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Abstract

**Purpose** – The aim of this research is to examine higher education (HE) internationalization in terms of international recruitment and academic collaboration with the focus on a single institution case study. The research investigates how the case study university conducts HE internationalization, identifies key implementation issues of HE internationalization, and develops an education-specific market entry dynamic framework. The discussion of the difference in the process of internationalization across faculties is also included.

**Design/methodology/approach** – This research adopts the interpretivist philosophy and inductive approach, with focus of a single institution. Based on the positions and job responsibilities, the total of 20 interviewees from three key departments (Corporate, Department 2 and Faculty) were selected and 22 semi-structured interviews were conducted. The total of 329 pages of interview transcripts were analyzed. Other types of data collection include observation and secondary documentary data. The answers from each group were used in a comparative analysis, resulting in an overlap pattern structure that indicates the level of the university’s internal integration. Data analysis strategies include content analysis, critical discourse analysis (CDA), colour coding, and categorization of meaning.

**Findings and contributions** – The market entry dynamic framework is the main outcome of this research. This framework provides a number of education-specific modes of entry and programme delivery methods to guide institutions’ internationalization. The implementation issues raised in this research indicate that the university’s internal integration has a major impact on HE internationalization. These issues highlight the areas where the university needs to improve. Faculty-specific factors explain the difference in the process of internationalization across the four faculties at the case study university, and explain the reasons why the levels of internationalization are different among these faculties.
Limitations and further research -- This dynamic framework contributes to rich understanding of HE internationalization in terms of international recruitment and academic collaboration at the present case study, and creates a sound basis for further studies across the HE sector. Since there is only one university involved in this research, the associated research generalizability is low. Therefore, further research in this area is encouraged to test the generalizability of this framework at other universities through quantitative population studies.
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1.0 Higher Education Internationalization: Definition and Rationales
Since the 1990s, the international initiatives of universities have expanded dramatically in volume, scope, and complexity (Altbach and Knight, 2007). Internationalization of higher education covers a wide range of perspectives, from studying abroad and recruiting international students, to distance learning, research and scholarly collaboration (Altbach, 1998; Biddle, 2002; and De Wit, 2002). Knight, a Canadian researcher generally regarded as an expert on the internationalization of higher education (Feast and Bretag, 2005), describes HE internationalization as “the process of integrating an international / intercultural dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution” (Knight, 1993, p. 21). This definition presents HE internationalization as a dynamic process and not a set of isolated activities, integration or infusion that contributes to the sustainability of the international dimension of higher education (De Wit, 1999). It also refers to the primary and universal functions of a higher education institution, namely, teaching, research and service to society (Knight and De Wit, 1997 and Zha, 2003).

The most widely recognized possible rationales for HE internationalization are clustered by Knight and De Wit (1997, cited in Zha, 2003, p. 9-14) into four groups: political, economic, educational and cultural rationales. Each rationale implies different motives and has an important effect on the understanding of HE internationalization.

Economic rationale is primarily the desire to use higher education (HE) to help a nation or region compete in the global market. Economic rationales refers to the objectives related

---

1 Internationalization of higher education will be referred to as HE internationalization.

2 Economic rationale: “at the institutional level, the economic motive or market orientation is becoming more prevalent as well. A rigorous debate is now under way as to whether the export of education products to international market is in fact contributing to the international dimension of teaching, research and service. Clearly, there can be a direct and beneficial relationship between an international market orientation and the internationalization of the primary functions of a university / college or institute...If one is to ensure that improving the quality of higher education is the primary goal of internationalization, no the development of international export markets, it is essential to find the balance between income-generating motives and academic benefits” (Knight, 1997, p. 10, cited in Zha, 2003).
either to long-term economic effects, where HE internationalization is seen as a contribution to the skilled human resources needed for international competitiveness of a nation and where foreign graduates are seen as key to the country's trade relations, or to the direct economic benefits (Zha, 2003), for example, institutional income and the net economic effect of foreign full-fee paying students.

Political rationale is often driven by a national government. Political rationale relates to issues concerning the country's position and role as a nation in the world, for example, security, stability and peace, and ideological influence.

Academic rationale includes the desire to meet international standards of quality in teaching, research and service. It is presented mainly as the objectives related to the aims and functions of higher education, enhancement of academic quality in teaching and research, and improvement of the human, technical and management infrastructure system (Zha, 2003; Feast and Bretag, 2005). With the academic rationale, internationalization is set as part of institutions' missions, in which valuable experience of international dimension for both institutions and staff can be developed.

Cultural and social rationale mainly focuses on the development of individual learners to improve the quality of their lives. It encourages institutions to consider the perspectives of national innovation and social development. Students can benefit from inter-cultural knowledge and experience in the context of higher education. Each rationale implies

3 Political rationale: "Historically, international education was seen as a beneficial tool for foreign policy especially with respect to national security and peace among nations; while, this is still a consideration today, it does not have the importance it once did" (Knight, 1997, p. 9, cited in Zha, 2003).

4 Cultural / social rationale: "The preservation and promotion of national culture is a strong motivation for those countries which consider internationalization as a way to respect cultural diversity and counter balance the perceived homogenizing effect of globalization. The acknowledgement of cultural and ethnic diversity within and between countries is considered as a strong rationale for the internationalization of a nation's education system" (Knight, 1997, p. 11, cited in Zha, 2003). And "Related to this point is the need for improved international understanding and communication. The preparation of graduates who have a strong knowledge and skill base in intercultural relations and communications is considered by many academics as one of the strongest rationales for internationalizing the teaching / learning experience of students in undergraduate and graduate programmes" (Knight, 1997, p. 11, cited in Zha, 2003).
different motives and has an important effect on HE internationalization. By placing these rationales in the U.K. institutional context, the discourse of internationalization of HE can be summarized as follows: the economic benefit to home institutions, political benefit to boost higher education in home countries, academic benefit to an expansion in international initiatives, and cultural and social benefit to individual learners and entire society.

