Facilitating México-US Higher Education Collaboration: Perspectives of U. S. Border Academics

Eduardo Arellano[1]

[1] Dr. Eduardo Arellano, profesor de departamento de la Dirección Educacional y de Desarrollo en la Universidad del Estado de Nuevo México, Estados Unidos.
Correo: edarella@nmsu.edu

Introduction

In the summer of 2001, a study was conducted to explore whether a set of personal and institutional characteristics facilitate collaboration between Mexican and U. S. Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs). Higher education collaboration takes many forms including joint research projects, degree programs, and development of courses and programs. Collaboration also includes distance education programs, multinational student cohort-based programs, and faculty and student exchanges. Other types of collaboration include shared faculty appointments, placement services, and joint development and technical assistance programs (Ganster, 1997: 1-10; Klasek, 1992: 108-128; León-García, Matthews, & Smith, 1999; Santillánez, 1995). It was important to investigate the existence of a set of personal and institutional characteristics that facilitate collaboration between Mexican and U. S. IHEs since the number and importance of these efforts has increased since the ratification of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) in 1994, especially in the México-US border region (Gill & Álvarez de Testa, 1995; León-García, Matthews, & Smith, 1999; Ponton, Ganster, León-García, & Marmolejo, 1997; Weintraub, 1994). The study was also needed because without knowing whether there were personal and institutional characteristics that facilitate collaboration, the efforts would likely be ineffective if occurring at all. This paper provides some background relevant to higher education collaboration, the methodology used in the study, and its results. The paper then concludes with some recommendations based on the study.

Background on Collaboration

NAFTA as a Catalyst of Collaboration

NAFTA is a treaty between Canadá, México, and the United States to integrate their economies (Browne, Sims, & Barry, 1994; Raat, 1996). However, NAFTA has become more than an economic agreement given that increased social, cultural, and political

integration has also occurred since discussions of NAFTA first began (Browne, Sims, & Barry, 1994). Integration has been evident in increased collaboration between Mexican and U. S. businesses, governments, non-profit organizations, and IHEs (De la Garza & Velasco, 1997). In business for example, the US-México Chamber of Commerce sponsored the "Good Neighbor" program in which Mexican and U. S. business college students participate in an internship exchange. This program was started in 1995 and primarily benefits business college students near the border (Marmolejo & León, 2000). In government, the Mexican and U. S. governments created the US-México Binational Commission that addresses a wide variety of border issues such as business, cultural and educational exchange, the environment, infrastructure, law enforcement, and public safety. Accomplishments by the commission include the construction of international bridges and sewage treatment plants, formal information exchange between law enforcement agencies, technical assistance programs, amending treaties to protect endangered species and establishing binational parks and protected lands (U. S. State Department, 1997). In the non-profit sector, Mexican and U. S. health, social action, human rights, and environmental groups have collaborated widely and effectively according to De la Garza & Velasco (1997). One example is the US-México Border Philanthropy Partnership (BPP) which is a "cross-border, binational collaboration of a group of funders and group of community foundations" whose mission is to "improve the quality of life of low-income communities along the U. S.-México border" (2007). The BPP fulfills its mission by strengthening community foundations and promoting philanthropy in the border region. From its inception in 2002 to now, 22 border community foundations, 12 regional, national, and international funders, and the Synergos Institute have formed the partnership. Together, they have mobilized $15 million dollars to strengthen border community foundations and over $3 million in local philanthropy for border communities. The partners have also created a network centered on peer learning to leverage more funds. In addition, the BPP has established six foundations in border com-

munities that previously did not have one and they have improved the capacity of 13 foundations to serve their respective communities (2007).

