

FACULTY COGNIZANCE, CAPACITY, AND MOTIVATION FOR INTERNATIONALIZATION ACROSS HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS (HEIS): IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY RECOMMENDATION

Lilyn G. Estrada

University of Negros Occidental-Recoletos, Blk 58 Lot 11 Manville Royale,
Tangub, Bacolod City, **Philippines**

Ma Quincy D. Dones*

La Carlota City College, **Philippines**

Diana B. Rodrigo*

University of Negros Occidental-Recoletos, **Philippines**

Received: 28/07/2026

Accepted: 11/08/2026

Published: 14/08/2026

DOI - <https://doi.org/10.61421/IJSSMER.2026.4404>

ABSTRACT

Advancing faculty preparedness has become a fundamental factor in achieving internationalization in higher education institutions. Thus, this quantitative study, using a descriptive-comparative-correlational research design, involved 269 faculty members across Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in local colleges, state universities, and private universities on Negros Island and determined the extent of faculty cognizance, capacity, and motivation for internationalization during the academic year 2025-2026. The faculty's cognizance, capacity, and motivation were measured using a research-made instrument. Results revealed that the extent of faculty cognizance, capacity, and motivation for internalization is high. Results also revealed that there was no significant difference in the extent of faculty cognizance, capacity, and motivation for internationalization, a strong positive relationship between faculty cognizance and capacity in internalization, and a moderate positive relationship between faculty cognizance and motivation for internalization across local colleges, state universities, and private universities in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Negros Island. Thus, the result of the study served as the basis for formulating college policy and providing targeted support to advance faculty-driven internationalization initiatives.

Keywords: faculty preparedness, cognizance, capacity, motivation, internationalization, Schema Theory, CCM (Cognizance, Capacity, and Motivation) research instrument, internationalization initiative

INTRODUCTION

Internationalization empowers faculty members to engage in global teaching, research, and professional collaborations, improving their competencies and the institution's pursuit of academic distinction. However, the central determinant of success in these efforts is faculty readiness. Advancing faculty preparedness is fundamental—it directly fosters worldwide cooperation for sustainable development, adding to the United Nations SDG 17 (Knight, 2020; Liu et al., 2025). Higher Education Institutions achieve internationalization through faculty exchanges, research, and partnerships, all of which rely on effective faculty training and commitment (Smith & Doe, 2020; United Nations, 2020).

The Commission on Higher Education (CHED) has established policies to support internationalization in the Philippines, as outlined in CMO No. 55, Series of 2016 – Policy Framework and Strategies on the Internationalization of Philippine Higher Education (<https://legacy.ched.gov.ph/2016-ched-memorandum-orders>). Implementation is often hampered by inadequate faculty training, language barriers, and limited support (Cruz, 2020). Faculty meet challenges juggling academic duties and global initiatives, pointing out the need to assess and strengthen faculty preparedness for CHED’s goals (Cruz & Sarmiento, 2021).

In the Negros Island Region, Higher Education Institutions have started to internationalize curricula and form partnerships with foreign institutions. While some universities offer joint research and exchange programs, progress varies (State University of Northern Negros, 2025). Villanueva and Gonzales (2021) identify resource gaps, differences in support, and limited faculty exposure as barriers. This points to the need to examine the specific faculty skills and motivations that shape further internationalization in this region.

At the institutional level, faculty members are central to achieving internationalization, especially in leading curriculum development, supporting collaboration, and mentoring students. The decisive factor is faculty readiness—awareness, skills, and motivation—which underpins the institution’s ability to prepare globally competent graduates (Leal, 2021). Despite this, many HEIs prioritize administration-led initiatives and overlook fostering faculty capacity and motivation (Ilieva et al., 2020). This gap raises critical questions about the adequacy of support for local faculty. While research examines internationalization policies and student programs, understanding of faculty preparedness in provincial HEIs, such as those on Negros Island Region, remains limited (Mananay et al., 2024, pp. 401-431). The predominant literature focuses on institutional strategies in national or urban settings, neglecting the challenges faculty face locally, such as limited funding, training, and support (Cruz, 2020; Villanueva & Gonzales, 2021). Thus, examining faculty readiness is urgent to address these issues.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study determined the extent of faculty cognizance, capacity, and motivation for internationalization across Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) local colleges, state universities, and private universities in Negros Island Region when respondents were taken as a whole and when grouped according to age, sex, civil status, school type, academic rank, years of experience, educational attainment, and average monthly income.

Specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions:

1. Is there a significant difference in the extent of faculty cognizance for internationalization when respondents are grouped according to demographics?
2. Is there a significant difference in the extent of faculty capacity for internationalization across local colleges, state universities, and private universities in Higher Education Institutions when respondents are grouped according to demographics?
3. Is there a significant difference in the extent of faculty motivation for internationalization when respondents are grouped according to demographics?
4. Is there a significant relationship between the extents of faculty cognizance, capacity, and motivation for internalization?

FRAMEWORK OF THE STUDY

This study focused on three main aspects of faculty preparedness. The first is cognizance, which means having knowledge and awareness. According to Rogers’ Diffusion of Innovation Theory

(2003), being aware is the first step in adopting internationalization practices. Faculty need to understand global trends, policies, and practices before they can take part in them. This theory matters for the study because internationalization is a new approach that needs faculty involvement. Faculty members need sufficient knowledge and awareness to participate in activities such as international research, curriculum changes, exchanges, and global partnerships. By assessing what faculty know, we can better understand how ready they are to join internationalization efforts.

Also, learning what faculty know can help shape suggestions for improving awareness through training, orientation, policy sharing, and ongoing learning. When faculty are more aware, they are more likely to take part in internationalization activities at universities.

The second aspect, capacity, builds on cognizance and encompasses skills, competence, and institutional support. Human Capital Theory (Becker, 1964) posits that training and skill investment make people more productive and effective. Support from the institution and professional development also help faculty become more prepared (Becker, 1964). Human Capital Theory is important to this study because it shows that faculty are better able to support internationalization when their institutions invest in their knowledge, skills, and professional growth. For faculty to succeed in international teaching, research, and collaboration, they need training, international experience, language skills, research opportunities, and strong institutional support.

This study looks at how well faculty members are prepared for internationalization in higher education. Using Human Capital Theory, the findings highlight where faculty are strong and where they need more support. These results can help shape policies that encourage ongoing professional development, international training, faculty exchanges, research support, language programs, and better resources. With these policies, institutions can build stronger faculty teams and reach their internationalization goals more successfully.

Indeed, Human Capital Theory supports the idea that institutions should invest in faculty development to help faculty succeed in internationalization.

The third aspect is motivation, which comes from both internal and external sources, as explained by Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Deci et al., 1989). Internal factors, including personal values and career growth, and external factors, such as recognition, incentives, and policies, all affect how faculty engage in internationalization.

Self-Determination Theory is important to this study because it helps explain what drives faculty to participate in internationalization efforts at universities. The theory shows that motivation comes from both internal factors, such as personal interest, career development, and a commitment to global engagement, and extrinsic factors, such as recognition from the institution, incentives, leadership support, and internationalization policies. When these factors are in place, faculty are more likely to engage in international teaching, research, collaborations, and outreach. On the other hand, if there is not enough support or few incentives, faculty may be less engaged in internationalization. This theory offers a useful way to examine faculty motivation and to suggest policies that back both internal and external motivation. These policies might include better professional development, recognition and rewards, funding, workload adjustments, and strategies that build a culture of internationalization in higher education.

Together, these three ideas—cognizance, capacity, and motivation—shape faculty preparedness to support internationalization in higher education.

FACULTY COGNIZANCE FOR INTERNALIZATION

At the policy level, CHED's iEducation portal consolidates guidance on CMO No. 55, TNE implementation, and related programs. These resources shape faculty awareness of mobility, quality assurance, ethics/data governance, and international partner engagement. In parallel, IAU's global survey emphasizes that awareness alone is insufficient. Institutions must embed internationalization in their strategy and academic core to realize its benefits. These conclusions justify items in Sections A5–A16 (policy literacy, QA, mobility, and ethical aspects) (Commission on Higher Education, 2016).

Philippine empirical work since 2019 notes generally positive dispositions toward internationalization among faculty but uneven knowledge of policies, processes, and funding sources. This is especially true outside large metropolitan HEIs (Ferrer, 2022). The findings signal the need for focused orientations, SOPs, and IRO mediation (Mananay et al., 2024).

FACULTY CAPACITY FOR INTERNALIZATION

IRO capacity is frequently cited as a hinge factor for operationalizing partnerships, mobility, and joint curricula. (International Relations Office – Romblon State University, 2025). The ANTENA IRO Management Guide details processes for partnership development, outward/inward mobility, and quality management. These are practical competencies mirrored in this instrument's items on project logistics, MOAs, and grant writing (B21, B25) (Mananay et al., 2024).

English-Medium Instruction (EMI). Across Asia (and the Philippines), EMI—defined as the employment of English as the language of instruction in academic subjects—has expanded to support internationalization goals, yet it continues to face recurring challenges. Typical problems include faculty language proficiency, pedagogical adaptation for multilingual classrooms, and assessment alignment. Recent systematic reviews (2019–2025) reiterate mixed outcomes. They call for structured faculty development (language + pedagogy) and intercultural classroom management, which are core elements captured in the capacity scale (B17, B18, B24) (Sameephet et al., 2025).