In respect to the economic rationale, international trade in education services has expanded rapidly over recent years. It was worth at least US $30 billion in 1999 and approximately 3% of total trade in service in OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) countries (Larsen and Tompkins, 2005). Although no university confirmed that income generation is a significant rationale, many researchers contend that the pursuit of profit is a key aspect of international education. This view is supported by Alexander and Rizvi (1993), Dobson (1998), Starck (2000), Matthews (2002), and Marginson (2003), who all agree that the key rationale for HE internationalization is economic. In the United Kingdom, Lines and Clarke (cited in Abramson, Bird and Stennett, 1996, p. 106) report a significant growth in off-shore programmes from the early 1990s. By 1998, the revenue from such programmes was estimated to exceed £250 million per annum. 80 British universities offering programmes in Malaysia (THES, 1998) and 50 universities offering off-shore programmes in Singapore (Tysome, 2000). According to Kemp (2002), international student market, comprising student fees and associated spending, is valued at £2.5 billion income to the U.K. economy. A recent survey conducted by UKCISA (United Kingdom Council for International Student Affairs, September 2010) indicates that a figure of £2.5 billion is estimated to be earned by U.K. public universities from these fees

---

5 For example, "Sir Colin Campbell, the University of Nottingham's Vice-chancellor emphasises that overseas campuses are not all about money. They are also about promotion opportunities for staff and students across the globe. 'It is about how best to create opportunity for talented people – whatever their nationality, culture or social status.' And according to Professor Drummond Bone, the University of Liverpool's Vice-chancellor, the campus [The whole university or a campus?] it has set up in Suzhou is an attractive proposition, both for research and teaching. Moreover, the university’s investment has been a fairly modest $2 million, a sum that has come not from Liverpool’s own coffers but from an American company called Laureate. 'There is no money that could have gone to Liverpool that has been channeled into China... Bone says. But Liverpool is in China not for the money, he says, but to get Liverpool’s name into the international market place" (Hodges, 2007, n.p – where does the quotation start and end?).
alone with another £2.5 billion spent by international students on goods and services in local communities, giving a total of £5 billion. For the majority of universities’ income, these fees paid by international students represent between 10% and 30% of total income.

In respect to the political rationale, in 2003, the U.K. Prime Minister launches a strategy to boost U.K. education across the world. The former Prime Minister, Tony Blair unveiled two five-year initiatives to boost the role of the United Kingdom in international education, aiming to attract an additional 100,000 overseas students to study in the United Kingdom and encouraging partnerships between universities / colleges in the United Kingdom and overseas institutions. Lord Kinnock (2003), Chair of the British Council and the Secretary of State for Education and Skills, states that the international initiative will help the United Kingdom build lasting mutually beneficial relationships with the people today. However, due to global economic recession since September 2008, in early 2010, U.K. government announced cuts to HE funds of up to £315 million. According to Guardian (2010), it means that thousands of young British students will lose the chance to study for a degree. The number of university places for local students will decrease and local tuition

---

6 Mr. Blair said: “Increasingly, education is crossing national boundaries as it prepares our young people for careers in the global economy. I am passionate about raising standards in education in our country, but that means that we must be willing to learn from the best in the world. It means sharing experience and knowledge and being open to innovation and creativity from whatever direction it comes. It is not just about getting student to choose U.K. universities and colleges. It is about building sustainable partnership between our university and college and those of other countries. We want to see many more shared research projects, shared courses and joint degrees; we want to see more exchanges of students and academic staff; we want U.K. education to become genuinely international.” (source: ‘New Labour’, the start of a worldwide campaign, London School of Economics, 18th June, 2003, London).

7 Lord Kinnock says: “International learning builds international understanding as well as opportunity, creativity and liberty. These initiatives will help the United Kingdom to build lasting relationships to mutual benefit with the people whose talents will shape our world in the twenty-first century.” (source: The publication of the White Pager, 22nd January, 2003, London).

8 “University funders at the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) will outline where the cuts of nearly £315m will be made today” Jessica Shepherd, title: “Cuts will deprive thousands of university place, academics warn” (source: The Guardian, 1st February 2010, www.guardian.co.uk).
fees will rise (ibid). The recession forces U.K. institutions to look at alternative income streams, and internationalization becomes a vital direction (such as targeting overseas full fee-paying students) for the coming two to five years.

In respect to the academic rationale, there has been an expansion in international activities at British universities; this is represented primarily by academic partnerships. There are more international visits, students and staff exchanges, research collaborations and cooperation and alliance agreements (Craft and Carr, 1998). Beside income generalization, altruism scholarship, increasing international profile, dissemination of knowledge, teaching and research are the motives for international academic collaboration. In addition, the academic rationale can be reflected in the internationalizing tertiary curricula and professional training along with updating qualifications of academic staff to international standards.

In respect to the cultural and social rationale, the U.K. government encourages HE internationalization and puts universities on the map of national innovation and social development. Important educational and social benefits include acquiring cross-cultural knowledge and competencies, improving foreign language proficiency (especially in English), establishing international personal and professional networks, familiarizing local students with other countries and cultures. This kind of experience benefits not only students, but also the whole society.

Whilst education is different from commercialization, in respect to international market expansion, the development of HE internationalization is partially based on business theory of internationalization. This indicates that some international approaches and market entry strategies can be shared between commercial internationalization and HE.

---

9 "Steve Smith, president of Universities United Kingdom - the umbrella group for vice-chancellors - has said the cut would force universities to deny places to thousands of students. It comes as a review is underway into whether tuition fees, now £3,225 a year, should rise to at least £5,000-6,000." Jessica Shepherd, title: "Universities tell Gordon Brown: cuts will bring us to our knees, exclusive top colleges warn", (source: The Guardian, 11th January, 2010, www.guardian.co.uk).
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Internationalization. Thus, this research uses literature on commercial internationalization as a foundation to explain higher education international development in terms of market expansion and address the associated issues and challenges.

