

THE UNIVERSITY *of York*

University of York
The York Management School
Working Paper No. 62
ISSN Number: 1743-4041
September 2011

**Internationalisation Strategy in UK
Universities: what works?**

Philip Warwick, University of York
Yvonne Moogan, Kaplan Business School, London

**This paper is circulated for discussion purposes only and its contents should be
considered preliminary**

Internationalisation Strategy in UK Universities: what works?

Philip Warwick, University of York
Yvonne Moogan, Kaplan Business School, London

Abstract

There has been a significant increase in the number of international students studying in the UK over the last ten years. A casual glance at UK University websites indicates that most UK Universities claim to have internationalised and adjusted to the globalisation of higher education (HE). However the extent and form of this internationalisation depends on how internationalisation is defined by the institution and shows wide variations.

This paper records how a small number of UK Universities have gone about internationalisation. It illustrates the variations in practice between institutions and tries to determine some examples of best practice which might be of use to other institutions as they seek to follow the same path.

Rather than discussing department or module level internationalisation initiatives the focus is at a more strategic level making reference to literature from the fields of organisational and strategic management.

Introduction

Most academics and support staff working in UK Universities for the last decade or more have witnessed a significant change in the student population of their institution. Whilst Higher Education in the UK has always recruited a small number of international students and teaching staff and enjoyed a steady flow of researchers from overseas; the last ten years has seen a significant increase in the international student population studying in the UK from 231k (11%) in 2000 to 369k (15%) in 2009¹. Many of these students studying on one year taught masters programmes. At the same time successive governments have been trying to increase student choice and participation leading to increased diversity in the student population (Rose & Bylander 2007, Ryan & Hellmundt 2008, Tait 2010). So as global student mobility increases, the diversity of home domiciled learners (cultural background, language, age, and experience) has also been growing, presenting new challenges to the learner, the educator and the Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).

Internationalisation of HE can be defined using Knight's (2003) definition as *...the process of integrating, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post secondary education*. This definition implies that HEIs should be taking action to create a

¹ Figures for 2000/1 and 2008/9 (international students in includes non UK EU) Source: hesa.ac.uk

productive international learning environment for HE students, which will help prepare these students for future careers in a globalised world, as well as internationalising research and support activities. Knight's definition is widely used and forms the basis of what many researchers consider to be internationalisation. However as we will see, not all share this definition, some Universities consider themselves to be successfully internationalising using their own much narrower definition of the process.

Zepke & Leech (2005) suggested that in order to retain students, Universities have to change to more accurately reflect their total student population. Those institutions that take no action and simply expect their students to assimilate into the local tradition (e.g. where international students are expected to conform to home student norms) are setting those students up to fail. So UK Universities with diverse student populations (on average 15 per cent of whom are likely to be international students) need to be reconsider their approach to teaching and learning to ensure that these approaches remain congruent with the student population. This does not mean making adjustments to programmes on which international students are concentrated but to all activities. At the same time they need to provide graduating students with an international rather than domestic outlook (Carroll and Ryan 2005). This then is the basic argument for internationalizing all University activities, rather than just recruiting international students or teaching overseas.

In 2006, Koutsantoni found that more than half of the UK Universities in his research sample said they had an internationalisation strategy (Table 1) and claimed to have internationalised their activities. However, he found that generally little thought had been given to the institutional changes necessary to accommodate international students with their diverse needs. For example, very few Universities have adjusted what they teach or offered much support to help staff adapt their teaching and learning practices, or redesigned support services to make them more appropriate to the demands of the international students (Badley 2000, Ryan 2006, Caruana & Sprurling 2007, Trahar 2007,). Indeed from our review of the literature, it seems that the most common way Universities have made progress with internationalising the learning experience for students is not as a result of a centrally promoted initiatives but through the actions of a small number of international enthusiasts, who have set about developing their own smaller scale initiatives to provide cross-cultural communication skills for students on international programmes or language support to international students (Luxon & Peelo 2009, Richardson and Warwick 2009). With a few exceptions these initiatives have tended to be bottom-up (Caruana & Hanstock 2008) generally undertaken and written-up by those with an interest in teaching and learning who find themselves involved in teaching modules on programmes with large numbers of international students.

This paper seeks to identify what if anything has changed since Koutsantoni's research took place in 2006. It aims to explore what Universities are actually doing at a University wide level, in the name of internationalisation and to determine if there is indeed a gap between stated internationalisation strategy and what students are actually experiencing.