FACULTY MOTIVATION FOR INTERNALIZATION

Global studies show that intrinsic interests, such as improving teaching and research and intercultural learning, coexist with extrinsic drivers like recognition, promotion points, and rankings. Within SDT, institutional climates that support autonomy and competence amplify internalization of internationalization behaviors. The results clarify how incentives and mentoring (C34–C35) interact with personal values (C29–C33) (Bureau et., 2021).

Local studies report that Filipino faculty value global exposure for pedagogical innovation and research impact. However, they are also sensitive to tangible supports such as grants, workload credits, and visible peer exemplars. (Suleiman et al., 2025) These data validate your separation of intrinsic and extrinsic indicators (Mananay et al., 2024).

DEMOGRAPHICS AND FACULTY COGNIZANCE FOR INTERNALIZATION

Regarding age, younger and early-career faculty frequently report greater familiarity with recent internationalization concepts, such as digital mobility and Internationalization at Home, due to recent training and exposure (Sandström & Weimer, 2022). In contrast, older or senior faculty may possess more extensive long-term international (de Wit, 2020). This relationship is typically non-linear and context-dependent (OECD, 2021). Seniority is associated with established research networks, which enhance research capacity (Leal, 2021).

Sex and gender shape faculty involvement in internationalization. Male academics typically join more international collaborations and global projects, while female faculty may encounter barriers like caregiving and limited mobility, reducing participation (Liu et al., 2020; OECD, 2025). These disparities underscore the need for policies promoting gender equity.

Civil status alone does not typically predict awareness or ability. Instead, it often serves as a proxy for other factors, such as mobility or caregiving responsibilities (Ilieva et al., 2020). For example, this is evident in the fact that married faculty members with dependents are less likely to undertake extended travel (OECD, 2021). In light of these links, scholars recommend collecting more detailed data regarding dependents and caregiving obligations, rather than focusing exclusively on marital status (Altbach & de Wit, 2020).

The type of school, whether public or private, research-intensive or teaching-oriented, shapes internationalization. Institutional resources, priorities, and goals impact faculty's international opportunities. For example, a well-funded private university may offer more support for international collaborations, travel grants, and global partnerships. In contrast, a regional public college may have fewer resources for such activities and fewer international partnerships. These differences show how school type influences the extent of internationalization efforts (Zhang & Li, 2024).

Higher academic rank is associated with broader international networks and greater access to grants, which increases capacity. Junior faculty may be more likely to adopt innovative pedagogies. Seniority shapes the type of international engagement, distinguishing between strategic and operational roles (Ilieva et al., 2020). Promotion and reward criteria are key drivers of motivation, as faculty seeking advancement respond to incentives that value international outputs and achievements (Knight, 2020).

Total years of experience correlate with accumulated networks and confidence; however, recent activity, such as engagement within the last five years, is a better indicator of current pedagogical capacity and active involvement (OECD, 2021). Years of experience sometimes exhibit an inverted-U relationship with active internationalization (Sandström & Weimer, 2022).

Faculty educational attainment is another key factor. Advanced education, such as a doctoral degree, equips faculty with the knowledge, skills, and credentials necessary for effective international collaboration and participation in global academic networks. This training enriches the faculty's global potential and contributes to academic brain circulation. Institutions that invest in doctoral programs can attract and retain top academic talent. Including global doctoral mobility statistics can further support this rationale. Faculty with advanced degrees significantly build their institution's internationalization capacity (Zhang & Li, 2024).

Socioeconomic status, often measured by average monthly income, affects access to international opportunities. Faculty in well-resourced institutions, or those with higher incomes, can more easily join international conferences, exchange programs, and research collaborations. Limited financial resources can restrict participation and impact institutional internationalization (Li et al., 2023). To address income gaps, institutions may provide travel bursaries or additional stipends for international collaborations. These policies can support faculty across income levels and encourage more equitable internationalization.

DEMOGRAPHICS AND FACULTY CAPACITY FOR INTERNALIZATION

Age frequently influences differences in faculty capacity, particularly in adapting to internationalization initiatives and new academic procedures. While younger faculty members are

generally more proficient with digital technologies, digital cooperative platforms, and inventive teaching techniques—skills that are progressively vital in internationalized higher education—older faculty members contribute extensive professional experience, institutional knowledge, and established academic networks that can strengthen international engagement (Culp-Roche et al., 2020).

Sex plays an important role in shaping faculty capacity in higher education. Although professional development is now more equitable, men and women still do not have the same access to international collaborations, leadership roles, or research opportunities (Kwiek & Roszka, 2021, pp. 1344-1380). Castulo et al. (2026) emphasize that institutions need gender-responsive practices to ensure equal chances for faculty development. Research on internationalization also shows that gender-related experiences affect who takes part in international activities, which then influences how faculty contribute to global engagement (Ma, 2025).

Meanwhile, According to Li et al. (2021), personal factors like family duties can shape faculty involvement in internationalization efforts. At the same time, support from family can encourage career development and career progress (Fox & Gaughan, 2021). As a result, marital status can have either a positive or negative impact on faculty capacity, depending on each person's situation and the support provided by their institution (Gribling Marinova, 2018).

The type of school, whether public or private, directly affects how well faculty can engage in internationalization by shaping resources, funding, and priorities (Krishanachinda, 2020). Private schools usually have more flexibility in how they use resources, while public schools may benefit from government-funded programs and larger networks (Lucero et al., 2020)

According to Eckhaus and Davidovitch (2020), academic rank has a significant impact on research output among university faculty. Those with higher ranks generally show higher academic productivity and professional competence. The authors believe that moving up in rank shows a faculty member's growing expertise, achievements, and ongoing involvement in academic work. In a similar study, Salahuddin et al. (2026) found that research and technical skills among faculty varied based on demographic and professional factors. This means that senior faculty and those in higher positions often have more advanced skills that support their academic success.

Studies show that ongoing teaching, research, outreach, and career development all help faculty improve their skills. Those with more experience tend to be more confident in designing courses, mentoring students, leading research, and taking on leadership roles (Sood et al., 2019). Bendol (2026) found that career growth improves when faculty regularly participate in seminars, mentoring, and research projects, and receive support from their institutions throughout their careers. Gaining experience also helps faculty develop research skills and become more productive scholars. Faculty who have served longer often have more chances to work on research teams, publish their work, and take part in international projects, which further builds their capacity (Tripodi et al., 2024).

Faculty with advanced degrees usually have stronger research skills, broader professional networks, and more experience with international academic standards (Helden et al., 2021, pp. 1741-1761). Overall, higher educational attainment can strengthen faculty capacity by increasing knowledge, skills, and participation in internationalization (De Witte & Soncin, 2021).

Income plays an important role in building faculty capacity because it allows access to professional development, research resources, and international opportunities. Faculty with higher incomes are more likely to attend conferences, earn higher qualifications, and join global academic networks (Faria et al., 2023).

DEMOGRAPHICS AND FACULTY MOTIVATION FOR INTERNALIZATION

Motivation depends on personal, professional, and organizational factors that change throughout a career (Stratford et al., 2023). Younger faculty often focus on advancing their careers, gaining recognition, getting promoted, and building skills, which encourages them to do research, publish, and network. In contrast, older faculty are usually motivated by fulfillment, sharing knowledge, mentoring, and helping their institutions (Martin et al., 2023, pp. 569-582).

Female faculty usually report more intrinsic motivation, especially when they have supportive colleagues and a healthy work environment. Male faculty, on the other hand, may be more driven by research output and career growth (Wilkesmann & Vorberg, 2021).

Studies show that married faculty members usually have higher intrinsic motivation and are more engaged in academic activities, likely because they receive emotional and social support from their families (Denson & Szelenyi, 2020). On the other hand, unmarried faculty might have more flexibility to pursue their professional goals, but they may not have the same support systems to help sustain motivation (Denson & Szelenyi, 2020, pp. 261-278).

Salajegheh et al. (2024) also found that teachers in private schools were more motivated than those in public schools, mainly because of better recognition, personalized support, responsive leadership, and more flexible organizations. On the other hand, public school teachers struggled with bureaucracy and limited resources, which lowered their motivation.

Recent research shows that faculty at different ranks are motivated by different factors (Niloofer et al., 2020, pp. 77-100). Those in higher ranks often report more autonomy, professional recognition, and involvement in decision-making, which can boost motivation (Daumiller et al., 2020).

Meanwhile, instructors with more experience often feel more confident, skilled, and familiar with their institution, which can boost their motivation and devotion to teaching (Snook et al., 2021). As they gain more teaching experience, faculty members improve their teaching skills and develop a stronger professional identity, which helps keep them motivated (Ma, 2022).

Faculty with higher academic qualifications, like master's or doctoral degrees, are often more motivated to teach, conduct research, serve the community, and pursue career development (Daumiller et al., 2022). Advanced education builds knowledge, skills, confidence, and competence, which support both internal and external motivation (Vu et al., 2021).

Lastly, recent research highlights the crucial role of salary, incentives, and benefits in motivating teachers and keeping them engaged. A study in the Philippines found these factors were key in teachers' decisions to stay in the profession (Busico et al., 2023.) Calizar (2026) found that financial benefits boost teachers' motivation and performance. Teachers with higher pay were more motivated and performed better (Calizar, 2026).

METHODOLOGY

This quantitative study utilized a descriptive-comparative-correlational research design. Specifically, the design was used to describe the distribution of one or more variables, disregarding any causal hypothesis (Aggarwal & Ranganathan, 2019), and then compare groups utilizing finding similarities and/or differences, and establish relationships between variables in an attempt to draw conclusions about them (Creswell & Creswell, 2022).