Although internationalization has become a key strategic element for universities around the world (Ayoubi and Massoud, 2007; Maringe, 2009), in respect to international market expansion, current literature may not fully explain the international circumstance within an institutional context. Strategy implementation has become an essential part of business strategies in today's international competition; however, it seems that little attention has been given to particular issues and challenges arising from HE internationalization, in spite of many discussions of related factors in literature. This research critically examines higher education internationalization in terms of international recruitment and academic collaboration with the focus on a single institution case study. The aim is to investigate how the case study university conducts HE internationalization, identify critical implementation issues of HE internationalization and develop an education-specific market entry dynamic framework.

1.1 Reason for choosing this topic

Compared to commercial internationalization, HE internationalization is still a fresh area of research. This present study uses literature on commercial internationalization to interpret HE internationalization. Although there is some overlap between them, there is currently no body of research that can fully explain the observed international circumstance in the case study university.

Research in similar areas of HE internationalization either focuses on the overall discussion or description of the circumstance of HE internationalization (Ryan, 2002; Mazzarol, Soutar and Seng, 2003; Maslen, 2009), or is based upon quantitative surface studies (Mallea, 1998; Kishun, 1998; Oettli, 1999; HESA, 2009; British Council, 2010), thus lacking in-depth analysis and explanation of issues and challenges faced by a university or particular faculties. Thus, an education-specific analysis and particular
explanation within an institutional context are needed to guide institutions' internationalization.

A number of U.S authors (Harari, 1992; Pickert and Turlington, 1992; Hanson and Meyerson, 1995) present HE internationalization mainly as a process of setting up an overseas branch campus; however, most U.K. universities do not have overseas branch campuses. The case study university is a typical example of the universities that internationalize without establishing satellite campuses abroad.

Finally, this topic is closely linked with the researcher's interest and her overseas study experience. As a beneficiary of international academic collaboration, the researcher is keen to examine the different ways universities conduct HE internationalization, especially the market entry strategy, and the implementation issues faced by universities.

1.2 Research aim and objectives
The overall aim of this research is to examine higher education (HE) internationalization in terms of international recruitment and academic collaboration with the focus on a single institution case study. The objectives are:

a) To critically review literature on strategy implementation and identify key implementation issues of HE internationalization.

b) To critically evaluate how the case study university undertakes internationalization in terms of international recruitment and academic collaboration.

c) To highlight faculty-specific factors that affect the level of internationalization across faculties at the case study university.

10 Faculties A, B, C, and D.
d) To develop an education-specific market entry dynamic framework for HE internationalization.

A total of six research themes have been identified for this study. They are as follows:

Theme 1: Internationalization strategy and understanding
Theme 2: International recruitment strategy
Theme 3: Academic collaboration (3A), and programme delivery (3B)
Theme 4: Overseas branch campus
Theme 5: Problems, issues and challenges of HE internationalization
Theme 6: Internationalization of faculties

As a bespoke model for HE internationalization, the education-specific market entry dynamic framework is the main contribution of this study. The total of eight previous interviewees and four foreign partners of the case study university took part in debriefing and agreed with the research findings. The dynamic framework was also presented informally at two international academic conferences and the feedback received was also positive.

1.3 The structure of this thesis

Chapter 2 'Literature review' provides a theoretical underpinning of this thesis. Research on commercial internationalization is discussed alongside literature on HE internationalization mainly covering the following aspects: theories of international approach, market entry strategy, strategy implementation, forms, challenges and risks of internationalization.

---

11 W.E Council, Malaysia; MM Institute, Malawi; BA College, Botswana; and SHM School, Switzerland.

12 International conferences: 'Vice Chancellor's 2010 Teaching and Learning International Conference' organized by the University of Plymouth, 30th June, 2010, Plymouth, United Kingdom; and 'University of Derby Collaboration Annual Conference 2010' organized by the University of Derby, 6th-7th July 2010, Buxton Campus, United Kingdom.
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HE internationalization. A gap may emerge between commercial internationalization and HE internationalization.

Chapter 3 ‘Research methodology’ identifies this qualitative research as based upon the interpretivist research philosophy. The open-ended exploratory nature of the inductive approach fits the design of this research. A post-1992 university is chosen as the case study. Based on positions and job responsibilities, 20 interviewees from three key departments were selected (the corporate group, or the senior management in charge of advancing the university’s strategic plan; the Department 2 group,\textsuperscript{13} who coordinate international initiatives across different departments responsible for international recruitment, initiatives and student support; and the faculty group, the academic teaching team who are responsible for strategy implementation). A total of 329 pages of interview transcripts were analysed. During the course of the study, the researcher had an opportunity to witness first-hand a potential collaboration between the case study university and Si Academy\textsuperscript{14} in China. As a representative of Si Academy, the researcher was directly involved in the process of establishing a partnership. This experience was analysed alongside the observed data in order to enhance triangulation. Four types of data analysis strategies were undertaken: content analysis, categorization of meaning, critical discourse analysis (CDA), and documentary data analysis.

Chapter 4 ‘Case study’ presents and analyses data gathered through field research at the case study university. The answers from each group (Corporate, Department 2 and Faculty) are used in comparative analysis, revealing an overlap pattern, which consists of common points (agreed by three groups), partially shared points (agreed by two groups), and group-specific points (expressed by a single group). The proportion of overlap indicates the level of integration among the key departments at the university.

\textsuperscript{13} Recent developments at the case study university include re-structuring of Department 2 and transferring its responsibility to other departments; thus previous issues in relation to Department 2 may still exist in other departments within the university.

\textsuperscript{14} Si Academy is the researcher’s previous employer in China.
Chapter 5 ‘Construction of the dynamic framework’ develops the market entry dynamic framework that provides education-specific modes of entry and programme delivery methods. The dynamic framework is constructed based on the analysis of international approaches and HE international development stage.

Chapter 6 ‘Conclusion and recommendations’ summarises the dynamic framework as the main research contribution that explains the relationship between commercial internationalization and HE internationalization. This education-specific framework may reveal more implementation issues, which could determine the success of HE internationalization. Recommendations are provided and areas for further research are identified.

1.4 Research limitations
This research critically examines HE internationalization in terms of international recruitment and academic collaboration, and defines a bespoke framework for HE internationalization. This framework offers different education-specific modes of entry and programme delivery methods to guide institutions’ internationalization. The limitations of this research are summarized as follows: lower generalizability, using a single case study, selection of interviewees and, scope of this research.