Lastly, Mexican and U. S. IHEs have collaborated in a variety of ways as mentioned above. Examples include the Border Partners for Action (Border PACT) which in 1999 began providing financial support to collaborative efforts along the border in many areas including health, immigration, special education, and water, among others (Consortium of North American Higher Education Collaboration, 2000: 2). Other examples include the partnership between the University of Arizona in Tucson, Arizona and the University of Sonora in Hermosillo, Sonora to provide health education to residents on both sides of the border (Rubin, 1997: A52). Also in the area of health, the University of California in San Diego, California; the San Diego Community College District also in San Diego; the Autonomous University of Baja California in Tijuana, Baja California; the Universidad IberoAmericana (Iberian-American University) also in Tijuana, and government agencies and private groups on both sides of the border developed the "Integrated Cross-Border Healthcare Education and Leadership Network." The goal of the network was to develop a program to improve the quality of health care in the San Diego/Northern Baja California region (Robson, 2001). Another example was a partnership between the San Diego Community College District in San Diego, California, and the Tijuana area technical schools in Tijuana, Baja California in which the San Diego Community College District trained Mexican instructors in mechanics, fire fighting, and police protection (Rubin, 1997: A52). Yet, another example is the collaborative effort between the Maricopa Community College District in Tucson, Arizona, and the University of Veracruz in Jalapa, Veracruz. These two institutions collaborated in small business development and disease prevention (Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development, 2000). Yet, another example was the US-México Teacher Exchange Program at the University of Texas at El Paso in El Paso, Texas. This program paired school districts from both sides of the US-México border and provided training

in technology and teaching strategies, arranged site visits, and sponsored information exchange forums (Canales, Gómez, & Villanueva, 1995). Collaboration between México and the US has had important impacts on both countries including a greater interdependence between border communities, sharing of resources, and improved relations (Herzog, 1995: 176-189). Aside from NAFTA, there are several reasons why Mexican and U. S. IHEs collaborate.

Rationale for Collaboration

There are general reasons why IHEs collaborate internationally, and there are specific reasons why Mexican and U. S. IHEs collaborate. In general, IHEs collaborate to increase mutual understanding and cooperation between nations through knowledge of different countries and the ability to communicate in other languages (Overton, 1992: 164-176). IHEs also collaborate to reduce ethnocentrism, make cultural research more applicable, and increase discussions about culture (Brislin, 1993). In fact, according to the most recent data available, over 200,000 U. S. college students studied abroad in academic year 2004/2005 (Institute of International Education, 2006).

Mexican and U. S. IHEs share some reasons for collaboration and there are reasons that are specific to each nation. Some of the reasons why Mexican and U. S. IHEs collaborate are because they face some of the same issues such as autonomy and accountability, individual and community needs and benefits, quality and access, and competition for limited resources (Gill & Álvarez de Testa, 1995). Another shared reason is to work towards academic integration which calls for "improving student employability, strengthening the curriculum, and adding value to the academic experience" (León-García, Matthews, & Smith, 1999: 8).

For Mexican IHEs, collaboration translates into improvements to the educational system, which is vital for México's economic potential (Crane, 1997: 26-30; De los Reyes, 1997: 96-104; Statland de López, 1996: A39). Improvements to the Mexican educational system are especially critical given that Mexican IHEs have had to respond rapidly to México's industries' globalization and modernization. The globa-

lization of México's industries in turn has compelled Mexican IHEs to prepare their students for a multicultural and multilingual work environment (Statland de López, 1996: A39). Mexican IHEs have also sought collaboration to provide doctoral training for their faculties (León-García, Matthews, & Smith, 1999) because as of 1999 only 11% of their full-time faculties had doctoral degrees (Asociación Nacional de Universidades e Instituciones de Educación Superior, **2000**) compared to 60% of U. S. faculties (National Council of Educational Statistics, 2004).

U. S. IHEs collaborate with Mexican IHEs and with other IHEs as a way of sharing limited resources and simultaneously decreasing their dependence on federal and state funding, which is critical given that public funding for higher education has been restricted and unpredictable (Heller, 2001). Furthermore, U. S. higher education has faced greater competition for funds from other services (Zusman, 1999: 109-148). For example, from 1986-1987 to 1996-1997, while the national average change in share of state budgets for higher education decreased 13.8%, it increased 96.1% for Medicaid and 26.7% for corrections (Mumper in Heller, 2001: 39). A host of other challenges exist to collaboration.