As applied in this study, the descriptive design determined the extent of faculty cognizance, capacity, and motivation for internationalization among Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) local

colleges, state universities, and private universities in Negros Occidental when respondents are taken as a whole and when grouped according to their demographics. On the other hand, the comparative design drew comparisons each for the extents of faculty cognizance, capacity, and motivation according to the respondents' demographics. Finally, correlational design enabled the researchers to establish relationships between the extents of the variables aforementioned.

The subject and respondents of the study were the full-time permanent faculty members of higher education institutions in Negros Island Region, both in public and private, who are involved in teaching, research, and extension functions. They served as the primary source of data regarding their cognizance, capacity, and motivation in advancing internationalization within their respective institutions. The inclusion criteria involved faculty who have been in service for at least one academic year and are engaged in educational activities that may contribute to the internationalization of education. The distribution of the respondents is shown in table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of the Respondents

School	Population	Sample
A	27	9
B	30	10
C	39	13
D	145	48
E	175	57
F	206	68
G	100	33
H	59	19
I	38	12
Total	819	269

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Extent of Faculty Cognizance for Internalization as a Whole and according to Demographics

The table 2 below shows the extent of faculty cognizance for internalization when respondents are taken as a whole and when grouped according to their demographics.

Results show that as a whole, the extent of faculty cognizance for internalization is high. The elevated level of faculty awareness indicates a deep understanding of the objectives and significance of internationalization in higher education (Calikoglu et al., 2022). This observation aligns with the findings of Amakiri et al. (2025), who emphasized that awareness and understanding of internationalization among members of the academic community are critical to promoting global engagement and enhancing institutional competitiveness in an increasingly interconnected educational context.

When grouped according to age, the extent of faculty cognizance is high for 20-29 years old ($M=3.78$, $SD=0.80$), 30-39 years old ($M=3.95$, $SD=0.68$), 40-49 years old ($M=4.04$, $SD=0.63$), 50-59 years old ($M=4.01$, $SD=0.66$) and 60 years old or above ($M=4.14$, $SD=0.49$). When grouped according to sex, the extent of faculty cognizance is also high for both males ($M=3.94$, $SD=0.73$) and females ($M=4.01$, $SD=0.62$). When grouped according to civil status, the same extent is the faculty cognizance for respondents that are single ($M=3.94$, $SD=0.83$), married ($M=3.99$, $SD=0.59$), and widowed ($M=4.00$, $SD=0.48$). When taken according to school type, both public ($M=3.96$, $SD=0.67$) and private ($M=4.12$, $SD=0.66$) HEIs' faculty also obtained high extent of cognizance. Amakiri et al. (2025) reported that members of the academic community demonstrated a strong understanding of internationalization concepts and objectives, reflecting the growing

embrace of these principles in institutional policies, programs, and strategic directions. This widespread awareness across demographic groups is due to the increasing emphasis on internationalization initiatives within higher education institutions (Van Mol & Perez-Encinas, 2022, pp. 1-16).

When grouped according to academic rank, high extent of cognizance for instructors ($M=4.01$, $SD=0.62$), assistant professors ($M=3.84$, $SD=0.73$), associate professors ($M=4.15$, $SD=0.58$), and professors ($M=3.92$, $SD=0.86$). When grouped according to years of teaching, there is a high extent of cognizance among faculty teaching for 0-5 years ($M=4.06$, $SD=0.73$), 6-10 years ($M=3.86$, $SD=0.73$), 11-15 years ($M=3.94$, $SD=0.62$), 16-20 years ($M=4.09$, $SD=0.50$), and 21 years or above ($M=4.06$, $SD=0.68$). When grouped according to educational attainment, the same high extent is obtained by faculty with bachelor's degree ($M=3.51$, $SD=1.02$), master's degree ($M=3.95$, $SD=0.67$), doctorate degree ($M=4.04$, $SD=0.63$), and those who still take post graduate degree ($M=4.17$, $SD=0.43$). Finally, when grouped according to average monthly income, high extent also characterizes the cognizance of faculty with 30 000 or below MI ($M=3.85$, $SD=0.70$), 30 001-40 000 MI ($M=4.02$, $SD=0.59$) and 40 001 or above MI ($M=3.99$, $SD=0.71$).

The results show that most faculty members have a strong understanding of internationalization ($M = 3.98$, $SD = 0.67$). They are familiar with its concepts, goals, and importance in higher education. This means internationalization is now a well-known part of how institutions and faculty approach academic work. Further supporting this result, the provisions of CHED Memorandum Order (CMO) No. 55, s. 2016 are being effectively articulated and implemented by higher education institutions. As a result, HEIs are better able to align their academic programs, policies, and governance with international standards and practices. Complementing CMO No. 55, Republic Act No. 11448 further strengthens the country's internationalization efforts by providing a legal framework for transnational higher education (TNE) providers and the cross-border delivery of higher education programs.

Looking at age groups, all faculty showed high awareness, with those aged 60 and above having the highest average ($M = 4.14$, $SD = 0.49$). This could be because older faculty have more experience and have seen more changes and international projects. Still, the high scores across all ages show that knowledge of internationalization is strong no matter the generation.

Both male and female faculty members showed high awareness, with females ($M = 4.01$, $SD = 0.62$) having a slightly higher average than males ($M = 3.94$, $SD = 0.73$). This small difference indicates that both genders have similar chances of learning about and participating in internationalization efforts.

Similarly, faculty members among different civil-status categories demonstrated high levels of cognizance. Faculty members, whether single, married, or widowed, all showed high awareness. The similar scores mean that marital status does not have much effect on how well faculty understand internationalization. Instead, their jobs and experiences at their institutions may matter more. Faculty from private institutions ($M = 4.12$, $SD = 0.66$) obtained a slightly higher mean than those from public institutions ($M = 3.96$, $SD = 0.67$). This may reflect the stronger emphasis that private institutions often place on international partnerships, accreditation standards, and global competitiveness.

Across academic ranks, all groups showed high awareness, with associate professors having the highest average ($M = 4.15$, $SD = 0.58$). This may mean that those in higher positions are more involved in research, international projects, and policy-making, giving them more exposure to internationalization. All groups likewise exhibited high cognizance. Faculty with 16–20 years of

experience ($M = 4.09$, $SD = 0.50$) and those with 21 years or more of experience ($M = 4.06$, $SD = 0.68$) reported slightly higher levels, suggesting that prolonged engagement in academia may enhance awareness of global trends and international learning practices.

All education levels showed high awareness, but faculty currently working on postgraduate studies had the highest average ($M = 4.17$, $SD = 0.43$). This could be because they are more involved in advanced research and exposed to international ideas. Faculty with doctorates also showed high awareness, indicating that advanced education deepens understanding of internationalization.

Faculty members at all income levels showed high awareness. The similar scores indicate that economic status has little effect on knowledge of internationalization. Instead, factors such as institutional policies, professional development, and academic involvement may play a larger role.

In line with the findings, faculty demographics and professional characteristics such as age, academic rank, and international experience are increasingly playing a decisive role in advancing institutional internationalization. Parallel to this finding, recent empirical and review studies consistently demonstrate that demographic variables such as age, sex, civil status, school type, academic rank, years of experience, educational attainment, and income influence faculty cognizance, capacity, and motivation for internationalization (de Wit et al., 2020; Ilieva et al., 2020; Sandström & Weimer, 2022). These effects are frequently mediated or moderated by institutional supports, academic discipline, and local or national contexts (Altbach & Knight, 2007; Leal, 2021).

Table 2. Extent of Faculty Cognizance for Internalization as a Whole according to Demographics

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Age			
20-29 years old	3.78	0.8	High
30-39 years old	3.95	0.68	High
40-49 years old	4.04	0.63	High
50-59 years old	4.01	0.66	High
60 years old or Above	4.14	0.49	High
Sex			
Male	3.93	0.73	High
Female	4.01	0.62	High
Civil Status			
Single	3.94	0.83	High
Married	3.99	0.59	High
Widowed	4	0.48	High
School Type			
Public	3.96	0.67	High
Private	4.12	0.66	High
Academic Rank			
Instructor	4.01	0.62	High
Assistant Professor	3.84	0.73	High
Associate Professor	4.15	0.58	High
Professor	3.92	0.86	High
Years of Teaching			
0-5 Years	4.06	0.73	High
6-10 Years	3.86	0.73	High
11-15 Years	3.94	0.62	High
16-20 Years	4.09	0.5	High
21 Years or Above	4.06	0.68	High

Educational Attainment			
Bachelor's degree	3.51	1.02	High
Master's degree	3.95	0.67	High
Doctorate degree	4.04	0.63	High
Post	4.17	0.43	High
Average Monthly Income			
30 000 and below	3.85	0.7	High
30 001-40 000	4.02	0.59	High
40,001 and above	3.99	0.71	High
As a Whole	3.98	0.67	High

Extent of Faculty Capacity for Internalization as a Whole and according to Demographics

Table 3 shows the extent of faculty capacity for internalization when respondents are taken as a whole and when grouped according to their demographics

Results show that as a whole, the extent of faculty capacity for internalization is high [$M=3.79$, $SD=0.71$]. When grouped according to age, the extent of faculty capacity is high for 20-29 years old ($M=3.68$, $SD=0.67$), 30-39 years old ($M=3.86$, $SD=0.78$), 40-49 years old ($M=3.80$, $SD=0.70$), 50-59 years old ($M=3.73$, $SD=0.66$) and 60 years old or above ($M=3.69$, $SD=0.67$). When grouped according to sex, the extent of faculty capacity is also high for both males ($M=3.83$, $SD=0.78$) and females ($M=3.75$, $SD=0.66$). When grouped according to civil status, the same extent is the faculty capacity for respondents that are single ($M=3.77$, $SD=0.85$), married ($M=3.79$, $SD=0.65$), and widowed ($M=3.72$, $SD=0.50$). When taken according to school type, both public ($M=3.76$, $SD=0.72$) and private ($M=4.00$, $SD=0.61$) HEIs' faculty also obtained high extent of capacity.