Firstly, research findings in this project help improve the understanding of the international recruitment and academic collaboration in the present case study, thus the generalizability of this study is low. Although triangulation improves the validity and reliability of this research, the findings based upon a single case study remain as a conceptual framework at the current stage (see discussion of generalizability, Chapter 3, section 3.4.3). Further research will focus on testing the generalizability of this research (see discussion of further research, Chapter 6, section 6.4).

Secondly, instead of multiple case studies, this study focuses upon a single institution (see discussion of the choice of a case study, Chapter 3, section 3.2.2.1.1). The researcher used
to be a student at the case study university. The case selection is based on data availability and accessibility. Interview questions address some sensitive issues and present an incremental level of cognitive involvement through analytical and evaluative questions (see discussion of the nature of interview question, Chapter 4, section 4.3). Compared to other universities, the researcher's interview requests are more likely to be accepted by the staff at the same university. The case selection increases the researcher's chances to gain richer and more valuable answers. Furthermore, the case study university is a typical example of a large group of U.K. institutions who conduct HE internationalization without overseas branch campuses. This sample section makes the research findings more likely to be transferable and applicable to other similar cases within this group.

Thirdly, all interviewees are members of the three key departments of the case study university (Corporate, Department 2 and Faculty). Their work relates directly to HE internationalization. This research aims to investigate how the case study university undertakes HE internationalization, thus neither other departments (such as estate management, career development and environment service), nor students (home or international) are involved as interviewees.

With respect to interviewee selection, there is always a possibility of bias, especially in qualitative research (not only for this study) in terms of members of staff self-selecting to participate in the interviews with an individual purpose to give answers either to promote a point of view or to force an issue. In order to limit bias, this research collects data from three different sources (interviews, observation and secondary data) and adopts triangulation, participant observation, ethnography research strategies and critical discourse data analysis to correlate, compare and evaluate the value of the data collected. However, in addition to primary data, other evidence (such as observed or secondary data) may not be available for every interview question (see discussion of data presentation and analysis, Chapter 4, section 4.5); therefore, not every primary data is triangulated with other evidence. Although this matter is out of the researcher’s control, the conclusions gleaned from the data analysis can be evaluated or affirmed through further research.
Finally, this study examines HE internationalization only in terms of international recruitment and academic collaboration. Since the case study university does not have an overseas branch campus, the operation and development of a foreign satellite campus is outside the scope of this study, but may be investigated through further research (see discussion of further research, Chapter 6, section 6.4).
Chapter Two Literature Review

2.0 Overview

Literature review provides a theoretical underpinning for this study. Internationalization is not a new notion and internationalization of higher education (HE) has increased significantly since 1990s. The development of HE internationalization is partially based on the commercial internationalization theories. The main body of literature includes two parts (see figure 2.1): literature on commercial internationalization and literature on HE internationalization. Literature on commercial internationalization includes theories of international approach (2.1), mode of entry (2.2), strategy implementation and obstacles (2.3), choice of international market (2.4), literature on HE internationalization includes internationalization of HE (2.5), models and forms of HE internationalization (2.6), and challenges and risks of HE internationalization (2.7). To a certain degree, the literature on commercial internationalization and HE internationalization overlap.

However, the nature of education is different from commercialization; therefore, there is no comprehensive overlap between the literature on commercial internationalization and HE internationalization. None of them (either on commercialization or on education) can fully explain internationalization process in the case study. A gap exists between commercial internationalization and HE internationalization, and literature compares the related areas regarding international approach, mode of entry, and risks and challenges of HE internationalization (see figure 2.1, linked by the dotted line) via the scopes of commercial internationalization and HE internationalization. The structure of literature review is presented in figure 2.1.
Since the literature on commercial internationalization has a longer history and a stronger background than research on HE internationalization, the following discussion starts with the examination of the literature on commercial internationalization.

2.1 Theories of international approach
This section discusses six theories of international approach. All of them are from commercial or manufacturing background. Scholars identify these approaches based on different perspectives, not all of which are applicable to HE internationalization. Although no theory of international approach can fully explain the international circumstance in HE internationalization, some can partially interrelate to the development of HE internationalization. This section addresses the characteristics of each international approach, investigates their compatibility with HE internationalization and finally highlights the applicable approaches by eliminating the ones unsuitable for this case study.
2.1.1 Uppsala school approach

Johanson and Vahlne (1977, 1990) developed the Uppsala school approach as a result of an incremental process of international involvement. The main relationship is between the development of the foreign market and the growth spurts of the parent company. With the Uppsala school approach, additional market commitment is made in small incremental steps, where the knowledge can be gained by experience, and accumulated experience leads to a better understanding of the knowledge gained. The knowledge and experience learnt in one geographical area can be transferred to another region. Every stage is a learning process where knowledge and experience are gained regularly. The entire process takes longer time, but presents lower risk to the parent organization because internationalization is usually conducted through a trial and error process, which reduces potential risks.

This approach implies that organizations increase their international involvement through small incremental steps. According to Anderson (2000), organizations will enter new markets that are at a greater 'psychic distance' due to differences in culture, languages, education, and business practices. This accumulated knowledge in conducting international operations drives internationalization by influencing the entry mode and country-market selection (ibid). The Uppsala school approach suggests that a new foreign market entrant gradually becomes involved in a foreign market through a pattern of entry modes beginning with exporting, then establishing an international sales subsidiary and, finally, establishing offshore production facilities (Johanson and Widersheim, 1975).

The Uppsala school approach has been criticized as too deterministic (Reid, 1981; Turnbull, 1987). Reid and Turnbull consider that an organization may be more internationalized if it views and handles different country markets as interdependent rather than completely separate entities. Furthermore, if organizations were to develop in accordance with this theory, individuals would have no strategic choices (Andersson, 2000). Another big challenge is the speed of market entry. Today many organizations simply do not follow the traditional pattern of internationalization proposed by the Uppsala school approach. For example, IT companies enter foreign markets with a speedy
expansion, rather than following incremental steps. Also, some organizations are international from the start; these are called international new ventures (McDougall, 1994; Oviatt and McDougall, 1994 and 1995), born global (Madsen and Servais, 1997), and global start-ups (Oviatt and McDougall, 1995). Adopting mixed entry modes simultaneously also increases market entry speed.