Table 1

Internationalisation of HEIs in the UK – Leadership Foundation for HE

Survey of 131 Higher Education Institutions

- 52% have an internationalisation strategy
- 16 % do not mention internationalisation in their corporate plan
- 28% only refer to international student recruitment
- 28% refer to initiatives to support international students
- 8% refer to international staff recruitment
- 6% mention staff development
- 4% refer to student experience issues
- 0.5% refer to teaching and learning issues

Source: Koutsantoni 2006

The Higher Education environment

During the last decade the business model of UK Universities has changed as Universities have become entrepreneurial corporations with recruitment targets, management information systems and performance measures, whilst students have become consumers making choices between competing institutions based on reputation, league table positions and cost, as much as course content (Clark 1998, Scott 2002, Jarzabkowski 2003, Marshall 2007). Students are now enticed to enrol at HEIs by marketing initiatives and corporate branding (Gibbs & Murphy 2009). Issues such as managing brand image, assessing advertising medium effectiveness and collecting market intelligence are common practice in the marketing departments of HEIs (Bonnema and Van der Walddt 2008).

In this context where the student is viewed as a consumer it is perhaps to be expected that Higher Education is increasingly dominated by managerialism, quality assurance regimes, competition, league tables and strategic organisational management (Gibbs and Murphy 2009, Kok et al 2010). This marketisation of Higher Education has served to increase the interest in the economic aspects of internationalisation (Ivy 2001, Scott 2002, De Vita and Case 2003, Jiang 2008). As a result, internationalisation at many UK universities is a managerially led activity, with a predominantly economic rationale based on recruiting international students to help plug funding gaps. It is less likely that internationalisation is being pursued for academic values (Taylor 2004).

Somewhat surprisingly, academics have not tended to resist the managerially led approaches to internationalisation (De Vita & Case 2003) perhaps because they share the belief that UK universities need the money. De Vita and Case (2003) suggested that most academics believe that Universities should respond to globalisation by developing an international curriculum through equipping their graduates with the skills to thrive in a

globalised world, however, without the same push from the top of the organisation that has accelerated international recruitment, the curriculum, teaching, learning and the skills agendas have tended to lag well behind the symbolic changes designed to aid international recruitment. Bartell (2003) suggests institutions often adopt a symbolic rather than an embedded approach to internationalisation; he characterizes this approach as making a series of superficial changes rather than taking a deeper more systematic approach to the implementation of internationalisation.

Strategy

In many of the organisations referred to in this study, internationalisation is a top level organisational strategy. This being the case we have looked at concepts referred to in the literature on strategic management to identify ways in which strategies can be systematically developed within the organisation. The two most commonly described approaches to strategy are the competitive forces school championed by Porter (1996) and the resource based view (RBV) championed by Barney (1991) and Wernerfelt (1984). Porter (1996) argues that rather than just being effective at what they do, organisations must aim to develop a unique position in the market based on an alignment between the organisation and the needs of its customers. Longer term advantage, (*sustainable competitive advantage*), results from the whole organisation working together to reinforce this alignment. In contrast, RBV emphasises looking inside the organisation to develop a deep understanding of the resource endowment which is suggested as the starting point for strategy development. The RBV approach as modified by Teece et al (1997), advocates developing *dynamic capabilities*, desirable internal resources, capabilities and conditions that allow the organisation to develop strategies suitable to the changing external environment.

Lynch (2009:5) developed the following 'consensus' definition of strategy a form of middle ground between the two views, strategy is ... *organising the utilization of resources to enhance performance of firms in their environment*. Applying Lynch's (2009) definition to HE, suggests that University strategy should align the organisation's internal resources (facilities, staff and reputation) to its external environment; in other words basing strategy on existing organisational resources and capabilities in the context of the rapidly changing HE landscape (McRoy and Gibbs 2009). It could be argued that some UK universities are exploiting their history, reputation, campus environment and location to recruit international students which is in effect exploiting resource based advantages. However we suspect that many are recruiting large numbers of international students before they develop the skills and resources to give them an ideal learning environment.

Where institutions have not only recruited international students, but have developed collaborative programmes and off shore campuses, the gap between internationalisation strategy and the institutions ability to deliver that strategy may be even greater (Ryan 2006). Training staff to deliver programmes overseas to an exclusively international

cohort, developing curricula that are appropriate and equally valued in very different contexts adds to the complexity of the task for academics. There are as yet, few formal programmes available to prepare academics for this task (Times Higher Education 03/09/10).

The strategic management literature identifies two main approaches to the development and implementation of strategy in the organisation. First the prescriptive view assumes that it is possible to develop a clearly expressed plan with actions to achieve that strategy (David 2009). In this approach, strategy is a rational linear process following a prescribed process of analysis leading to the development of a strategic plan, which is then systematically implemented. Secondly there is the emergent view of strategy, which rejects the certainty of the prescriptive view, noting the uncertainty of a fast evolving business environment, it suggests that strategy develops incrementally and emerges over time (Mintzberg 1987). Strategic management in this case is centred on dynamic, entrepreneurial management skills, which build on the experiences and judgments of managers, whilst the prescriptive view requires the application of detailed and systematic processes (David 2009). Emergent strategies develop from experimentation and incremental changes which may evolve into strategies over time, leading to the argument that strategy is crafted in situ rather than planned (Mintzberg 1987). Bartell & Ghoshal (1994) take Mintzberg's idea one stage further arguing that top managers should concentrate on communicating the purpose of the organisation, (what might be called leadership) rather than designing detailed strategy.