When grouped according to academic rank, high extent of capacity for instructors ($M=3.83$, $SD=0.73$), assistant professors ($M=3.66$, $SD=0.73$), associate professors ($M=3.94$, $SD=0.63$), and professors ($M=3.61$, $SD=0.74$). When grouped according to years of teaching, there is a high extent of capacity among faculty teaching for 0-5 years ($M=3.78$, $SD=0.78$), 6-10 years ($M=3.79$, $SD=0.79$), 11-15 years ($M=3.68$, $SD=0.63$), 16-20 years ($M=3.98$, $SD=0.56$), and 21 years or above ($M=3.78$, $SD=0.72$). Higher academic rank is associated with broader international networks and greater access to grants, which increases capacity (Altbach & Knight, 2007). Junior faculty may be more likely to adopt innovative pedagogies (Beelen & Jones, 2015). Seniority shapes the type of international engagement, distinguishing between strategic and operational roles (Ilieva et al., 2020).

When grouped according to educational attainment, faculty with bachelor's degree ($M=3.21$, $SD=0.96$) obtained moderate extent, high extent master's degree ($M=3.79$, $SD=0.72$) and doctorate degree ($M=3.79$, $SD=0.67$), while very high extent of faculty capacity for those who still take post graduate degree ($M=4.27$, $SD=0.38$). Finally, when grouped according to average monthly income, high extent also characterizes the capacity of faculty with 30 000 or below MI ($M=3.83$, $SD=0.82$), 30 001-40 000 MI ($M=3.74$, $SD=0.60$) and 40 001 or above MI ($M=3.80$, $SD=0.76$).

The results show that faculty in higher education institutions generally have the skills, knowledge, and resources needed to support internationalization efforts, as seen in the high overall faculty capacity ($M = 3.79$, $SD = 0.71$). This means faculty are well prepared to participate in international teaching, research, collaboration, and academic activities. As a result, HEIs can build on this strength by growing international partnerships, research collaborations, virtual exchanges, and internationalized curricula.

High ratings across all age groups show that internationalization capacity is not limited to any one generation of faculty. Both younger and older educators are able to take part in internationalization efforts, which suggests that professional development and institutional programs have reached faculty at different career stages. This means age is likely not a major barrier to faculty involvement in internationalization.

Likewise, high ratings for both male and female faculty suggest that opportunities, resources, and experiences related to internationalization are accessible to everyone. This points to institutions creating welcoming environments where all faculty can build the skills needed for global engagement. As reported, sex and gender shape faculty involvement in internationalization. Male academics typically join more international collaborations and global projects, while female faculty may encounter barriers like caregiving and limited mobility, reducing participation.

Similar levels of capacity across civil-status groups suggest that personal or family circumstances do not significantly affect faculty readiness for internationalization. Faculty, whether married or not, seem able to take part in international academic activities. As reported by Ilieva et al. (2020), civil status alone does not typically predict awareness or ability. Instead, it often serves as a proxy for other factors, such as mobility or caregiving responsibilities. Internationalization efforts are becoming institutional focuses among different types of higher education institutions. However, the relatively higher mean among private HEIs may indicate greater access to resources, international networks, funding opportunities, or institutional support mechanisms that facilitate capacity development.

High ratings across academic ranks show that internationalization skills are being developed at all levels. Associate professors scored a bit higher, which may be due to their experience, wider research networks, and more involvement in collaborations. Mentoring programs could use the knowledge of senior faculty to help colleagues in lower ranks build their capacity.

The results show that faculty capacity remains high regardless of how many years someone has been teaching. Faculty with 16–20 years of experience had the highest average score, suggesting that a mix of extensive teaching experience and ongoing growth helps prepare them for internationalization.

Education level seems to play a key role in faculty capacity. Faculty with only a bachelor's degree showed moderate capacity, while those with graduate degrees had high or very high levels. Faculty are currently working on postgraduate studies. In particular, the average score suggests that ongoing advanced education improves exposure to suggested ideas, research skills, networking, and best practices. This demonstrates the value of supporting graduate studies and lifelong learning in strengthening internationalization.

Finally, high ratings across all income groups indicate that faculty capacity for internationalization depends little on income. This means opportunities to build internationalization skills are likely available to faculty through different salary levels, though ongoing institutional support remains important.

In brief, this evidence shows that HEIs already have a strong base of faculty capacity for internationalization. Still, institutions should continue investing in career development, international programs, research collaborations, and postgraduate education to further build faculty readiness and sustain internationalization efforts.

Table 3. Extent of Faculty Capacity for Internalization as a Whole according to Demographics

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretation
Age			
20-29 years old	3.68	0.67	High
30-39 years old	3.86	0.78	High
40-49 years old	3.8	0.7	High
50-59 years old	3.73	0.66	High
60 YO or Above	3.69	0.67	High
Sex			
Male	3.83	0.78	High
Female	3.75	0.66	High
Civil Status			
Single	3.77	0.85	High
Married	3.79	0.65	High
Widowed	3.72	0.5	High
School Type			
Public	3.76	0.72	High
Private	4	0.61	High
Academic Rank			
Instructor	3.83	0.73	High
Assistant Professor	3.66	0.73	High
Associate Professor	3.94	0.63	High
Professor	3.61	0.74	High
Years of Teaching			
0-5 Years	3.78	0.78	High
6-10 Years	3.75	0.71	High
11-15 Years	3.68	0.63	High
16-20 Years	3.98	0.56	High
21 Years or Above	3.79	0.72	High
Educational Attainment			
Bachelor's degree	3.21	0.96	Moderate
Master's degree	3.79	0.72	High
Doctorate degree	3.79	0.67	High
Post	4.27	0.38	Very High
Average Monthly Income			
30 000 or below	3.83	0.82	High
30 001-40 000	3.74	0.6	High
40 001 or above	3.8	0.76	High
As a Whole	3.79	0.71	High

Extent of Faculty Motivation for Internalization as a Whole and according to Demographics

Table 4 in the next page shows the extent of overall faculty motivation and in terms of internal and external motivation when respondents are taken as a whole and when grouped according to demographics.

Results show that the overall extent of motivation for internalization is high ($M=3.95$, $SD=0.75$). The same extent is shown in terms of internal ($M=4.07$, $SD=0.83$) and external ($M=3.83$, $SD=0.87$) motivation. Results show that as a whole, the extent of faculty capacity for internalization is high [$M=3.79$, $SD=0.71$].

In terms of internal motivation according to age, the extent of faculty motivation is high for 20-29 years old ($M=3.98$, $SD=0.80$), 30-39 years old ($M=4.15$, $SD=1.00$), 40-49 years old ($M=4.06$, $SD=0.73$), 50-59 years old ($M=3.99$, $SD=0.75$) and 60 years old or above ($M=4.08$, $SD=0.66$). Studies show that age can affect what motivates faculty, but research results are mixed. Motivation depends on personal, professional, and organizational factors that change throughout a career (Stratford et al., 2023).

According to sex, the extent of faculty internal motivation is also high for both males ($M=4.07$, $SD=1.02$) and females ($M=4.06$, $SD=0.67$). In general, while sex is one factor in faculty motivation, support from the organization and workplace conditions matter more (Wilkesmann & Vorberg, 2021; Alharthi, 2026). Studies show that sex or gender can affect faculty motivation, but the results are often mixed (Snook et al., 2021). Female faculty usually report more intrinsic motivation, especially when they have supportive colleagues and a healthy work environment. Male faculty, on the other hand, may be more driven by research output and career growth (Wilkesmann & Vorberg, 2021). However, these differences are small and depend more on organizational and cultural factors than on gender itself. Likewise, Spanish University Context (2021) and Martínez-Ramón & Morales-Rodríguez (2022) found that female university faculty had higher intrinsic motivation to teach, which was associated with greater engagement with students and colleagues.