In response to these criticisms, Johanson and Vahlne (1997) suggest three exceptions\(^{15}\) to the Uppsala school approach of incremental market commitment, but the drawback of speed still exists because one of the main weaknesses of the Uppsala school approach is that knowledge development and experience accumulation are time consuming. In the Uppsala school approach, knowledge is gained through a trial and errors process that does take time. Nordstrom and Kleiner (1990) affirm this argument by stating that the world has become much more homogeneous and the impact of physical distance has been reduced. Recent starters would like to enter directly into large markets rather than through a step-by-step knowledge and experience-building process (ibid). Another weakness is that the companies adopting the Uppsala school approach take a self-focused position and concentrate on their own activities, ignoring the environment (such as competition and political policy) during international market expansion. Porter (1985) states that competition is one of the most important factors in internationalization. Organizations must carefully consider their competitive environment before moving into a foreign market.

The above nature and weaknesses of the Uppsala school approach limit its application to HE internationalization, especially in the areas of international recruitments and academic collaborations. In a broad sense, education belongs to service industry and therefore programmes can be considered 'soft' products. With 'soft' products, institutions have to make sure that the processes of producing (teaching) and consuming (learning) are launched abroad simultaneously. Universities cannot ask overseas students or partners to

\(^{15}\) These are: (i) when firms have large resource they may be expected to make larger internationalization steps; (ii) when market conditions are stable and homogeneous relevant market knowledge can be gained in ways other than through experience; and (iii) when the firm has considerable experience from markets with similar conditions it may be possible to generalize this experience to the specific market. Johanson and Vahlne (1997) also contend that the internationalization process is based on the behavior of different actors in the firm and, in particular, on those who are engaged in a foreign market.
wait until sufficient necessary knowledge and experience has been gained. The nature of the Uppsala school approach is incompatible with the inseparability of service in education (Carman and Langeard, 1980; Nicoulaud, 1986). The incremental knowledge/experience development obstructs service delivery. Furthermore, since the 1990s, the development of HE internationalization has increased considerably (see discussion of Internationalization of HE, Chapter 2, section 2.5). Entry speed and market competition are vital factors for education. Since the Uppsala school approach cannot overcome this weakness, this international approach is not applicable to HE internationalization.

2.1.2 Transactional cost analysis (TCA)

The initial notion of transactional cost was established by Coase (1937), who identifies transactional cost as a yardstick to measure cost prior to selecting internal (hierarchical) or external (agents or distributors) expansions. Based on Coase’s (1937) point, Anderson and Gatignon (1986) developed a transactional cost analysis approach called ‘transactional cost analysis’ (TCA). Anderson and Gatignon argue that the market entry mode selection should be able to maximize long-term efficiency measured by the risk-adjusted rate of return on investment (ROI). It is suggested that control is the most important determinant of risk and return. High-control entry modes (for example, wholly owned subsidiaries, acquisition and greenfield, see discussion of hierarchical mode of entry, Chapter 2, section 2.2.3) increase return on the one hand and risk on the other hand. By contrast, low-control modes (for example, licensing, export and contract manufacturing) involve less commitment of investment but also have lower returns. An organization will tend to expand until the cost of organizing an extra transaction within the firm (firm-based) will become equal to the cost of carrying out the same transaction by means of an exchange on the open market (market-based).

TCA acts on a platform between externalization, which is market-based, and internationalization, which is firm-based. The key measurement is cost. If the cost of external expansion (such as through partners, agents or distributors) is lower than the cost of internal expansion (such as through own subsidiaries or branches), then the direction will be taken towards externalization. Lee and Carter (2005) state that TCA is based on the
MARKET ENTRY MODE OF HIGHER EDUCATION INTERNATIONALIZATION: A CASE STUDY OF A POST-1992 UNIVERSITY

CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW

theory that an organization will internalize if it can perform at a lower transactional cost than if it exported or entered into a contractual arrangement with a local partner. TCA always prefers lower cost. But why does TCA always prefer the option of lower cost? Coase (1937) explains it as there is a friction between sellers (organizations) and buyers (customers), and consequently transaction costs emerge. So organizations intend to minimize their costs through lower cost solutions.

However, cost is also a drawback of TCA: the approach uses cost as the only measurement, thus bypassing human contribution. Ouchi (1980) evaluates social issues and points out that the relevance of intermediate forms (between markets and hierarchies), such as the clan, where governance is based on a win-win cooperation (in contrast to a zero-sum game situation) is significant. For instance, building trustworthy relationships is always preferred for long-term development. Ghoshal and Moran (1996) criticize TCA mainstream as too narrow an assumption of human nature and opportunities, and its equally narrow interpretation of economic objectives. Cost is a key issue, but it cannot be the only criteria in determining an organization’s international development.

Another weakness is that TCA does not fit the development of small or medium enterprises (Christensen, 2001). In general, small companies lack resource, such as knowledge, capital and experience, which leaves them fewer opportunities to decide their own international structures (either through internalizing or externalizing), thus rendering them less competitive on the international market. Small or medium enterprises have to rely on large companies by becoming their contractual partners or outsourcers. This is the reason why so many outsourcing or contract manufacturing organizations emerge: they are not strong enough to compete on their own or decide their own direction of development. Therefore, TCA is not suitable for small or medium organizations.

In relation to HE internationalization, TCA can be used in international student recruitment through agents, partnerships and satellite campuses. The cost and involvement increase incrementally from agent recruitment to setting up a satellite campus. Cost is an important concern in universities’ international expansion. Recruitment through agents and foreign
partners belongs to external expansion, and the latter requires more investment. The satellite campus is categorized under internal expansion with the heaviest investment compared to the other two forms (agent recruitment and partnership collaboration). Most institutions choose agents and partners (through external expansion) because the associated cost is much lower than establishing overseas branch campuses (through internal expansion). Cost measurement determines the forms of market expansion. Thus, TCA is applicable to HE internationalization.