The reality of strategic management in large organisations is that neither a truly prescriptive approach nor an exclusively emergent approach, are entirely appropriate. A suitable compromise position may be an adaptive approach (Chaffee 1985) which allows for both the development of a long term view and the ability to change this view to reflect a fast moving external environment. Whilst UK HEIs, like many large public sector organisations probably lean towards the use of a prescriptive approach to strategy (Jarzabkowski 2003); Clark (1998) attributed the success of his so called 'entrepreneurial universities', to their ability to be fast moving and flexible, suggesting they need to have people leading them who can spot opportunities and be adaptive in their approach to strategy.

Implementing Internationalisation

When a new strategy is introduced the organisation's staff are likely to be the most significant player in the implementation phase (Easterby-Smith 1987, Rudzki 1994, McRoy and Gibbs 2009). Staff are the key resource in any University, those Universities that seek to internationalise their activities must be able to convince staff that this is the right thing to do (Leask 2005, McNichol et al 2008, Taylor 2004,). In most organisational contexts, a new strategy with staff at its heart would be the prompt for some form of training need analysis leading to a staff development initiative aimed at developing new expertise

(Lynch 2009, Marshall 2007). Perhaps because of the difficulties of introducing staff development programmes in a HE context, this approach is much less common in UK Universities (McRoy and Gibbs 2009), although it has been attempted by some Australian institutions (Gelade 2003, Ryan 2006, Crossling et al 2008, McNicholl et al 2008).

McNichol et al (2008) focus on the development of an appropriate culture in the organization and advocate staff development because *staff are the engine which must drive the initiative* (p. 3). Staff development programmes were developed at University of South Australia (Gelade 2003) and Monash (Crossling et al 2008 and McNichol et al 2008) to help staff develop an internationalized curriculum. Taylor (2004) suggests that human resource strategy must link to the internationalisation strategy, for example recruiting staff from overseas or who have international experience.

In order to implement internationalisation strategies and to build commitment, Knight (1994) suggests the adoption of a linear approach, rather like David's prescriptive strategic management process (David 2009) referred to above. She suggests internationalisation strategies should go through six clear stages of development before they can be truly integrated within an organization in order to ensure an international strategy is understood. These stages include: raising awareness, generating commitment, detailed planning, operationalising through the organisation, systematic review and demonstrating top level commitment. In contrast Qiang's (2003) suggests an approach which is more like Chaffee's (1985) adaptive approach to strategy, namely an incremental approach to implementation which reinforces commitment. Crossling et al 2008, and McRoy & Gibbs 2009 similarly refer to incremental initiatives, pilot schemes that demonstrate an evidence based approach aimed at overcoming possible resistance and increasing the level of ownership among stakeholders.

So what lessons can be learnt from the literature to help HEIs to successfully introduce a process of internationalisation? It is clear that there are no universal guidelines, instead the authors have developed and adapted Knight's (1994) linear approach to introducing internationalisation strategy, adding ideas from other similar frameworks (Poole 2001 and Elkin et al 2005) and some concepts from conventional approaches to strategic implementation (David 2009, Lynch 2009) which appeared to be relevant to the task. This led to the creation of the following list of eight pre-requisites for the successful introduction of internationalisation strategies that Universities should develop:

1. A formal systematic approach to strategic management, which retains some flexibility to adapt to changing circumstances in the external environment. One strand of organisational strategy being institutional internationalisation
2. A focus on the agreed outcome of internationalisation
3. A close link between the organisation's resource capabilities and its external environment

4. A clear understanding of how the internationalisation strategy is going to be implemented and supported within the organisation.
5. Effective two way communication routes with staff
6. Appropriate and on-going staff development opportunities to support internationalisation and allow incremental progress through feedback and dissemination.
7. Clear and visible leadership and an on going commitment to internationalisation from the top of the organisation and from senior academics through-out the organisation.
8. A review system which can monitor and evaluate progress and revise the strategy as necessary

Whilst this list is not exhaustive and is not sensitive to contextual differences, it is used in this article as a benchmark against which to compare attempts to introduce internationalisation strategies and to identify possible explanations for the relative success or weaknesses of the strategies and their implementation.