Challenges to Collaboration

While there is a need for México-US higher education collaboration, there are also many challenges. One of those challenges is the marked differences between the Mexican and U. S. higher education systems (Klasek, 1992: 108-128; Smuckler, 1993: 167-178). Evidence of such differences includes the facts that the US has had significantly more institutions, students and faculty (Levin, 1998). According to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, the US had over 4,000 institutions as of Fall 2004, while México had just over 2,000 in the 2005-2006 academic year (Secretaría de Educación Pública, 2007). And, while the US had 17 million college students in the Fall of 2004 (Knapp, Kelly-Reid, & Whitmore, 2006), México had nearly 2.5 million in academic year 2005-2006 (Secretaría de Educación Pública, **2005-2006**). Another difference is that Mexican higher edu-

cation curricula are more focused toward professions as opposed to the U. S. curricula which generally incorporates some liberal arts to its professional curricula. Yet another difference is that while U. S. higher education is generally under the jurisdiction of individual states, Mexican higher education is greatly influenced by its national government through funding (Marmolejo & León-García, 1997: 17-30). It should be noted that Mexican higher education offers very little in terms of two-year degree programs (Marmolejo & León-García, 2000). Aside from the differences between the two systems, the list of additional challenges is long: lack of financial support because of other institutional and societal priorities in both countries (Smuckler, 1993: 167-178); language barriers (León-García, Matthews, & Smith, 1999); lack of incentives for faculty members to initiate binational collaboration (Carter, 1992: 39-51); and the reliance on individual faculty members and departments rather than involving a broad base of support, which would include administrators and community members (Smuckler, 1993: 167-178). In 1997, Bosworth, Collins, and Lustig (1997) also noted that some Mexican and U. S. citizens are highly nationalistic and have little interest in integration beyond economic integration. The above challenges pose the question of the prospects of collaboration.

Improving Prospects for Collaboration

Some literature suggests how the prospects of collaboration can be improved. One recommendation is for IHEs to include cross-cultural competence as a criterion for hiring, tenure, and promotion (Carter, 1992: 39-51). Cross-cultural competence is "the ability to think, feel, and act in ways that acknowledge, respect, and build upon ethnic, sociocultural, and linguistic diversity" (Lynch and Hanson, 1998). Canales, Gómez, and Villanueva (1995) asserted that an understanding of the educational systems of México and the US and the linkages within and between them is essential for effective collaboration. Other authors argued that knowledge of the structures of Mexican and U. S. higher education systems must exist, and collaboration partners should have knowledge of the major issues important to the Mexican and U.

S. educational systems (Ewell & Kent, 1995; Gill & Álvarez de Testa, 1995). Deresky (1997) pointed to several personal and institutional characteristics to enhance binational collaboration such as effective conflict resolution, patience, adaptability, flexibility, cultural awareness, strong personal relationships, and political awareness across nations. Although, the previously mentioned authors suggested characteristics that would facilitate international higher education collaboration, none had been tested in the field with the academics involved in these efforts. To address this gap in the research, the following methods were used in the current study.

Methodology

Delimitations

The study included a number of key delimitations. First, it focused on collaboration between México and the US, specifically those in the border region. Although, there are different ideas as to what is considered the México-US border region, for the purpose of the study, it was defined as the geographic area encompassing the six Mexican states of Baja California, Chihuahua, Coahuila, Nuevo León, Sonora, and Tamaulipas and the four U. S. states of Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas (Raat, 1996). Second, although academics on both sides of the border are equally important to successful partnerships, the study centered on U. S. border academics due to limited resources and time constraints. Again, for the purpose of the study, academics were defined as higher education faculty and administrators. Third, the study was concentrated solely on academics at public universities due the very different natures between public and private universities. The study focused on universities without including community colleges due to their very dissimilar missions. Fourth, a personal characteristic was defined as one that a person participating in a collaborative effort possesses. An example of a personal characteristic was an individual's fluency in English and Spanish or his or her personal understanding of a certain issue. Lastly, an institutional characteristic was defined as one that involved two or more people or elements of an

IHE. An example of an institutional characteristic would be structural characteristics of collaboration or upper administration's involvement in a collaborative effort.

Research Design

A questionnaire was developed guided by literature on México-US and North American higher education collaboration, and international education. A group of six U. S. border academics at public border universities, who had experience and had written about México-US collaboration, were asked to provide feedback on the questionnaire to ensure face validity. These experts were identified during the literature review of the study. They were researchers, administrators, faculty, and consultants in higher education, especially international education. Besides their knowledge on the topic of the study, the experts also came with backgrounds in higher education and business administration, cross-cultural communication, and bilingual education, among others. Some of the experts had also worked with Mexican governmental agencies and non-profit organizations.