2.1.3 OLI / contingency approach or eclectic paradigm

Dunning (1988) argues that market entry modes are influenced by OLI: ownership, location and internalization. The OLI approach sets out to explain “the extent, form and pattern of international production” and is founded on “the juxtaposition of the ownership of specific advantages of firms contemplating foreign production...the propensity to internalize the cross-border markets for these, and the attractions of a foreign market for the production” (Dunning, 1988, p. 12). The OLI paradigm is used to explain different forms of international production as well as the selection of a country for foreign direct investment (FDI). It describes the degree to which the organization has advantages due to the three components of the paradigm.

Ownership is specific to the company and related to the accumulation of intangible assets, technological capacities or product innovation. Intangible assets include the organization’s asset power, frequently reflected in its size (Yu and Ito, 1988; Terpstra and Yu, 1990), multinational experience (Gatignon and Anderson, 1988), and ability to develop differentiated products (Anderson and Coughlan, 1987).

Location refers to the institutional and productive factors present in a particular geographical area. Location advantages arise when it is better to combine products manufactured in the home country with irremovable factors and intermediate products of another location (such as lower cost of labour, material and tax incentives). The location advantage relates to such factors as market potential, which can be measured by size and growth and investment risk (Khoury, 1979; Terpstra and Yu, 1990). The advantage of
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location is associated with the economic and political conditions in a target market (Agarwal and Ramaswami, 1992).

Internalization stems from the capacity of the organizations to manage and coordinate activities internally in the value-added chain. These are related to the integration of transactions into multinational hierarchies through foreign direct investment (such as greenfield and acquisition; see discussion of hierarchical mode of entry, Chapter 2, section 2.2.3). Dunning (1988) states that it is more beneficial for a company to make direct use of its competitive advantage in a foreign country rather than to sell or lease it to someone else. Internalization is concerned with the company’s ability to transfer ownership-specific advantages across national borders (Anderson and Gatignon, 1986).

Li (1994, 2003) confirms a positive relationship between ownership-specific factors (for example, technology, marketing skills, finances, the organization’s size and internationalization). Dunning (1998) emphasizes the importance of location-specific factors as having a significant impact on non-production costs (for example, transaction costs), since location-specific costs are rising faster than production costs. However, the main drawbacks of OLI are higher investment and less consideration for competition (Woodcock, Beamish and Makino, 1994). Return on investment (ROI) is directly linked to the amount of investment. Less consideration for environmental issues (such as competition) leads to high uncertainties. Thus, although OLI aims to reap the highest benefit, it may not be easy to implement in practice.

With the OLI approach, greenfield and acquisition are two typical market entry modes. Pinto and Rouhiainen (2001) indicate that as far as the financial services sector is concerned, the advantages of OLI approach are greatest when the organization uses acquisition as its market entry mode. However, Pinto and Rouhiainen’s view may be only suitable for commercial internationalization because HE internationalization often adopts greenfield (such as establishing own overseas branch campuses), instead of acquisition (see discussion of hierarchical mode of entry, Chapter 2, section 2.2.3).
In addition, the weakness of ignoring competition affects the application of OLI in HE internationalization because although ownership advantage can protect the institution’s core competence (for example, intellectual property), specific products (such as curriculum and programmes) and associated intangible assets, the university may struggle to compete on the international market because the ownership advantage can only be managed internally. It is difficult for an institution to access and control or manage the competitors’ competences or resources. With the OLI approach, the institution focuses on a ‘self-concentrated position’ and overlooks the importance of cooperation with other institutions (for example, local partners), while the resource-based approach is an option to overcome this weakness (as discussed later, see section 2.1.6).

2.1.4 Agency approach
The agency approach is based on Jensen and Meckling’s (1976) principle of a contract where parent companies delegate agents (Carney and Gedajlovic, 1991). The feature of agency approach is information transfer. Parent companies control a set of economic functions or assets through some form of ownership or property rights. The control of these functions or assets can be delegated from the parent companies to the agents who operate on their behalf (Jensen and Meckling, 1976).

The effect of the agency approach on HE internationalization is twofold. The traditional and most common method of HE internationalization is to recruit foreign students to come to the institutions’ home campuses. This recruitment relies heavily on overseas agents who are delegated by home institutions. However, education agents do not exclusively represent a single institution. Instead, they work independently and serve many institutions simultaneously. Agents act as middlemen between institutions and local customers / students. The agency approach can be seen as a reaction to the TCA measurement (see section 2.1.2). For instance, if the cost of setting up own subsidiaries (internalization) is higher than using agents (externalization), institutions will prefer to use agents. However, the main drawback of the agency approach is that when agents become intermediates in international business, their capabilities and characteristics may lead to lower loyalty. Since agents are paid by commission, they could potentially put more effort into an
organization's competitors in order to gain higher commission. A higher financial benefit (commercialization) is always an effective incentive for agents.

During information transfer, the agency approach also highlights the problem of information asymmetry (Arrow, 1971), which arises when agents begin to acquire detailed knowledge of business operations. The risk is in an organization's competitors being able to access information from same agents. In commercial internationalization, this causes the parent company's advantages to diminish and makes it difficult to manage the agents. However, the asymmetry problem is not typical for HE internationalization because most information (for example, entry requirement, fees, qualifications, English language proficiency levels, length of study and study environment) transferred between universities and agents is about student recruitment rather than the syllabus. As a core competence, the syllabus and curriculum are only involved in partnership and collaboration, such as teaching and learning. Agents do not access these resources (including curriculum, syllabus, teaching material, workshops, assessment and moderation); nor are they interested in teaching. Thus, the asymmetry problem does not affect home institutions during international recruitment.