The Methodology

The main purpose of the research is to explore the reality of internationalisation of UK higher education, using a small sample of Universities to identify what approaches to internationalisation appeared to be the most successful. It is also hoped to locate any typical 'gaps' between the intended internationalisation strategy and the ability of organisations to deliver the strategy? The research questions relevant to this article are as follows: are there any gaps between strategic intentions and the implementation of these intentions? Are there differences between the views of institutional managers and those of academics and support staff? What is the student perception of internationalisation and the motives for internationalisation? What approaches to internationalisation appear to be successful and which do not?

In order to answer these questions, one of the authors studied the internationalisation strategies of a group of smaller research led 'Plateglass' Universities founded in the late 1950s and early 1960s². Interviews were conducted with a 'diagonal slice' of staff and students at four of these seven institutions and focused on the views and experiences of staff and students. The University names were given a colour code to protect the anonymity of the institutions and the interview subjects (red, orange, yellow, green, blue, purple and brown).

² The *new* English Universities of the late 1950s and 60s: Sussex, York, East Anglia, Essex, Kent, Warwick and Lancaster. It could be argued that Keele was a forerunner to these seven and that Stirling should be added to the as it was created in a similar way on out town campus; however neither were created in the same way or with the same set of legislation as the *Plateglass* (Beloff 1968) or *Shakesperian* (Scott 2002) seven. Other 1960s new Universities like Aston, Loughborough and Salford were created following the publication of the Robbins Report in 1963 by expanding existing technical colleges.

In addition to some outputs from this on-going piece of research, the authors have incorporated into the article, the views and experiences of 11 collaborating colleagues from the Business Management Accounting and Finance (BMAF) Internationalisation Special Interest Group (SIG), who were asked to provide anonymous qualitative feedback on their own institutions (during the summer of 2010). Nine of these colleagues were from post-1992 institutions and two were from pre-1992 Universities (one a member of the 1994 Group and one a member of the Russell Group).

The findings from both samples are evaluated against the best practice guidance as derived from the literature on internationalisation and strategic management, in particular the list of eight suggested pre-requisites for successful internationalisation strategies as identified above.

The Results

Despite the seven Plateglass Universities having a similar history, similar campus locations (outside smallish provincial cities) and the same national context, they have very different ideas about what constitutes internationalisation and have chosen contrasting approaches to internationalisation. One has expanded rapidly both at home and overseas with off-shore Asian campuses whilst another has emphasised its 'Europeaness', developing satellite locations in Brussels and Paris. Other institutions have concentrated on collaborative teaching agreements and setting up satellite campuses in London specifically to attract more international students. Two highlight their research, reputation, domestic and international ranking as their main assets. One simply states it seeks to attract the best scholars from around the world, with little reference to other international considerations (see appendix 1 for comparative data and appendix 2 for a review of internationalisation in their strategic plans).

Two of the institutions in the study have developed fairly detailed key performance indicators (KPIs) and have linked internationalisation initiatives to their other activities such as teaching and learning and student experience. Three have a more stand alone, (what one interviewee described as a 'lean-to shed') approach to internationalisation and one makes little reference to any international initiatives beyond the aspiration to produce world class research (see Appendix 2). The two with the most detailed internationalisation strategies have developed and publicised detailed milestones for the implementation of internationalisation in their strategic plans. At these two institutions internationalisation appears to be a top-down and centrally driven initiative.

The top-down approach to implementing strategy is not noted for building commitment among academics (Caruana and Hanstock 2008, Winter 2009). Perhaps as a result, the majority of UK institutions have instead relied on module and programme level 'bottom-up' initiatives. Indeed both authors have been involved in this type of activity. This more widely observed approach to internationalisation is usually based on small scale projects

led by enthusiasts and funded from within existing resources of time and money. The outcome of this approach is a set of small incremental changes, which rarely have a significant impact on the whole institution in the short term, but could perhaps be classified as an adaptive approach to strategy development if the initiatives continue over a lengthy period.

In the Plateglass Universities, the research found academic staff were rather cynical about motives for institutional internationalisation much more so than senior academic managers at PVC and Faculty level. These senior managers tended to talk about reputation and student experience as being the motivation for internationalising, whereas the academic staff suggested it was international student fee income that was the main concern. Anecdotal evidence from colleagues in the BMAF Internationalisation SIG, paints a surprisingly similar and uniform picture of internationalisation at UK institutions. Staff continue to perceive that Universities are internationalising for largely economic motives.

The SIG members reported:

- *a mismatch between ambitions and reality*
- *problems securing adequate resources to support teaching and learning initiatives*
- *significant variations in the implementation of internationalisation between departments*
- *bottom-up initiatives and staff development programmes attended by the already 'converted'*
- *academic staff opting out of considering the internationalisation agenda*

Whilst institutional internationalisation strategies exist, SIG group members suggest that the content of the strategy is often not communicated throughout the University and that there are significant variations in practice across departments. So, it is clear that even in those Universities that have moved away from a purely economic approach to internationalisation, there is no clear consensus about how best to implement internationalisation in practice and what approach is the most likely to be successful.