The questionnaire was designed to find personal and institutional characteristics that facilitate México-US collaboration. The statements in the questionnaire reflected the personal and institutional characteristics that served as the dependent variables for the analysis. The questionnaire was made available through the Internet and U. S. mail. Potential participants without an electronic mail address were sent a questionnaire via U. S. mail. Of the 243 academics that were invited, 107 or 44% of them participated in the study. Texas was the U. S. border state with the greatest participation in the study with 36%, followed by California with 27%, Arizona with 21%, and New Mexico with 16%.

The study's population was public university academics who worked in the U. S. border states and had participated in a collaborative effort with a Mexican IHE between 1996 and 2001. Potential participants were obtained from the directories of the Association of International Education Administrators, the Association of International Educators, and the Consortium for North American Higher Educa-

tion Collaboration. It was necessary to use these directories because at the time of the study there was no inventory of México-US higher education collaborative efforts or a directory of their participants (Marmolejo & León-García, 2000).

Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used to treat the study's data. Descriptive statistics were used to categorize and summarize the data (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 1994) as well as to present the profile of the study's participants. Frequency distributions were the descriptive statistics that were used. The *t*-test was the inferential statistic that was used to test whether the hypothesized personal or institutional characteristics could be generalized to the study's population (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 1994). An alpha level of .05 was set for all *t*-tests. While the methodology may be perceived as simple, the research was inevitably exploratory in nature given that no empirical research was found on the particular focus of the study, therefore one could not assume that seemingly obvious characteristics such as English-Spanish bilingualism would be supported by U. S. border academics involved in collaboration with Mexican IHEs.

Results

Background Information

As mentioned previously, different demographic data of the participants was solicited to provide a profile of the participants. The majority of the participants were Anglo (65%), over 30% were Hispanic, and less than 5% identified with another ethnic or racial background. Approximately 40% of the participants indicated that they spoke and read Spanish fluently, but only 30% indicated that they wrote Spanish fluently. The majority of the participants (58%) lived less than 200 miles away from the México-US border while the remaining (42%) lived over 200 miles away.

Over 64% of the participants had five or more years of experience collaborating with Mexican IHEs. The top four types of collaboration that participants had experience with included student exchanges, faculty exchanges, joint research projects, and joint academic cour-

se offerings. Participants were able to choose more than one type of collaboration, and many had experience in more than one type. Fifty percent of the participants had collaborated in the academic areas of science, math, engineering or technology, while education, health, and human services were the next most chosen areas of collaboration.

Personal and Institutional Characteristics

Participants were asked to rate the level of importance they attached to the hypothesized personal and institutional characteristics. Table 1 below shows which characteristics were statistically significant and those that were not. Statistical significance, as given by the *t*-test in Table 1, meant two things: (a) the sample population believed the characteristic to be important to collaboration with Mexican IHEs, and (b) the results from the sample were statistically representative of the hypothesized population.

Table 1. Perspectives on Personal and Institutional Characteristics

Personal Characteristics	Statistically Significant
Being proficient in English & Spanish	Yes
Being able to resolve conflicts effectively	Yes
Understanding the structure of the Mexican higher education system	Yes
Understanding the major issues of the Mexican higher education system	Yes
Understanding the Mexican political system and how it affects its higher education system	No
Understanding and respecting the Mexican culture	Yes
Understanding institutional policies regarding international education collaborative efforts	Yes
Knowledge of various funding sources for international education collaborative efforts	Yes
Being in continuous contact with Mexican colleagues during a collaborative effort	Yes
Using the latest technology (Internet, e-mail, etc.)	Yes

Table 1. Perspectives on Personal and Institutional Characteristics

Institutional Characteristics	Statistically Significant
Having a collaborative effort in which the participants frequently visit each other's institutions	Yes
Having a collaborative effort in which the chief executive officers of the participating institutions are personally committed	Yes
Having a collaborative effort in which the participants share common goals	Yes
Having a collaborative effort that is continually evaluated and modified by its participants	Yes
Institutions and participants making a multi-year commitment to a collaborative effort	Yes
Having a collaborative effort that involves many people	No
Having collaborative efforts that are mutually beneficial to institutions and participants	Yes
Having financially stable collaborative efforts	Yes