2.1.5 Industrial network approach
Johansson and Mattson (1988) explain that the industrial network approach views an international organization in relation to other organizations in the marketplace; hence an international organization is not seen as an isolated actor. The position of an organization within a domestic (local) network can be used as a connection to other networks in other countries. According to Whitelock (2002), the industrial network approach addresses the major weakness of both the Uppsala school approach and OLI in that these two approaches view an international decision as one taken by an individual within an organization. Johanson and Mattsson (1986) express a similar view. They believe that the Uppsala school approach and OLI concentrate on the autonomy of the organization in developing its international marketing activity. It is the organization, or rather individuals within it, who determines how it will enter a specific market abroad.
The strength of the industrial network approach to internationalization lies in explaining the process rather than the existence of multinational or international organizations. Johanson and Vahlne (1990) extend the Uppsala school approach involved in network development that is new to the organization, whereas penetration means developing positions and increasing resource commitments in networks in which the organization already participates. Thus, if the relationships between organizations are seen as a network, it can be argued that organizations internationalize because other organizations in their (inter)national network are doing so. However, this kind of network penetration is not suitable for HE internationalization because institutions may skip the step of domestic network development and internationalize directly by collaborating with foreign institutions. Another weakness of the industrial network approach is that this relationship emphasizes interaction of network members rather than the characteristics of individual network member. Typical examples are organizations in the supply chain and logistics industries where each member aims to maintain or improve its relationship with others while giving less consideration to its own features. Thus its business survives on the network. However, the network remains unstable because each member relies heavily on others' resources, if one unit / member changes its status or withdraws, the entire network needs to be rearranged as a consequence of this change.

According to Cunningham (1986), the industrial system is a network of organizations engaged in the production, distribution and use of goods and services through which lasting business relationships are established, developed and maintained. However, this approach does not work in HE internationalization. Although academic collaboration does establish and enhance an education network (partnerships) among institutions, each institution remains independent. International academic collaboration (network) adds credibility to both partners, but none of them rely solely on the partnership. By contrast, they can exit the collaboration (network) at any time and this withdrawal will not affect their partnership with other institutions. Institutions do not survive or rely heavily on the partner’s resources and commitment to continue their institutional functions. Therefore, the industrial network approach is not applicable to HE internationalization.
2.1.6 Resource-based approach

The resource-based approach (also called resource-based view, RBV) aims to develop a dynamic capability of competitive advantages. This approach views the organization as a source of competitive advantage (Barney, 1991). Many authors have proposed a similar characteristic of resource as sustaining a long-term competitive advantage (Barney, 1991; Grant, 1991; Mahoney and Pandian, 1992; Peteraf, 1993 and Wernerfelt, 1997). For example, Barney (1991) argues that resources must be valuable, rare, imperfectly imitable and not substitutable, and Grant (1991) proposes that resources must capture durability, transparency, transferability and replicability. These attributes are "often relatively broad and hazy" (Winter, 1995, p. 23) and there are no "clear boundaries between them" (Andersen and Kheam, 1998, p. 74). Resources in general can be considered as stocks of available tangible or intangible factors, which are owned or controlled by the organizations and converted into products or services. The resource-based view (RBV), developed within the field of strategic management, has two roots: seminal writings on business strategy by Andrews (1971, cited in Foss, 1995) and Chandler (1962, cited in Foss, 1995) among others; and Penrose's (1959) theory of the growth of the organization, which characterizes organizations as a collection of heterogeneous or firm-specific resources (Foss, 1995). The resource-based approach in HE internationalization tends towards the former root: development of strategic management, where the resource-based approach has been adopted as an international strategy in terms of academic collaboration.

In HE internationalization, resource compatibility between the home university and the partner institution is a prerequisite. Tangible resources include curriculum, research basis, campus environment, facilities and accommodations; intangible resources include staff, students, technology, and reputation and partnerships, among others. In addition to compatibility, the resource-based approach recognizes the importance of intangible knowledge-based resources in providing a competitive advantage during HE internationalization. This is manifest in education because the resource-based approach addresses not only the ownership of resources, but also the ability for organizational learning required to develop new resources. New resource can become a competitive advantage and create new core competence.
The resource-based approach can be described as a cross-dimension of both internal and external resources in the university-oriented mode. For example, internal university-oriented resource (tangible and intangible) is an important prerequisite. Without internal resource, it will be difficult for the university to compete on both domestic and international markets. Thus, university-oriented resource must be competitive and reliable; then it will be possible to develop external university-oriented resource, such as international collaborations, partnerships with various expert organizations, research institutions or educational associations. External university-oriented resources can be achieved through different modes of entry, including franchise, validation, articulation, top-up, and credit transfer. Although some resources, such as e-journals and e-books, can be accessed by internet, most physical resources, such as facilities and hard copies of books and journals, are located centrally on the home campus. Thus, even within the resource-based approach, some resources are not equally shared.

The weakness of the resource-based approach is that its theoretical foundations are still at an early stage of development and therefore it is sometimes difficult to discern to what degree previous researchers are relying on internationalization research or the resource-based approach. Here, the researcher criticizes the resource-based approach based on primary research. There are two drawbacks of the resource-based approach. Firstly, resources are difficult to maintain; for example, resources can suddenly vanish if a key person leaves the university or a key academic partner withdraws. Thus, resources are not permanently reliable. The organization must keep learning and exploring new resources for its continuous development. Secondly, the resource-based approach does not guarantee the creation of core competence even if the resource is unique, because sometimes the unique resources are too unique to find markets or ‘feeders’ (see discussion of Q 7.2, Chapter 4). Owning unique resources does not mean gaining core competence. Core competence is only created in the process of developing rather than simply assessing certain resources.
2.1.7 Summary

Each theory of international strategy shows different perspectives on internationalization. The principle of the Uppsala school approach is that entering a particular market depends on what knowledge and experience has been acquired by organizations. However, this approach makes no explicit mention of the impact of competition at the point of market entry. The OLI approach emphasizes location, ownership and internalization, and the transaction cost analysis (TCA) relies on a cost-based measurement. Both OLI and TCA approaches pay more attention to the transactional cost (in this case, of internationalization), while ignoring market competition. The agency approach emphasizes how functional relationships are organized efficiently, and focuses on the transfer of knowledge and experience between agents and parent companies. However, lower loyalty is a main and inevitable weakness of the agency approach. Although the industrial network approach can be considered a means of identifying a foreign market in terms of international expansion, it relies heavily on the interdependence among the network members and overlooks the characteristics of each individual organization. Internal and external resource development and arrangement is the main feature of the resource-based approach. This approach encourages resource compatibility and complementarities but does not guarantee resource reliability and development of core competence.