Many of the SIG members, like colleagues at the Plateglass Universities, responded to the Universities lack of action in this area, by introducing a series of local level initiatives in an attempt to make the institution and programmes more international and relevant for a diverse student population.

Two institutions represented in the SIG group, both in the post 1992 sector, are reviewing their curriculum and considering student support in a more systematic way. In one of these institutions there appears to be on-going commitment from senior academic managers to push through change. However SIG group members pointed out that if this commitment is not continually reinforced, staff soon pick-up the mood music and realise that the priority may have changed to either promoting research, the University's ranking

in league tables, or the annual National Student Satisfaction survey of traditional UK based learner groups.

In the Plateglass Universities there are significant variations in the way internationalisation is defined and the way it is being introduced. Leadership emerged as an important differentiator between the four research sites as the interviews progressed. At Red and Brown Universities, the leadership of the internationalisation agenda, was being shared by two or three of the senior management team. As the interviews progressed, it was clear that there was a range of views about what constituted internationalisation and who was in charge of this agenda. In contrast, at Green University and then at Yellow University, they had two very different approaches but by and large a much clearer understanding of who was in charge of internationalisation and perhaps as a result, a shared idea of what it entailed. Senior managers at one University emphasising student experience whilst at the other, international teaching collaborations were the main feature of internationalisation. At Red University the interviews reinforced the importance of leadership as an issue. Here there was no clear understanding of who was in charge of internationalisation. There even appeared to be some confusion among the top team about who was formally responsible for putting together and implementing an internationalisation strategy. It was therefore not surprising to find that academic staff and students at Red University were unsure about who was in charge and what was on the agenda. Several interviewees at Red were concerned about the role of a partner organisation who was recruiting international students to foundation year, pre masters and pre-sessional language programmes.

Most of the staff interviewed at the four Plateglass Universities had a fairly narrow view of internationalisation, nothing like the Knight (2003) definition at the start of this paper. None had come across any formal University wide staff development programmes, that tackled issues relating to internationalisation, apart from Teaching Certificates and Masters programmes for new staff. Also they were not aware of the details of international student support initiatives. The Student Union Representatives tended to be more supportive of the internationalisation agenda than the academic staff. Most applauded their University's attempts to improve the experience of the average international student. Most of the representatives had invested time during their year in office on this issue, so were perhaps unlikely to be too critical of the progress made.

When asked to rate the success of the internationalisation agenda the majority of the staff were rather cautious about declaring their views, but staff and student representatives at Yellow and Green Universities were most supportive of the way their University had gone about internationalisation. At Yellow, the emphasis on student experience, driven by a forceful PVC figure, who was continually communicating with staff and students to reinforce the internationalization agenda seemed to have some impact on the rest of the organisation. At Green University, the academic staff in particular had a fairly narrow definition of internationalisation as being about Green's international teaching

collaborations. They did think however that the University had been successful in building these links. So using their own institution's definition of institutional internationalisation, staff at Yellow and Green Universities were able to say that their University had successfully internationalised.

Discussion

The research evidence was evaluated with reference to the list of suggested pre-requisites identified on page 6. The initial research findings suggest that 6 out of 7 *Plateglass* Universities have an international strategy which is articulated and understood at senior levels of the organisation. It is difficult to reach a judgement on the success or otherwise of these internationalisation strategies at this stage, however the research does suggest that where internationalisation strategies are having the most impact and are most widely understood, they seem to be driven by enthusiasts at senior level, (perhaps a Deputy or Pro Vice Chancellor). Where this energy is directed to external relations, it seems likely that there is a corresponding growth in international recruitment initiatives, research collaborations and/or teaching partnerships. Where this enthusiasm centres on the student experience and teaching and learning, then it seems the institution will follow with initiatives in this area. None of the institutions studied and very few of those represented by the BMAF Internationalisation SIG are making progress on all aspects of internationalisation as defined Knight (2003) at the start of the article.

All seven of the *Plateglass* group do appear to have formal strategic management processes. Several demonstrate the flexibility suggested by Clark (1998) and have been able to move quickly to develop trans-national programmes. Arguably some have exploited reputation advantages in developing their internationalisation strategy; however, apart from these observations, the main feature of the sample is the significant variations that exist in the practice of strategic management and the approach to internationalisation. This is despite the relatively similar context and heritage.

The literature and the two research samples suggest that the majority of UK universities continue to focus on external issues as they develop an internationalisation strategy. They have a tendency to neglect internal capability issues, leaving a few 'champions' to try to improve the international student experience with local level initiatives, while the majority of the University staff and many home students fall in to the habit of linking internationalisation to the recruitment of international students, or in some institutions, to teaching overseas.