When grouped according to civil status, the same extent is the internal motivation for respondents that are single ($M=4.06$, $SD=0.81$), married ($M=4.06$, $SD=0.85$), while very high for widowed ($M=4.28$, $SD=0.45$). When taken according to school type, both public ($M=4.05$, $SD=0.84$) and private ($M=4.15$, $SD=0.78$) HEIs' faculty obtained high extent of internal motivation for internalization. Studies show that married faculty members usually have higher intrinsic motivation and are more engaged in academic activities, likely because they receive emotional and social support from their families (Denson & Szelényi, 2020). On the other hand, unmarried faculty might have more flexibility to pursue their professional goals, but they may not have the same support systems to help sustain motivation (Denson & Szelényi, 2020, pp. 261-278). Supporting this evidence, Baumbach (2025) found that married faculty reported higher intrinsic motivation for research than unmarried faculty, suggesting that family support promotes persistence and engagement in scholarly work. Still, the link between marital status and motivation is complicated and can change depending on work demands and the institution (Baumbach, 2025; Shaffer et al., 2026). When grouped according to academic rank, high extent of internal motivation for instructors ($M=4.14$, $SD=0.94$), assistant professors ($M=3.93$, $SD=0.76$), associate professors ($M=4.15$, $SD=0.76$), and professors ($M=4.11$, $SD=0.81$). This result is supported by Calvin et al. (2024) which states that academic rank is linked to differences in faculty responsibilities, recognition, pay, authority, and opportunities for advancement. According to years of teaching, there is a high extent of internal motivation among faculty teaching for 0-5 years ($M=4.14$, $SD=0.65$), 6-10 years ($M=4.01$, $SD=1.07$), 11-15 years ($M=3.96$, $SD=0.70$), and 21 years or above ($M=4.09$, $SD=0.81$), but is very high for those teaching 16-20 years ($M=4.25$, $SD=0.60$). When grouped according to educational attainment, there is a high extent in internal motivation for faculty with bachelor's degree ($M=3.92$, $SD=0.88$), master's degree ($M=4.04$, $SD=0.90$), doctorate degree ($M=4.10$, $SD=0.74$), but very high for those who still take post graduate degree ($M=4.28$, $SD=0.64$). Finally, when grouped according to average monthly income, high extent also characterizes the internal motivation of faculty with 30 000 or below MI ($M=4.20$, $SD=1.22$), 30 001-40 000 MI ($M=4.05$, $SD=0.67$) and 40 001 or above MI ($M=4.03$, $SD=0.78$).

On the other hand, in terms of external motivation according to age, the extent of faculty motivation is high for 20-29 years old ($M=3.58$, $SD=0.91$), 30-39 years old ($M=3.84$, $SD=0.91$), 40-49 years old ($M=3.90$, $SD=0.76$), 50-59 years old ($M=3.87$, $SD=1.04$) and 60 years old or above ($M=3.67$,

SD=0.68). According to sex, the extent of faculty external motivation is also high for both males (M=3.79, SD=0.92) and females (M=3.86, SD=0.82). When grouped according to civil status, the same extent is the external motivation for respondents that are single (M=3.76, SD=0.99), married (M=3.86, SD=0.81), and widowed (M=3.69, SD=0.30). When taken according to school type, both public (M=3.82, SD=0.87) and private (M=3.94, SD=0.86) HEIs' faculty obtained high extent of external motivation for internalization. When grouped according to academic rank, high extent of external motivation for instructors (M=3.89, SD=0.74), assistant professors (M=3.69, SD=1.00), associate professors (M=3.97, SD=0.80), and professors (M=3.81, SD=0.87). According to years of teaching, there is a high extent of external motivation among faculty teaching for 0-5 years (M=3.88, SD=0.76), 6-10 years (M=3.75, SD=0.88), 11-15 years (M=3.74, SD=0.77), 16-20 years (M=3.91, SD=0.73), and 21 years or above (M=3.96, SD=1.07). When grouped according to educational attainment, there is a high extent in external motivation for faculty with bachelor's degree (M=3.54, SD=0.87), master's degree (M=3.79, SD=0.79), doctorate degree (M=3.88, SD=0.98), but very high for those who still take post graduate degree (M=4.28, SD=0.70). Finally, when grouped according to average monthly income, high extent also characterizes the external motivation of faculty with 30 000 or below MI (M=3.84, SD=0.73), 30 001-40 000 MI (M=3.82, SD=0.76) and 40 001 or above MI (M=3.84, SD=0.98).

Table 4. Extent of Faculty Motivation for Internalization as a Whole according to Demographics

Variable	Internal Motivation			External Motivation		
	M	SD	Int	M	SD	Int
Age						
20-29 years old	3.95	0.82	High	3.59	0.9	High
30-39 years old	4.09	0.69	High	3.84	0.81	High
40-49 years old	4.07	0.73	High	3.91	0.77	High
50-59 years old	3.99	0.75	High	3.79	0.82	High
60 years old or Above	4.08	0.66	High	3.67	0.68	High
Sex						
Male	4.02	0.8	High	3.8	0.91	High
Female	4.06	0.67	High	3.83	0.74	High
Civil Status						
Single	4.06	0.81	High	3.77	0.99	High
Married	4.03	0.69	High	3.84	0.72	High
Widowed	4.28	0.45	Very High	3.69	0.3	High
School Type						
Public	4.03	0.72	High	3.8	0.8	High
Private	4.15	0.78	High	3.94	0.86	High
Academic Rank						
Instructor	4.08	0.66	High	3.89	0.74	High
Assistant Professor	3.93	0.76	High	3.65	0.85	High
Associate Professor	4.17	0.74	High	3.97	0.81	High
Professor	3.91	0.9	High	3.8	0.78	High
Years of Teaching						
0-5 years	4.14	0.65	High	3.88	0.76	High
6-10 years	3.94	0.75	High	3.76	0.88	High
11-15 years	3.96	0.7	High	3.74	0.77	High
16-20 years	4.26	0.6	Very High	3.93	0.75	High
21 years or above	4.09	0.81	High	3.88	0.83	High
Educational Attainment						
Bachelor's degree	3.92	0.88	High	3.54	0.87	High

Master's degree	4	0.71	High	3.81	0.79	High
Doctorate degree	4.1	0.74	High	3.82	0.83	High
Post	4.28	0.64	Very High	4.28	0.7	Very High
Average Monthly Income						
30 000 or below	4.01	0.92	High	3.68	1.06	High
30 001-40 000	4.12	0.67	High	3.95	0.71	High
40 001 or above	3.99	0.69	High	3.77	0.77	High
As a Whole	4.07	0.83	High	3.83	0.87	High

Difference in the Extent of Faculty Cognizance for Internalization according to Sex and School Type

Mann Whitney test was used in table 5 to show the difference in the extent of faculty cognizance for internalization when grouped according to sex and school type. Results show that there is no significant difference in the extent of cognizance for internalization according to sex [$U=8380.500$, $p=0.513$] and school type [$U=3085.000$, $p=0.138$].

With this, Gender does not seem to influence their awareness in this case. Instead, things like exposure, institutional practices, and professional development likely affect both groups in the same way (Hanley & Chankseliani, 2025). Because of this, programs to improve faculty awareness of internationalization do not need to be different for men and women. Using general strategies that help all faculty members build their skills is more effective (Hur et al., 2025).

Also, results suggests that the type of institution does not have a big impact on faculty awareness of internationalization. Faculty members from all school types seem to have similar exposure to related ideas, policies, and practices. This could mean that things like institutional initiatives, professional development, and access to information are offered in much the same way among different schools. As a result, strategies to improve faculty awareness can be created and used

Table 5. Difference in the Extent of Faculty Cognizance for Internalization according to Sex and School type

Variables	U	z	p
Sex	8380.500	-0.6548	0.513
School Type	3085.000	-1.4837	0.138

Note: difference is significant when $p \leq 0.05$

Kruskal Wallis test was used in table 6 to show the difference in the extent of faculty cognizance for internalization when grouped according to age, civil status, academic rank, educational attainment, and average monthly income. Results show that there is no significant difference in the extent of faculty cognizance according to age [$H=3.118075$, $p=0.538$], civil status [$H=0.078943$, $p=0.961$], academic rank [$H=7.373895$, $p=0.061$], years of teaching [$H=4.755288$, $p=0.313$], educational attainment [$H=3.703$, $p=0.295$], and average monthly income [$H=1.392$, $p=0.499$].

Firstly, younger and older faculty members show similar levels of understanding. This suggests that factors like institutional exposure, professional development, or corporate regulations have a greater impact on awareness than age (Sandra, 2024).

The institution does not need age-specific programs to improve awareness. Instead, a unified approach like campus-wide training, seminars, or information campaigns is likely to be more effective in helping faculty understand internationalization efforts.

Secondly, Civil status does not affect how faculty understand internationalization (Jin & Schneider, 2019). Therefore, information, institutional efforts, and professional development about internationalization reach all civil status groups in similar ways. As a result, programs to improve

understanding do not need to vary by group. Instead, institutions should focus on access to training, academic roles, or support, which may have a greater impact.

Also, below finding reveals that information, policies, and activities about internationalization likely reach faculty at all ranks equally. It also shows that academic rank does not affect faculty awareness. As a result, efforts to improve awareness can include all ranks instead of focusing on certain groups.

Furthermore, results suggest that knowledge of internationalization is independent of teaching experience. Institutional policies, professional development, access to information, and organizational support may contribute to consistent awareness among faculty. Therefore, programs to enhance faculty awareness of internationalization should be offered to all, as teaching experience is not a differentiating factor.

Moreover, faculty with bachelor's, master's, or doctoral degrees demonstrate similar understanding of internationalization initiatives. These findings indicate that institutional policies, professional experience, training, and organizational culture have a greater impact on awareness than academic qualifications. Therefore, strategies to enhance faculty awareness can be implemented uniformly across all educational groups.

Lastly, faculty members seem to have similar levels of understanding about internationalization no matter their salary. This suggests that awareness is more likely linked to institutional policies, leadership, communication, and professional development opportunities than to financial compensation (Calikoglu et al., 2020, pp. 61-79). For this reason, higher education institutions should keep offering equal access to internationalization programs, training, and information for all faculty members, regardless of income (Moshtari & Safarpour, 2024).

