.1080/08975930.2014.929513

O'Meara, K. (2002). Uncovering the values in faculty evaluation of service as scholarship. *The Review of Higher Education*, *26*(1), 57–80. https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2002.0028

O'Meara, K., Sandmann, L. R., Saltmarsh, J., & Giles, D. E. (2011). Studying the professional lives and work of faculty involved in community engagement. *Innovative Higher Education*, *36*(2), 83–96. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-010-9159-3

Pope, E. M., deMarrais, K. P., Cagney, A. G., & Moore N. D. (2017). International scholarly communities in Fulbright programs. *Learning Communities Journal, 9*(1), 57-85.

Pyrko, I., Dörfler, V., & Eden, C. (2017). Thinking together: What makes communities of practice work? *Human Relations*, *70*(4), 389–409. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726716661040

Sá, C.M. (2007). Interdisciplinary strategies in U.S. research universities. *Higher Education, 55*, 537–552. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-007-9073-5

Santonen, T., & Ritala, P. (2014). Social network analysis of the ISPIM innovation management community in 2009-2011, *International Journal of Innovation Management*, *18*(1). https://doi.org/10.1142/S1363919614500108

Stohl, M. (2007). We have met the enemy and he is us: The role of the faculty in the internationalization of higher education in the coming decade. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(3-4), 359–372. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315307303923

Van Rijnsoever, F. J., & Hessels, L. K. (2011). Factors associated with disciplinary and interdisciplinary research collaboration. *Research policy*, *40*(3), 463-472.

Wenger, E. (1998a). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge University Press.

Wenger, E. (1998b). Communities of practice: Learning as a social system. *Systems Thinker*, *9*(5), 2–3. Retrieved from https://thesystemsthinker.com/communities-of-practice-learning-as-a-social-system/

Wenger, E. (2009). A social theory of learning. In K. Illeris (Ed.), *Contemporary theories of learning* (pp. 209-218). Routledge.

Yin, R. K. (2016). *Qualitative research from start to finish* (2nd ed.). Guilford Publications.