There is less evidence of successful implementation of strategy. Those aspects of the strategies that have been successful in some institutions tend to relate to specific measurable targets, such as student recruitment targets rather than the broader goals associated with internationalizing the institution. Communication of internationalisation strategies was generally weak both at the *Plateglass* and SIG group institutions. Leadership was varied, from very visible and highly committed to the virtually non-

existent. Generally those institutions with the clearest leadership of internationalisation were making the most progress.

Although some authors describing internationalisation claim successes (Jones 2009, Luxon & Peelo 2009, Richardson and Warwick 2009), the evidence from the two research samples used in preparing this paper do not provide clear and easily understood evidence of lasting organisation success. Progress towards comprehensive institutional internationalisation in the UK remains limited. It is therefore difficult to make any judgements about what approaches to internationalisation are the most successful, aside from the need for consistent, visible and supportive leadership. What is clear is that in most cases, a transformation of the student population, to a much more international profile has occurred well in advance of the internationalisation to the rest of the organisation. Future internationalisation success will depend on how quickly Universities can respond to their changing student population and what proportion of the international student income UK Universities are willing to devote to the internationalisation of the whole institution.

Conclusion

HE has become subject to significant commercial pressures in the last decade. One consequence has been the drive to recruit more international students, but we should not confuse the recruitment of international students with the process of internationalisation. The literature indicates that internationalisation extends well beyond recruitment. It is an on-going process, encompassing teaching and learning, research strategy, curriculum, the student experience, staff development, student support services and much more.

In the organisations we have looked at in the compilation of this article, and with which we are familiar, there appears to be many gaps between the stated intentions of the organisations, as laid out in their international strategies and the capabilities of those organisations to deliver the strategy. In particular, UK Universities do not appear to have developed staff and other resources in line with their international student recruitment. In the view of the authors the next phase of internationalisation in UK Universities should centre on the development of resources (staff and organisational) to meet the needs of internationalisation. Senior academics and managers in the University, Faculties and Departments will need to demonstrate their on-going commitment to internationalisation by engaging with the international agendas in their daily activities.

**Research Sample - English New 1960s Universities
Comparative Data March 2010**

University	Number of Students (a)	EU students (b)	Non EU students (c)	Percent Inter'nal (d)	Int. fees % of income (e)	THES World top 200 (f)	The Guardian rank (g)	The Times rank (h)	Sunday Times rank (i)	THES Std exper'ce rank(j)
Red	15695	580	1670	14.3	7.9	n/a	40	28	27	6
Orange	11510	1075	2075	27.4	15.7	n/a	36	43	39	40
Yellow	17805	1170	1650	15.8	10.5	n/a	28	39	41	38
Green	13720	885	1755	19.2	10.1	170	12	23	20	20
Blue	12450	890	1100	16.0	8.7	121	34	35	22	52
Purple	28445	890	4795	20.0	12.5	69	4	6	7	18
Brown	13185	685	2040	20.7	7.5	81	11	11	9	39

Key:

(a)	Total all HE students HESA 2007/08 (source: HESA 2009) ³
(b)	Total EU domicile HE students (excluding UK) 2007/08 (source: HESA 2009)
(c)	Total non EU HE students 2007/08 (source: HESA2009)
(d)	Percent of International students in HE 2007/08 (all students from outside UK) (source:HESA 2009)
(e)	Fees 2008/09 (source: Times Higher Education 18/03/2010)
(f)	THES world rankings 2009 (focussed on research) http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk (accessed 16/03/09)
(g)	Teaching based ranking http://www.guardian.co.uk/news/datablog/2009/mar/10/universityguide (accessed 16/03/09)
(h)	The Times University Guide 2010 - multivariate including graduate prospects
(i)	Sunday Times University Guide, includes weighting for reputation (http://extras.timesonline.co.uk6/10/08)
(j)	THES student experience table 2009 based on NSS survey and funding directed at T&L and facilities

Notes: Green (24) and Purple (42) appear in the Financial Times top 100 full-time Global MBA programmes (FT 2010)

³ HESA 2009a Students in Higher Education Institutions 2007-2008, Cheltenham, HESA

At the end of 2008-09, all institutions were in surplus apart from Blue which had debts of around £1.9 million.