Table 6. Difference in the Extent of Faculty Cognizance for Internalization according to Age, Civil Status, Academic Rank, Educational Attainment, and Average Monthly Income

Variable	H	df	p
Age	3.118075	4	0.538
Civil Status	0.078943	2	0.961
Academic Rank	7.373895	3	0.061
Years of Teaching	4.755288	4	0.313
Educational Attainment	3.703	3	0.295
Average Monthly Income	1.392	2	0.499

Note: difference is significant when $p \leq 0.05$

Difference in the Extent of Faculty Capacity for Internalization according to Demographics

Mann Whitney test was used in table 7 to show the difference in the extent of faculty capacity for internalization when respondents are grouped according to sex and school type. Results show that there is no significant difference in the extent of capacity according to sex [$U=7880.000$, $p=0.147$] however, the difference is significant according to school type [$U=2890.500$, $p=0.050$] with the capacity of private HEIs faculty being significantly higher than the public HEIs faculty.

The results show that male and female faculty members have similar ability to support internationalization efforts. Gender does not play a major role in faculty members' participation in internationalization (Watanabe, 2024). Meanwhile, Faculty at private HEIs had higher capacity than those at public HEIs (Marinoni & Pina-Cardona, 2024). This may indicate that private institutions provide better support, more adaptable policies, easier access to training, or more targeted internationalization efforts (Tamtik, 2022).

Table 7. Difference in the Extent of Faculty Capacity for Internalization according to Sex and School Type

Variable	U	z	p
Sex	7880.000	-1.4513	0.147
School Type	2890.500*	-1.9617	0.050

Note: *difference is significant when $p \leq 0.05$

Kruskal Wallis test was used in table 8.A to show the difference in the extent of faculty capacity for internalization when respondents are grouped according to age, civil status, academic rank, years of experience, educational attainment, and average monthly income. Results show that there is no significant difference in the extent of capacity for internalization according to age [$H=2.52867$, $p=0.640$], civil status [$H=0.15562$, $p=0.925$], academic rank [$H=7.19281$, $p=0.066$], years of teaching [$H=4.41065$, $p=0.353$], and average monthly income [$H=1.683$, $p=0.431$].

However, the difference in the extent of capacity is significant according to educational attainment [$H=9.064$, $p=0.028$]. Post hoc test in table 8.B shows the post hoc test which revealed that the extent of capacity of those who are still pursuing post graduate school is significantly higher than the bachelor's degree holder faculty.

Ma (2025) reports that faculty participation in internationalization activities is determined by professional experience and experience with global academic environments. Similarly, Calikoglu et al. (2024) observe that faculty engagement in internationalization varies across career stages, suggesting that age-related factors may also affect faculty members' ability to participate in international programs and collaborations. Development programs should support all age groups equally.

Meanwhile, capacity levels stay consistent across all groups, indicating that factors such as training, resources, and institutional support exert greater influence (Ji et al., 2026). Therefore, strategies to enhance capacity may be uniformly implemented regardless of civil status, making civil status an unlikely basis for targeting interventions.

Moreover, when making policies or planning programs, there is no need to focus on faculty rank. Offering professional development to everyone may work better (Kohan, 2023). To build capacity, it is more helpful to improve access to training, boost motivation, and raise awareness instead of focusing on rank.

Furthermore, teaching experience does not affect capacity for internationalization. Training opportunities related to internationalization may be just as available to faculty at all experience levels (NAFSA, 2026). Likewise, faculty, regardless of income, may have similar chances to develop internationalization capacity. Institutional support and professional development seem to be offered uniformly, regardless of personal finances. Efforts to strengthen faculty capacity should not depend on income group. Instead, continue focusing on institutional strategies that may benefit all faculty equally.

However, faculty members' ability to work internationally is closely related to their level of education. Faculty with only a bachelor's degree have less capacity than those with doctorates or those in postgraduate programs. Faculty still in postgraduate programs show even greater capacity than those with master's or doctoral degrees (Kayingo et al., 2022). This suggests that continuing education may help more than simply completing a higher degree.

This means that advanced or ongoing graduate education helps faculty become better prepared, more skilled, and more engaged in international work. (Verbyla et al., 2023) The data highlight the

value of continuous academic development, as ongoing postgraduate study appears to strengthen faculty in this area.

Table 8A. Difference in the Extent of Faculty Capacity for Internalization according to Age, Civil Status, Academic Rank, Years of Experience, Educational Attainment, and Average Monthly Income

Variable	H	df	p
Age	2.52867	4	0.640
Civil Status	0.15562	2	0.925
Academic Rank	7.19281	3	0.066
Years of Teaching	4.41065	4	0.353
Educational Attainment	9.064*	3	0.028
Average Monthly Income	1.683	2	0.431

Note: *difference is significant when $p \leq 0.05$

Table 8B. Post hoc Test for Educational Attainment

Educational Attainment	Test Statistic	Adj. p-value
Bachelor-Master	-51.28	0.327
Bachelor-Doctorate	-54.074	0.274
Bachelor-Post	-113.194*	0.016
Master-Doctorate	-2.794	1.000
Master-Post	-61.914	0.168
Doctorate-Post	-59.12	0.231

Difference in the Extent of Faculty Motivation for Internalization according to Demographics

Mann Whitney test was used in table 9 to show the difference in the extent of faculty motivation for internalization when respondents are grouped according to sex and school type. Results show that there is no significant difference in the extent of faculty motivation according to sex [$U=8706.500$, $p=0.892$] and school type [$H=3086.000$, $p=0.138$].

Male and female faculty show similar motivation for internationalization activities (Li et al., 2021). Therefore, efforts to increase motivation do not need to be based on sex. Likewise, the type of institution does not significantly affect faculty motivation to participate in internationalization activities (Salahi & Smith, 2022). Policy and administrative support for faculty motivation to internationalize should apply equally across all school types.

Table 9. Difference in the Extent of Faculty Motivation for Internalization according to Sex and School Type

Variable	U	z	p
Sex	8706.500	-0.1361	0.892
School Type	3086.000	-1.4819	0.138

Note: difference is significant when $p \leq 0.05$

Kruskal Wallis test was used in table 10 to show the difference in the extent of faculty motivation for internalization when respondents are grouped according to age, civil status, academic rank, years of experience, educational attainment, and average monthly income. Results show that there is no significant difference in the extent of faculty motivation according to age [$H=1.75583$, $p=0.781$], civil status [$H=0.00341$, $p=0.998$], academic rank [$H=6.92836$, $p=0.074$], years of teaching [$H=4.7976$, $p=0.309$], educational attainment [$H=3.674$, $p=0.299$], and average monthly income [$H=0.882$, $p=0.643$].

Younger and older faculty show similar motivation. Internationalization engagement is consistent across age groups (Calikoglu et al., 2022). Thus, institutions need not create age-specific motivation strategies. Also, members' motivation for internationalization appears unchanged across single, married, and other civil statuses (Li et al., 2021). Therefore, schools do not need to adjust their plans or programs based on civil status. Instead, focus on other factors that may influence motivation, such as professional development, institutional support, or workload.

Internationalization efforts can be applied equally to all academic ranks, without needing special motivational strategies for different ranks. However, it is still important to watch for any small differences that future research might find, for as faculty move from instructor or lecturer roles to assistant, associate, and full professor positions, their motivations can shift. Studies suggest that academic rank affects both intrinsic motivations, like professional fulfillment and scholarly achievement, and extrinsic motivation, such as promotion, prestige, and rewards (Niloofer et al., 2020).

Efforts to boost faculty motivation for internationalization need not to depend on teaching experience. Institutions can use a unified approach for programs, incentives, and training. Other factors, such as institutional support, access to international opportunities, or professional development, may have a greater impact on motivation than years of teaching (Li et al., 2021).

Similarly, Stupnisky and Salahuddin (2025) noted that encouraging interventions, recognition, and a positive institutional environment enhance faculty motivation more than academic credentials.

Finally, Li et al. (2021) found that faculty involvement in internationalization is primarily shaped by institutional policies, organizational support, professional goals, and personal beliefs, rather than financial rewards. Likewise, personal and professional aspirations are more reliable predictors of faculty engagement in internationalization than external or monetary factors.

Table 10. Difference in the Extent of Faculty Motivation for Internalization according to Age, Civil Status, Academic Rank, Years of Experience, Educational Attainment, and Average Monthly Income

Variable	H	df	p
Age	1.75583	4	0.781
Civil Status	0.00341	2	0.998
Academic Rank	6.92836	3	0.074
Years of Teaching	4.7976	4	0.309
Educational Attainment	3.674	3	0.299
Average Monthly Income	0.882	2	0.643

Note: difference is significant when $p \leq 0.05$

Relationship between the Extents of Faculty Cognizance, Capacity, and Motivation for Internalization

Spearman rank correlation was used in table 11 to show the relationships between the extents of faculty cognizance, capacity, and motivation for internalization. There are strong positive correlations between faculty cognizance and capacity [$r=0.720$, $p=0.000$], cognizance and motivation [$r=0.671$, $p=0.000$], and capacity and motivation [$r=0.719$, $p=0.000$].

When faculty are more aware of and engaged in internationalization, they tend to possess stronger skills and competencies needed to implement internationalization initiatives (Li et al., 2021). This evidence suggests that policymakers and administrators can strengthen faculty capacity by investing in targeted awareness-building activities. Those initiatives provide the foundation for

developing the knowledge, confidence, and competencies required for effective internationalization (Mittelmeier et al., 2024). This finding supports the study of Hsu (2025), who reported that faculty members with a better understanding of internationalization are more likely to actively engage in initiatives and develop the competencies needed to implement them effectively.