As Table 1 shows, there was only one personal and one institutional characteristic that did not meet the criteria of statistical significance. The rest of the characteristics that were significant can be summarized as commitment and cross-cultural competence. For each of the characteristics above, *t-tests* were used to test the statistical significance. Each of the characteristics had the following scale: (a) strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) disagree, and (d) strongly disagree. Each choice from the scale was assigned a number: strongly agree = 4, agree = 3, disagree = 2, and strongly disagree = 1. Therefore, the *t*-statistic examined whether the mean response was significantly greater than 3. The resulting *t*-statistics and *p*-values are shown in Appendix A. There was not enough support to suggest that knowledge of México's political system and the system's effect on higher education was a concern for the study's population, nor that the participants believed that numerous people must be involved in a collaboration to make it successful. These results suggest that the political system may provide some context to collaboration, but that it does not have a direct impact on the results of collaboration. In addition, it is likely that individual or small groups of

faculty or staff in U. S. institutions conduct partnerships with Mexican IHEs and generally do not solicit involvement across departments or many other individuals throughout their campuses.

In order to provide participants an opportunity to elaborate on their perspectives regarding the personal and institutional characteristics, a comments section was included in the questionnaire. The comments reinforced the findings in Table 1 but also presented other characteristics that were not addressed in either the literature review or the questionnaire. For example, participants stressed the importance of trust, respect, patience, and flexibility in initiating and implementing collaboration. Although the Mexican political system was not a concern, some comments did indicate that it is important to understand the political, social, and economic aspects of particular issues that are relevant to collaboration. In light of these comments, it is possible that the question on the Mexican political system was too broad. The results led to other conclusions and recommendations.

Conclusion

Collaboration between Mexican and U. S. IHEs need to draw on institutional strengths and fulfill critical needs to be successful. For example, a major goal of the Mexican higher education system is to increase the number of its faculty members with graduate degrees. U. S. institutions have the expertise to provide this training. Collaboration that provides graduate opportunities to Mexican faculty members has been successful and will continue to be successful precisely because institutional strengths and needs are addressed on both sides of the border. For the U. S. higher education system, internationalizing its students and academics in light of globalization remains a vital issue for which Mexican IHEs can provide avenues to build upon.

Perhaps the biggest challenge to successful collaboration is the element of time. The study's participants indicated, both quantitatively and qualitatively, that the collaborative process requires long-term commitment because success does not occur quickly. This long-term commitment requires continuous contact, which strengthens personal and professional relationships. It is the strength of the relationships that determines how the participants will confront resource challenges and cultural misunderstandings. Cultural issues were also of particular interest in the study, specifically the understanding and respecting of the Mexican culture and English-Spanish bilingualism both of which also require time.

Ultimately, successful collaboration between IHEs is worth the effort, as the benefits flow from the institutions into their respective societies. Although, the study obtained perspectives from U. S. border academics, the following recommendations based on the literature review and the study's results, may be useful to academics on both sides of the border. While some recommendations may seem simplistic, their implementation in many cases is far from reality:

1. Discover and pursue mutually beneficial goals such as the sharing of resources and increased understanding between the two systems of higher education and societies.

2. Develop, select, and promote cross-culturally competent academics.
3. Provide incentives to encourage collaboration due to the extensive time commitment needed.
4. Create awareness about collaboration among top administrators whose support is needed to make such efforts successful.
5. Provide or facilitate training on the Mexican and U. S. higher educational systems and their major issues.
6. Emphasize patience, adaptability, flexibility, trust, and respect in academics interested in collaboration.
7. Make readily available information on possible funding sources and the institutional policies pertinent to international education on the Internet and at multiple campus sites and share the information on a regular basis to academics.
8. Facilitate continuous contact between academics across the border by funding regular site visits and making the latest communications technology accessible to them.
9. Build in sufficient resources to implement effective collaboration and evaluation of such efforts in order to sustain them for long-lasting positive impacts.

The following are recommendations for future research:

1. Due to limited resources and time constraints, the study was limited to academics from U. S. border public universities. However, future research may include the perspectives of U. S. border academics from various types of public and private institutions, including community colleges, liberal arts colleges, and universities. It may also be useful to compare the perspectives of academics from the different types of institutions. It may be possible that implementation of collaboration differs substantially across types of institutions. Furthermore, future research can compare the perspectives between administrators and faculty that are involved in collaborative efforts. It may be possible that administrators and faculty view collaboration differently.