Appendix 2

Internationalisation in Published New 1960s University Strategic Plans

Institution	Red	Orange	Yellow	Green	Blue	Brown
Date of plan	2008-2012	2009-2014	2009-2012	2009-2015	2009-2015	2009-19
Main Strategic Plan themes in order	Research Education Enterprise People Finance Facilities Environmentalism Organisation and management	Research Student Experience Knowledge Transfer Global Challenges Finance Organisational issues	Excellence International Impact Student Experience Research Enterprise Effective, efficient, sustainable	Internationalisation Research impact Teaching People Student Experience Finance Services and systems	Research & scholarship Teaching and learning Student experience Financial Services and systems	Excellence Internationalisation Inclusivity Sustainability
Internationalisation	Some indirect references to global citizenship for students Int'l research	Clear commitments in each faculty strategy Research links Top management commitment, International Student targets, Developing international partnerships	International partnerships International student numbers Home student Int' experience Int'l Research impact European links and campus development	International mind set for staff and students Int'l Research Int'l Teaching partnerships Off shore partners Int'l employability skills for students	Some indirect references to: international business programmes, student experience. Aiming for Int'l research impact and to attract world class scholars	Strong component of plan Int'l reputation Int'l research programmes Int'l exchange
Explicit International Targets	% of articles with foreign co-authors	Strategy in place Marketing plan Strategic alliances THES world top 200	Int'l strategy to be embedded (doesn't say how measured)	Student numbers Int'l research impact and collaborations Proportion of fees Offshore std numbers % non UK Staff	International student barometer score	No internationalisation targets in plan

Note: Purple University strategic plan not available for external review on the web

References

- Badley, G. 2000, Developing Globally Competent University Teachers, *Innovation in Education and Training International*, 37, 3, 244-253
- Bartell, M. 2003, Internationalisation of Universities, a culture based framework, *Higher Education*, 45, 2003, 43-70
- Bartlett, C. and Ghohal, S. 1994, Changing the Role of Top Management: Beyond Strategy to Purpose, *Harvard Business Review*, Nov/Dec 1994
- Barney, J. 1991, Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage, *Journal of Management*, 17, 1, 99-120
- Beloff, M. 1968, *The Platelglass Universities*, London, Secker & Warburg
- Black, K. 2004, A Review of Factors which contribute to the Internationalisation of a programme of study, *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sports and Tourism Education*, 3, 1 5-18
- Bonnema, J. and Van der Walddt, D. 2008, Information and source preferences of a student market in higher education, *International Journal of Educational Management*, 22, 4, 314-327
- Briguglio, C. 2000, Language and Cultural Issues for English as a Second/Foreign Language Students in Transnational Educational Settings, *Higher Education in Europe*, 25, 3, 425-434
- Carroll, J. and Ryan, J. (Eds) 2005, *Teaching International Students – Improving Learning For All*. Abingdon, Routledge
- Caruana, V. and Hanstock, J. 2008, Internationalising the curriculum at the University of Salford: from rhetoric to reality, in McKenzie, A. and Shiel, C. (eds) *The Global University: The Role of Senior Managers*, London, Development Education Association.
- Caruana, V. and Spurling, N. 2007, *The Internationalisation of UK Higher Education: a review of selected material*, York, HEA, available on line at <http://www.hea/internationalisation/> (accessed 29/10/07)
- Chaffee, E. 1985, Three Models of Strategy, *Academy of Management Review*, 10, 1 89-98
- Clark, D. 1998, *Entrepreneurial Universities*, Oxford, Pergamon.
- Crosling, G, Edwards, R. and Schroder, B. 2008, Internationalizing the curriculum: the implementation experience in a Faculty of Business and Economics, *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 30, 2, 107-121
- David F. 2009, *Strategic Management, Concepts and Cases*, 12e Upper Saddle River NJ, Pearson
- De Vita, G. and Case, P. 2003, Rethinking the internationalization agenda in UK higher education, *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 27,4, 383-398
- Easterby-Smith, M. 1987, Change and Innovation in Higher Education: A Role for Corporate Strategy? *Higher Education*, 16, 1, 37-52
- Elkin, G, Devjee, F, and Farnsworth, J, 2005, Visualising the internationalization of Universities, *International Journal of Education Management*, 19,4 , 318-329
- Gelade, S. 2003, Internationalisation and Academic Staff at University of South Australia. Paper presented at the Australian International Education Conference, Melbourne 2003.
- Gibbs, P. and Murphy, P. 2009, Ethical Marketing of Higher Education: What might be done to encourage its adoption? *Higher Education Management and Policy*, 21, 3, 76-90