Results also suggest that greater faculty awareness of internationalization is associated with greater motivation to engage in or support related activities (Li et al., 2021). However, the relationship is not strong enough for cognizance to fully account for motivation. This indicates that awareness is an important prerequisite for faculty engagement, while motivation is also influenced by other institutional and circumstantial factors. Enhancing faculty awareness through training, seminars, international exposure, and continuous dissemination of internationalization policies and opportunities may help strengthen motivation to participate in internationalization initiatives (Yongxin & Mustapha, 2025). Nevertheless, because the relationship is only moderate, higher education institutions should also provide institutional support, leadership, incentives, workload adjustments, and professional development opportunities to sustain faculty engagement.

Finally, faculty members with greater skills, competencies, and training are more motivated to pursue internationalization, suggesting that capacity and motivation increase concurrently rather than independently (Ji et al., 2026).

Improvements in faculty capacity may increase motivation for internationalization (Ji et al., 2026). Investment in professional development and training can therefore enhance motivation and engagement in internationalization initiatives (Li et al., 2021). These results suggest that enhancing faculty capacity increases both ability and motivation (Ji et al., 2026). This stresses the importance of robust institutional support systems for internationalization (Jiewei et al., 2026).

Table 11. Relationships between Extents of Faculty Cognizance, Capacity, and Motivation for Internalization

Variable	r	df	p
Faculty Cognizance x Faculty Capacity	0.720*	267	0.000
Faculty Cognizance x Faculty Motivation	0.671*	267	0.000
Faculty Capacity x Faculty Motivation	0.719*	267	0.000

*Note: *correlation is significant when $p \leq 0.05$*

CONCLUSION

From the above findings, it can be concluded that faculty members consistently have high cognizance for internalization across all demographic and professional groups, indicating that age, sex, civil status, school type, academic rank, years of teaching, educational attainment, and average monthly income do not substantially affect faculty members' awareness and understanding of internationalization. In addition, faculty members tend to show strong ability to support internationalization, regardless of age, sex, civil status, school type, academic rank, teaching experience, or monthly income. The main difference is in educational attainment: those working toward postgraduate degrees have a very high capacity, while faculty with only a bachelor's degree have a moderate capacity. This suggests that advanced education helps strengthen faculty capacity for internationalization. Lastly, faculty members show strong motivation for internationalization, with high ratings for both internal and external factors. They are driven by personal reasons such as professional growth, satisfaction, and dedication to teaching, as well as by institutional support, recognition, and career opportunities. This indicates a strong overall readiness to participate in internationalization efforts.

REFERENCES

- 1) Alharthi, F. B. (2026). The Double-Edged Sword of Laissez-Faire Leadership: How Gender and Trust Shape Faculty Motivation. *Acta Psychologica*, 263, 106285. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2026.106285>
- 2) Altbach, P. G., & de Wit, H. (2020). COVID-19: The Internationalization Revolution that Isn't. *International Higher Education* (102), 8–10. <https://ejournals.bc.edu/index.php/ihe/article/view/14603>
- 3) Amakiri, E. I., Abubakar, R. M., & Jada, H. M. (2025). Assessing the Understanding of Mapua Community on Internationalization of Higher education. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, IX(VII), 1071–1082. <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2025.90700087>
- 4) Baumbach, A. J. (2025). Gender and Family Differences in Faculty Motivation. [Doctoral Dissertation, University of North Dakota]. UND Scholarly Commons. <https://commons.und.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=8035&context=theses>
- 5) Becker, G. S. (1964). *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- 6) Bendol, H. (2026). Experiences and challenges of faculty members on the professional development in higher education institutions. *International Journal of Education, Research, and Innovation Perspectives*, 2 (3). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19235267>
- 7) Bureau, J. S., Howard, J. L., Chong, J. X. Y., & Guay, F. (2021). Pathways to Student Motivation: A Meta-Analysis of Antecedents of Autonomous and Controlled Motivations. *Review of Educational Research*, 92(1), 46–72. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543211042426>
- 8) Calikoglu, A., Lee, J. J., & Arslan, H. (2020). Faculty International Engagement: Examining Rationales, Strategies, and Barriers in Institutional settings. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 26(1), 61–79. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315320963508>
- 9) Calizar, B. G. (2026). Motivation and Demotivation on Teachers' Performance in Senior High School, Division of Olongapo City, Philippines. *International Journal of Research in Interdisciplinary Studies*, 4(6), 62–68. <https://doi.org/10.65138/ijris.2026.v4i6.317>
- 10) Castulo, N. J., De Vera, J. L., Buenaventura, M. L., Sebial, S. C. L., Del Rosario Aquino, J. M., Bua-Ay, B. O., Hibanada, R. R., Raguindin, P. Z. J., Bedural, Z., Geronimo, R. R., Quismundo, L. B., Batulat, E. T., & Zanoria, I. O. B. (2026). Developing a Gender Equity, Diversity, and Inclusivity (GEDI)-Responsive Curriculum framework for Philippine higher education: a qualitative case study of faculty perspectives. *Frontiers in Sociology*, 10, 1672056. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2025.1672056>
- 11) Commission on Higher Education. (2002, January 17). CHED Memorandum Order No. 03, s. 2001: Revised implementing rules and regulations (IRR) for Republic Act No. 8292, otherwise known as “An Act Providing for the Uniform Composition and Powers of the Governing Boards, the Manner of Appointment and Term of Office of the President of Chartered State Universities, and Colleges, and for Other Purposes”. Supreme Court E-Library. <https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/10/43279>
- 12) Commission on Higher Education. (2016). CMO No. 55, s. 2016: Policy Framework and Strategies on the Internationalization of Philippine Higher Education. <https://cmscdn.e.gov.ph/CHED/pdf/2016-CMO-NO55.pdf>
- 13) Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2022). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- 14) Culp-Roche, A., Hampton, D., Hensley, A., Wilson, J., Thaxton-Wiggins, A., Otts, J. A., Fruh, S., & Moser, D. K. (2020). Generational differences in faculty and student comfort

- with technology use. *SAGE Open Nursing*, 6, 2377960820941394. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2377960820941394>
- 15) Daumiller, M., Stupnisky, R., & Janke, S. (2020). Motivation of Higher Education Faculty: Theoretical Approaches, Empirical Evidence, and Future Directions. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 99, 101502. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2019.101502>
 - 16) de Wit, H., Hunter, F., Howard, L., & Egron-Polak, E. (2020). The Impact of COVID-19 on the Internationalization of Higher Education: Emerging Findings and Directions for Research. *Studies in Higher Education*, 45(7), 1521–1525.
 - 17) De Witte, K., & Soncin, M. (2021). Do International Classes Pay Off? A Cost-Benefit Analysis of the Internationalisation of Higher Education in Flanders. *Higher Education*, 82(3), 459–476. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-021-00737-0>
 - 18) Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior*. Plenum Press.
 - 19) Deci, E. L., Connell, J. P., & Ryan, R. M. (1989). Self-Determination in a work organization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(4), 580–590. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.74.4.580>
 - 20) Denson, N., & Szelényi, K. (2020). Faculty Perceptions of Work-Life Balance: The Role of Marital/Relationship and Family Status. *Higher Education*, 83(2), 261–278. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00654-8>
 - 21) Eckhaus, E., & Davidovitch, N. (2020). Academic Rank and Position Effect on Academic Research Output – A Case Study of Ariel University. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 10(1), 295. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v10n1p295>
 - 22) Faria, J., Mixon, F., & Sawyer, W. (2023). Human Capital, Networks and Segmentation in the Market for Academic Economists. *Economies*, 11(6), 165. <https://doi.org/10.3390/economies11060165>
 - 23) Fox, M., & Gaughan, M. (2021). Gender, Family and Caregiving Leave, and Advancement in Academic Science: Effects Across the Life Course. *Sustainability*, 13(12), 6820. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13126820>
 - 24) Hanley, N., & Chankseiani, M. (2025). Intercultural Competence Beyond International Student Mobility: Insights from a Global Study. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 30(2), 167–184. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10283153251364515>
 - 25) Hur, G., Roberts, T. G., Diehl, D. C., Bunch, J. B., & Diaz, J. (2025). An Outcome Evaluation of the Faculty Instructional Development Program: Its impact on Teacher Self-Efficacy and teaching Approaches. *SAGE Open*, 15(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251385764>
 - 26) Ilieva, R., Beck, K., & Waterstone, B. (2020). Rethinking the Roles of Faculty in the internationalization of higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 39(4), 749–763. International Association of Universities. (2015). *Internationalization*. <https://iau.global/internationalization>
 - 27) Ji, Q., Mydin, F., & Azman, N. (2026). Barriers to Faculty Engagement in Curriculum Internationalization: A Mixed-Methods Study of Chinese-Foreign Joint Education. *International Journal of Chinese Education*, 15(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2212585x261421689>
 - 28) Jiewei, W., Kurniady, D. A., Komariah, A., Sururi, Nugraha, R. S., Ruhimat, M. D. C., & Shuhua, Z. (2026). How Can Higher Education Enhance Social Adaptation and Minimize Struggles among International Students? *Journal of International Students*, 16(13), 145-170. <https://doi.org/10.32674/pwmhxa88>