2. Again, the study was limited to the perspectives of U. S. border academics. However, future research can attempt to obtain the perspectives of Mexican border academics involved in collaboration with U. S. IHEs. For example, a study can be conducted to compare the perspectives of Mexican and U. S. academics on the personal and institutional characteristics of the current study.
3. The current study was limited to México-US border collaboration. However, future research can attempt to discover personal and institutional characteristics that facilitate collaboration involving all of Canadá, México, and the US in both binational and trilateral collaboration. Such research can also compare the perspectives of academics from each of the nations to analyze whether there are significant differences between the academics. Furthermore, such research may provide insight as to whether binational collaboration continues to be more prevalent than trilateral collaboration. Lastly, such research can compare the perspectives of academics involved in binational collaboration as opposed to those involved in trilateral collaboration to analyze whether there are significant differences.
4. Future research may assess the degree to which academics involved in North American higher education collaboration have demonstrated cultural flexibility. Cultural flexibility is defined as changing one's behavior to meet the demands of situations found in another culture (Brislin, 1993). Cultural flexibility is important to analyze because national cultures affect professional practices to a point that some practices that are acceptable in one culture may not be acceptable in another (Hofstede, 1995: 150-165). For example, a professional practice accepted in the Mexican culture is that a personal commitment to an individual can form the basis of a business agreement (Deresky, 1997). However, in the US, a personal commitment is insufficient for a business agreement, instead written contracts are the norm. The proposed future research could attempt to

determine whether Canadian, Mexican, or U. S. professional practices are more prevalent. The proposed research may suggest that academics involved in collaboration are adapting to the Canadian, Mexican, or U. S. culture or that a North American culture of collaboration is evolving; one that combines all three. However, it is equally possible that the academics are not demonstrating cultural flexibility and instead continue to use their own national professional practices.

5. Future research may evaluate the status, success, and beneficial impacts of collaboration between Canadá, México, and the US. Such research can inquire as to the different types of collaboration that is occurring in North America, to what extent involved academics believe that their efforts have been successful, and what, if any, have been the beneficial impacts of collaboration.
6. Due the very different nature of the business, government, and non-profit sectors, future research may analyze México-US collaboration in each of these sectors. Such research may wish to explore the personal and institutional characteristics that facilitate implementation in each of these sectors.

In sum, the acceleration of globalization has many implications. Thurow's (2003) work strongly points to the economic, social and cultural ties that accompany globalization. Governmental ties, such as those exemplified by NAFTA will only increase over time, and the current study shows that México-US higher education collaboration is a growing phenomenon that will rise in importance as communication systems advance and distance becomes trivial. México-US collaboration is of joint interest and can be of mutual benefit to both nations. Although, the current study discussed what U. S. border academics can do to improve collaboration, these insights are applicable to Mexican border academics as well. By seriously considering the results and recommendations of the study, academics on both sides of the border can move toward the benefits of globalization rather than resist its challenges.

Appendix A

Resulting *t-statistics* and *p-values*

Personal Characteristics	*t*	*P*
Being proficient in English & Spanish	6.24	.00005
Being able to resolve conflicts effectively	8.98	.00005
Understanding the structure of the Mexican higher education system	6.38	.00005
Understanding the major issues of the Mexican higher education system	4.06	.00005
Understanding the Mexican political system and how it affects its higher education system	1.59	.06
Understanding and respecting the Mexican culture	18.44	.00005
Understanding institutional policies regarding international education collaborative efforts	7.03	.00005
Knowledge of various funding sources for international education collaborative efforts	4.38	.00005
Being in continuous contact with Mexican colleagues during a collaborative effort	8.45	.00005
Using the latest technology (Internet, e-mail, etc.)	4.80	.00005
Institutional Characteristics		
Having a collaborative effort in which the participants frequently visit each other's institutions	6.28	.00005
Having a collaborative effort in which the chief executive officers of the participating institutions are personally committed	7.66	.00005
Having a collaborative effort in which the participants share common goals	12.90	.00005
Having a collaborative effort that is continually evaluated and modified by its participants	5.86	.00005
Institutions and participants making a multi-year commitment to a collaborative effort	6.76	.00005
Having a collaborative effort that involves many people	-4.14	.00005
Having collaborative efforts that are mutually beneficial to institutions and participants	15.09	.00005

References

Asociación Nacional de Universidades e Instituciones de Educación Superior (ANUIES). *Estadísticas de la educación superior, 1999: personal docente de los niveles técnico superior, licenciatura y posgrado* [online], 1999, [ref. September 2, 2005]. Available on Web: [http://anuies.mx/principal/servicios/estadisticas/perso-docente-1999.pdf].

Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development. *Partnership Profile: Maricopa Community College/Universidad Veracruzana* [online], 2000, [ref. February 7, 2001]. Available on Web: [http://www.aascu.org/alo/IP/proposals.htm#2000awardees].

Bosworth, B., S. M. Collins, & N. C. Lustig (eds.). *Coming Together?: México-United States Relations*. Washington, D. C.; Brookings Institution Press, 1997.

Brislin, R. *Understanding Culture's Influence on Behavior*. Fort Worth, TX; Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 1993.

Browne, H., B. Sims, & T. Barry. *For Richer, for Poorer: Shaping U. S.-Mexican Integration*. Albuquerque, NM; Resource Center Press, 1994.

Canales, J., L. C. Gómez, & N. Villanueva. *The Educational Systems of México and the United States: Prospects for Reform and Collaboration*. Boulder, CO; Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1995.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. *Enrollment Profile: Distribution of Institutions and Enrollments by Classification Category* [online], 2005, [ref. August 20, 2007]. Available on Web: [http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/index.asp].

Carter, H. M. "Implementation of International Competence Strategies: Faculty". In: C. B. Klasek (ed.). *Bridges to the Future: Strategies for Internationalizing Higher Education*. Carbondale, IL; Association of International Education Administrators, 1992, pp. 39-51.

Consortium for North American Higher Education Collaboration (CONAHEC). "Border PACT Announces First Grant Awardees". *TRIbune*. Tucson, AZ; CONAHEC, Fall 2000, p. 2.

Crane, A. "Higher Learning". *Business México*, No. 7, 1997, pp. 26-30.

De la Garza, R. O. & J. Velasco (eds.). *Bridging the Border: Transforming México-US Relations*. Boulder, CO; Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1997.

De los Reyes, G. "NAFTA and the Future of Mexican Higher Education". *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, No. 550, 1997, pp. 96-104.

Deresky, H. *International Management: Managing Across Borders and Cultures*. Second edition. New York, Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers, Inc., 1997.

Ewell, P. T. & R. Kent. *Policy Approaches to Evaluation and Incentive Funding in Mexican and U. S. Higher Education*. Boulder, CO; Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1995.

Ganster, P. "The U. S.-Mexican Border Region". In: B. C. Ponton, P. Ganster, F. León-García, & F. Marmolejo. *A Region in Transition: The México-US Borderlands and the Role of Higher Education.* Boulder, CO; Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1997, pp. 1-10.

Gill, J. I. & L. A. Álvarez de Testa. *An Essay on Higher Education in México and the United States*. Boulder, CO; Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1995.

Heller, D. E. (ed.). *The States and Public Higher Education Policy: Affordability, Access, and Accountability*. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.

Herzog, L. A. "Border Commuter Workers and Transfrontier Metropolitan Structure Along the US-México Border". In: O. J. Martínez (ed.). *US-México Borderlands: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*. Wilmington, DE; Scholarly Resources, Inc., 1995, pp. 176-189.

Hinkle, D. E., W. Wiersma, & S. G. Jurs. *Applied Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*. Third edition. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1994.

Hofstede, G. "The Business of International Business is Culture". In: T. Jackson (ed.). *Cross-Cultural Management*. Boston, Butterworth-Heinemann Ltd., 1995, pp. 150-165.

Institute of International Education. *U. S. Students abroad Top 200,000, Increase by 8 Percent* [online], November 13, 2006, [ref. August 23, 2007]. Available on Web: [http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/?p=89252].

Klasek, C. B. "Inter-Institutional Cooperation Guidelines and Agreements". In: C. B. Klasek (ed.). *Bridges to the Future: Strategies for Internationalizing Higher Education*. Carbondale, IL; Association of International Education Administrators, 1992, pp. 108-128.

Knapp, L. G., J. E. Kelly-Reid, and R. W. Whitmore. "Enrollment in Postsecondary Institutions, Fall 2004; Graduation Rates, 1998 & 2001 Cohorts; and Financial Statistics, Fiscal Year 2004 (NCES 2006-155)" [online]. U. S. Department of Education. Washington, D. C.; National Center for Education Statistics, 2006, [ref. August 24, 2007]. Available on Web: [http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2006155].

León-García, F., D. Matthews, & L. Smith. *Academic Mobility in North America: Towards New Models of Integration and Collaboration*. Boulder, CO; Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1999.