- Harris, R. 1995, Overseas students in the United Kingdom university system, *Higher Education*, 29, 77-92
- Ivy, J, 2001. Higher education institution image: a correspondence analysis approach, *International Journal of Education Management*, 15, 6, 276-282
- Jarzabkowski, P. 2003, Strategic practices: an activity theory perspective on continuity and change, *Journal of Management Studies*, 40, 1, 23-55
- Jiang, X. 2008, Towards and internationalization of higher education from a critical perspective, *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 32, 4, 347-358.
- Jones, E. 2009, Shouldn't all faculties be international? The International Faculty at Leeds Metropolitan University, *Enhancing Learning in the Social Sciences*, 2, 1, 1-19
- Knight J 1994 *Internationalisation: Elements and Checkpoints*, Ottawa, Canadian Bureau for International Education
- Knight J 2003 Updating the definition of Internationalisation, *International Higher Education*, 33, Fall, available at http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/newsletter/news33/textoo1.htm (accessed 18/10/07)
- Koutsantoni D 2006 Some examples of internationalization and their implications for the UK, London, The Leadership Foundation of HE, available on line at <http://www.lfhe.ac.uk/international/summit2006/index.html> (accessed 17/10/07)
- Kok, S. Douglas, A. McClelland, B. and Bryde, D. 2010, The Move Towards Managerialism: Perceptions of staff in "traditional" and "new" UK Universities, *Tertiary Education and Management*, 16,2, 99-113
- Leask, B. 2005, Internationalising the curriculum and intercultural engagement – a variety of perspectives and possibilities, paper presented at the Australian International Educational Conference, Gold Coast, October 2005
- Luxon, T. and Peelo, M. 2009, Internationalisation: its implication for curriculum design and course development in UK higher education, *Innovations in Teaching and Learning International*, 46,1, 51-60
- Lynch, R. 2009, *Strategic Management 5e*, Harlow, Pearson
- Marshall, S. 2007, *Strategic Leadership of Change in Higher Education*, Abdingdon, Routledge
- McNicholl, Y. Burney, S. and Luff, A. 2008, Enhancing faculty culture to meet student needs: internationalising the curriculum. Paper presented at Australian Universities Quality Agency Conference, Canberra July 2008.
- McRoy, I. and Gibbs, S. 2009, Leading Change in Higher Education, *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership*, 37, 687-707
- Mintzberg, H. 1987, Crafting Strategy, *Harvard Business Review*, 65, 4, 66-75
- Mintzberg, H. 1994, The Fall and Rise of Strategic Planning, *Harvard Business Review*, 72, 1, 107-104
- Poole, D. 2001 Moving towards professionalism: the strategic Management of International Education activities at Australian Universities and their Faculties of Business, *Higher Education*, 42, 4, 395-435
- Porter, M. 1996, What is Strategy? *Harvard Business Review*, 74, 6, 61-78

Qiang, Z. 2003, Internationalization of Higher Education: towards a conceptual framework, *Policy Futures in Education*, 1, 2, 248-270

Richardson, H. and Warwick, P. (2009) Building Cross Cultural Competencies 2009/51 The York Management School available on line at:
<http://www.york.ac.uk/management/research/working-paper/#10>

Rose, S. and Bylander, J. 2006, Border Crossings: Engaging students in Diversity Work and Intergroup Relations, *Innovations in Higher Education*, 31, 5, 251-264

Rudzki, R. 1995, The Application of a Strategic Management Model to the Internationalisation of Higher Education, *Higher Education*, 29, 4, 421-441

Ryan, J. and Hellmundt, S. 2003, Excellence through diversity: Internationalisation of curriculum and pedagogy, paper presented at IDP Australian International Education Conference, October 2003.

Ryan Y. 2006, From Strategy to implementation in a global University. Paper presented at HERSDA conference, Perth Aus. July 2008.

Schuerholtz-Lehr, S. 2007, Teaching for Global literacy in Higher Education: How prepared are the Educators? *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11, 180-207

Scott, P. 2002, The Future of general education in mass higher education systems, *Higher Education Policy*, 15, 61-75

Skyrme, G. 2007, Entering the university: the differentiated experience of two Chinese international students in a New Zealand university, *Studies in Higher Education*, Volume 32, 3, 357-372

Tait, C. 2010, Chinese Students' perceptions of the effects of western university examination formats on their learning, *Higher Education Quarterly*, 64, 3, 261-275

Taylor, J. 2004, Towards a strategy for internationalisation: lessons and practice from four Universities, *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 8:149-171.

Teece D, Pisano, G, Shuen A. 1997, Dynamic capabilities and strategic management, *Strategic Management Journal*, 18,7, 509-533.

Times Higher Education 03/09/10 *Overseas Growth exposes Brits to knowledge vacuum* p9

Trahar, S. 2007, *Teaching and learning: the international education landscape, some theories and working practices*, Bristol, Escalate

Wernerfelt, B. 1984, A Resource Based View of the Firm, *Strategic Management Journal* 5, 171-180

Winter, R. 2009, Academic manager or managed academic? Academic identity schisms in higher education, *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 31, 2, 121-131

Zepke, N. and Leach, L. 2005, Integration and adaptation, approaches to the student retention and achievement puzzle, *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 6, 1, 46-59