- 29) Kayingo, G., Kibe, L., Venzon, A., Gordes, K. L., & Cawley, J. F. (2022). Assessing Demand for Doctoral-Prepared PA Faculty: a five-year longitudinal study. *BMC Medical Education*, 22(1), 331. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-022-03375-x>
- 30) Knight, J. (2020). The Internationalization of Higher Education Scrutinized: International Program and Provider Mobility. *Sociologias*, 22(54), 176–199. <https://doi.org/10.1590/15174522-97865>
- 31) Kohan, M., Changiz, T., & Yamani, N. (2023). A Systematic Review of Faculty Development Programs Based on the Harden Teacher's Role Framework Model. *BMC Medical Education*, 23(1), 910. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-023-04863-4>
- 32) Krishanachinda S. (2020). The Structural Equation Modeling of Human Resource Development Affecting Internationalization of Private Schools. *The Southeast Asian Conference on Education 2020: Official Conference Proceedings* (pp. 167-180) <https://papers.iafor.org/submission55376/>
- 33) Kwiek, M., & Roszka, W. (2020). Gender Disparities in International Research Collaboration: A Study of 25,000 University Professors. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 35(5), 1344–1380. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joes.12395>
- 34) Leal, F. (2021). Faculty Perceptions of Internationalization in Higher Education: A comparative study. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 35(4), 783–796.
- 35) Leal, L. M. (2021). Faculty Readiness and the Internationalization of Higher Education: Awareness, skills, and motivation. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 25(2), 238–254.
- 36) Li, H., & Khattak, S. I. (2023). Towards a Parsimonious Model of Faculty Motivation, Engagement, and Work Performance: A Case Study of a Chinese University. *Work*, 75(3), 899–915. <https://doi.org/10.3233/wor-211394>
- 37) Li, H., Khattak, S. I., & Jiang, Q. (2021). A Qualitative Assessment of the Determinants of Faculty Engagement in Internationalization: A Chinese Perspective. *SAGE Open*, 11(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211046935>
- 38) Liu, C., Zhou, J., Wen, W., Liu, F., Ji, L., & Zhang, C. (2025). The Effect of the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership on Taiwan's Global Value Chain of the Electronic Information Industry. *Sustainability*, 17(1), 281. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17010281>
- 39) Lucero, H., Victoriano, J., Carpio, J., & Fernando, P. J. (2020). Assessment of E-Learning Readiness of Faculty Members and Students in the Government and Private Higher Education Institutions in the Philippines. *International Journal of Computing Sciences Research*, 5(1), 398–406. <https://doi.org/10.25147/ijcsr.2017.001.1.48>
- 40) Ma, D. (2022). The Role of Motivation and Commitment in Teachers' Professional Identity. *Frontiers in Psychology* 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.910747>
- 41) Mananay, J. A., Sanchez, J. M. P., Boholano, H. B., & Beltran, N. Y. (2024). Patterns and Pathways: Teachers' Perceptions, Readiness, Support, and Barriers to Internationalization in higher education. *International Journal of Learning Teaching and Educational Research*, 23(9), 401–431. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.23.9.21>
- 42) Marinoni, G. & Pina-Cardona, S. B. (2024). Internationalization of Higher Education: Current Trends and Future Scenarios. *International Association of Universities*. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.14764.32649>
- 43) Martin, A., Mori, J., & Froehlich, D. E. (2023). Career Development of Early Career Researchers via Distributed Peer Mentoring Networks. *Merits*, 3(3), 569–582. <https://doi.org/10.3390/merits3030034>
- 44) Martínez-Ramón, J. P., Morales-Rodríguez, F. M., Ruiz-Esteban, C., & Méndez, I. (2022). Self-Esteem at University: Proposal of an Artificial Neural Network based on Resilience,

- Stress, and Sociodemographic Variables. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 815853. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.815853>
- 45) Mittelmeier, J., Lomer, S., Al-Furqani, S., & Huang, D. (2024). Developing Meaningful Internationalization that Impacts Students' Outcomes in Higher Education: A Scoping Review of the Literature 2011–2022. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 28(4), 503–525. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10283153231222278>
 - 46) Moshtari, M., & Safarpour, A. (2023). Challenges and Strategies for the Internationalization of Higher Education in Low-Income East African Countries. *Higher Education*, 87(1), 89–109. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-023-00994-1>
 - 47) NAFSA (2026). NAFSA Executive Internationalization Leadership e-Institute 2026-27. <https://www.nafsa.org/events/nafsa-executive-internationalization-leadership-einstitute-2026-27>
 - 48) Niloofar, N. A., Theodore, K., & Miriam, C. (2020). Examining Motivation Theory in Higher Education among Tenured and Non-Tenured Faculty: Scholarly Activity and Academic Rank. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 12(2), 77–100. <https://doi.org/10.5897/ijeaps2020.0644>
 - 49) Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2021). Internationalization and the Future of Higher Education. OECD Publishing.
 - 50) Salahi, L., & Smith, C. (2022). Supporting Local News Ecosystems: Faculty Motivations in Maintaining News-Academic Partnerships. *Teaching Journalism & Mass Communication*, 12(2), 51-60. <https://aejmc.us/spig/wp-content/uploads/sites/9/2022/12/TMJC-12.2-Salahi-Smith-2.pdf>
 - 51) Salahuddin, M., Herbert, M. J., & Stupnisky, R. H. (2026). Research and Technological Competencies Predicting Faculty Success. *Industry and Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09504222261436507>
 - 52) Salajegheh, M., Sandars, J., Mirzazadeh, A., & Gandomkar, R. (2024). Understanding the Capacity Development of Faculty Development Programs: A Sequential Explanatory Mixed Methods study. *BMC Medical Education*, 24(1), 744. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-024-05715-5>
 - 53) Sameephet, B., Heebkaew, N., Boonnithi, N., Neera, K.-O., & Panna, S. (2025). A Systematic Review of English Medium Instruction in East Asia: Challenges and Implications. *rEFlections*, 32(2), 1165–1187. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1482862.pdf> ERIC
 - 54) Sandra, A., MA. (2024). Faculty Members' Perspective on the Internationalization of Higher Education in Taiwan. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 26(2), 277–290. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-024-10016-z>
 - 55) Sandström, A.-M., & Weimer, L. (2022). Internationalization of Higher Education: Institutional Strategies and Faculty Engagement. *Higher Education Policy*, 35(1), 45–62.
 - 56) State University of Northern Negros. (2025, September 4). State University of Northern Negros Strengthens Global Ties with INTI through MOU Signing. State University of Northern Negros. <https://sunn.edu.ph/sunn-inti-mou-signing-2025/>
 - 57) Stratford, E., Watson, P., & Paull, B. (2023). What Impedes and Enables Flourishing among Early Career Academics? *Higher Education*, 88(1), 259–277. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-023-01115-8>
 - 58) Stupnisky, R. H., & Salahuddin, M. (2025). Motivation is Important, but can It Be Improved? Examining Faculty Perceptions of Research Motivation and Productivity Interventions. *Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-025-01546-5>

- 59) Suleiman, A. D., Tang, Y., & Hou, D. (2025). Factors Impacting Faculty Adoption of Project-Based Learning in Computing Education: a Survey. ArXiv.org. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2507.18039>
- 60) Tamtik, M. (2022). Selling Out the Public University? Administrative Sensemaking Strategies for Internationalization via Private Pathway Colleges in Canadian Higher Education. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 28(2), 296–313. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10283153221137687>
- 61) Tripodi, G., Zheng, X., Qian, Y., Murray, D., Jones, B. F., Ni, C., & Wang, D. (2024). Tenure and Research Trajectories. arXiv (Cornell University). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2411.10575>
- 62) United Nations. (2020). The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2020. United Nations. <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/report/2020/The-sustainable-Development-Goals-Report-2020.pdf>
- 63) Van Mol, C., & Perez-Encinas, A. (2022). Inclusive Internationalization: Do Different (social) groups of students need different internationalization Activities? *Studies in Higher Education*, 47(12), 2523–2538. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2022.2083102>
- 64) Verbyla, M. E., Vernaza-Hernandez, V. & Feldman, A. (2023). International Research Experiences and Global Competency Development for Graduate Students in Engineering and Science. *International Journal of Engineering Education* 28(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/10283153231172019>
- 65) Vu, T., Magis-Weinberg, L., Jansen, B. R. J., Van Atteveldt, N., Janssen, T. W. P., Lee, N.C., Van Der Maas, H. L. J., Raijmakers, M. E. J., Sachisthal, M. S. M., & Meeter, M. (2021). Motivation-Achievement Cycles in Learning: a Literature Review and Research Agenda. *Educational Psychology Review*, 34(1), 39–71. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-021-09616-7>
- 66) Watanabe, M. (2024). Gender Inequality in International Research Engagement Amid Transformation to Global and Neoliberal Academia: The Case of Japan. *Gender Work and Organization*, 32(5), 1812–1822. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.13224>
- 67) Wilkesmann, U., & Vorberg, R. (2021). The Influence of Relatedness and Organizational Resources on Teaching Motivation in Continuing Higher Education. *ZeitschriftFürWeiterbildungsforschung*, 44(3), 263–284. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40955-021-00186-3>
- 68) Yongxin, L., & Mustapha, S. M. (2025). What Drives Faculty Engagement in Higher Education Internationalization? A Systematic Review of Concepts, Predictors, Mechanisms, and Contexts. *International Journal of Social Science and Education Research Studies*, 05(12). <https://doi.org/10.55677/ijssers/v05i12y2025-11>