Levin, J. S. *Within and Across Borders: Higher Education in Canadá, México, and the United States*. Boulder, CO; Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1998.

Lynch, E. W. & M. J. Hanson (eds.). *Developing Cross-Cultural Competence: A Guide for Working with Children and their Families*. Third edition. Baltimore, MD; Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co., Inc., 1998.

Marmolejo, F. & F. León-García. "Higher Education in the México-US Borderlands: A Profile". In: B. C. Ponton, P. Ganster, F. León-García, & F. Marmolejo. *A Region in Transition: The México-US Borderlands and the Role of Higher Education*. Boulder, CO; Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1997, pp. 17-30.

-----. "La educación superior en la frontera México-Estados Unidos: convergencias y divergencias". In: *Revista de la Educación Superior en Línea* [online]. México City, Asociación Nacional de Universidades e Instituciones de Educación Superior (ANUIES), No. 115, 2000, [ref. March 6, 2001]. Available on Web: [http://web.anuies.mx/anuies/revsup/res115/txt7.htm].

Mumper, M. "The Paradox of College Prices: Five Stories with no Clear Lesson". In: D. E. Heller (ed.). *The States and Public Higher Education Policy: Affordability, Access, and Accountability*. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001, p. 39.

National Council on Educational Statistics. *National Study of Postsecondary Faculty: 2004: Percentage Breakdown of Highest Degree for Full-Time Faculty with Instructional Duties for Credit, by Institution Level, Fall 2003* [online], 2004, [ref. September 7, 2005]. Available on Web: [http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2005/2005172.pdf].

Overton, J. L. "The Process of Internationalization at Minority Institutions". In: C. B. Klasek (ed.). *Bridges to the Future: Strategies for Internationalizing Higher Education*. Carbondale, IL; Association of International Education Administrators, 1992, pp. 164-176.

Ponton, B. C., P. Ganster, F. León-García, & F. Marmolejo. *A Region in Transition: The México-US Borderlands and the Role of Higher Education*. Boulder, CO; Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1997.

Raat, W. D. *México and the United States: Ambivalent Vistas*. Second edition. Athens, GA; The University of Georgia Press, 1996.

Robson, E. S. *Integrated Cross-Border Region Healthcare Education and Leadership Network in The North American Institute News* [online]. North American Institute, Issue 21, 2001, [ref. March 6, 2001]. Available on Web: [http://www.northamericaninstitute.org/naminews/issue21/healthcare.html].

Rubin, A. M. "Colleges on the México-US Border Join Forces to Help the Region's Disadvantaged". *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, No. 44, September 19, 1997, p. A52.

Santillánez, E. J. *Higher Education's Responsiveness in México and the United States to a New Economy and the Impacts of NAFTA*. Boulder, CO; Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1995.

Secretaría de Educación Pública. *Sistema educativo de los Estados Unidos Mexicanos: principales cifras, ciclo escolar 2005-2006* [online], March, 2007, [ref. August 20, 2007]. Available on Web: [http://www.sep.gob.mx/work/resources/LocalContent/83205/51/est_2007.pdf].

Smuckler, R. H. "University International Linkages". In: C. D. Goodwin (ed.). *International Investment in Human Capital: Overseas Education for Development*. New York, Institute of International Education, 1993, pp. 167-178.

Statland de López, R. "Mexican Colleges Internationalize their Programs". *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, No. 42, July 19, 1996, p. A39.

Thurow, L. C. *Fortune Favors the Bold: What We Must Do to Build a New and Lasting Global Prosperity*. New York, HarperCollins Publishers, 2003.

US-México Border Philanthropy Partnership. *US-México Border Philanthropy Partnership: About the Partnership* [online], [ref. August 24, 2007]. Available on Web: [http://www.borderpartnership.org/index.html].

U. S. State Department. *Fact Sheet: 14th US-México Binational Commission Meeting* [online], May 5, 1997, [ref. February 23, 2001]. Available on Web: [http://www.state.gov/regions/wha/97bnc_fs.html].

Weintraub, S. *NAFTA: What Comes Next?* Washington, D. C; The Center for Strategic and International Studies, 1994.

Zusman, A. "Issues Facing Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century". In: P. G. Altbach, R. O. Berdahl, & P. J. Gumport. *American Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century: Social, Political, and Economic Challenges*. Baltimore, MD; The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999, pp. 109-148.