Mixed approaches are needed in order to better understand HE internationalization because firstly, not every international approach is applicable to HE internationalization; and secondly, the relevant ones may not provide full explanation of HE internationalization. They may focus on a facet of a certain development stage of HE internationalization. Four theories of international approaches are compatible with HE internationalization: TCA, agency, resource-based and OLI\(^\text{16}\) (see discussion of the applicable group, Chapter 5, section 5.1.1). The remaining two approaches (the Uppsala school approach and the industrial network approach) are eliminated (see discussion of the eliminated group, Chapter 5, section 5.1.2).

---

\(^{16}\) Since the case study university does not have an overseas branch campus, the application of OLI currently remains an area for further development.
Theories of international approach are always linked to the mode of entry. Ekeledo and Sivakumar (2004), and Javalgi (2003) state that the resource-based approach and TCA have been used to explain the international market entry mode strategies of manufacturing and service organizations. The international approach is the basic platform for internationalization, while the mode of entry is a particular 'action' strategy for international market expansion. The next section focuses on the mode of entry and investigates the associated compatibility in HE internationalization.

2.2 Mode of entry

According to Terpstra (1987, p. 52), market entry is "one of the most critical decisions in international marketing" because it sets the framework for channel structure and the level of control an organization will have over its marketing channel (Stern and El-Ansary, 1982). Root (1994) states that an international market entry mode is an institutional arrangement, which makes the company's products, technology, human skills, management or other resources available in a foreign country. According to Albaum, Strandskov and Duerr (1998), the entry mode is an important step as it decides the degree of the company's control over the selected market and the consequent decisions in terms of management, implementation and evaluation will affect every aspect of the business.

In commercial internationalization, an organization can arrange its entry into a foreign country through two main options. The first option is producing products outside the target country market and then exporting them to a foreign country. The second option is transferring the company's resources, technology, capital, human skills, and enterprise to a foreign country. However, the question is whether these modes of entry are compatible with HE internationalization. If yes, then how do these modes of entry apply to HE internationalization, and if no, then what are the associated reasons of the incompatibility? The researcher assumes that not every mode of entry is suitable for HE internationalization because educational services are described as 'idiosyncratic' (Erramilli and Rao, 1993), characterized by unusually high levels of professional skills, specialized knowledge and customization in the delivery of instruction. The concerns of controlling and maintaining
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(for example, quality of service provision and governmental policy) are bound to influence the mode of entry. In addition, E-learning (also known as information communication technology, ICT) is not identified properly by current literature on mode of entry in terms of internationalization. There are no studies categorizing E-learning as a mode of entry. However, E-learning is an actual market entry strategy in HE internationalization (see discussion of borderless education and transnational education in section 2.6.1.5, Chapter 2; and Q 4.1, Chapter 4). This research intends to filter out the unsuitable modes of entry, identify the applicable ones, add any overlooked and potential options and create an education-specific market entry dynamic framework for HE international markets expansion.

Hollensen (2004) classifies the existing modes of entry into three mode groups. Each mode group offers different levels of control, risk, benefit and costs. These modes of entry are termed export, intermediate and hierarchical.

2.2.1 Export mode of entry
Using the export mode of entry, the company’s products are manufactured in the domestic market or a third country and then transferred either directly or indirectly to host markets. It is the most common mode for an initial entry into an international market. Entering a foreign market by exporting is a low-risk and highly flexible way because it requires minimal commitment of foreign investments or adjustment to the company’s domestic planning, although it might suffer from the low control of friction between home and overseas markets by the exporting organization (Root, 1994). Export channels can be either direct (through agents and distributors) or indirect (through brokers and piggybacks).

2.2.1.1 Direct export
Direct export occurs when exporting companies sell directly to an importer or buyer located in a foreign market area (Hollensen, 2005). Exporting companies can access foreign market and contact foreign customers through agents and distributors who purchase goods directly from the exporting companies and sell them to local customers. The difference between the two is that distributors buy and sell products on their own
account, while agents act on behalf of exporting companies and receive a commission (Hollensen, 2004). Companies with direct exporting have existing business contracts and employ foreign nationals (agents or distributors) to sell through commission or profit margin. In HE internationalization, the direct export form is a traditional and typical mode adopted by most HE institutions. It is represented by student mobility (see discussion of student mobility, section 2.6.1.1), where students are recruited to study at the foreign institution's home campus. The products of education are programmes and courses; the clients are students.

In a broad industry definition, education belongs to the service industry. The inseparability of production and consumption is a typical feature in service (Booms and Nyquist, 1981). Inseparability may pose additional problems for education, “where student participation in their leaning process is a critical factor in determining success” (Shuell and Lee, 1976, p. 6). The learning and teaching processes cannot be separated in education. Thus, instead of directly exporting products (programmes or courses) abroad, institutions ‘import’ students (customers) to come over to the institutions’ home campuses. This circumstance has emerged since the 1990s and has remained common today. The USA, United Kingdom, Canada, Australia and New Zealand have been among the largest ‘exporters’ of higher education service, while areas like India, China, South-East Asia, Middle East and Africa have become larger suppliers of student ‘customers’ (Australian Education International, 2005; Mai, 2005). In the U.K. higher education sector, the Education Reform Act, enacted by Margaret Thatcher’s “New Right” Government in 1988, and the subsequent Further and Higher Education Act 1992, were the legislations that brought U.K. higher education to the markets (Johnson, 2001). A survey by CVCP (Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals, United Kingdom, 2000) shows that 73% of U.K. universities report that their institutional missions included an international strategy.

Tertiary education has become a major global export commodity. It can be reflected in student mobility (see discussion of student mobility, Chapter 2, section 2.6.1.1). According to OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development), 2.7 million tertiary students were enrolled outside their country of citizenship (OECD, 2006) and current
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projections indicate that the number may double by 2015. The OECD estimates that the higher education market in its member states is conservatively worth approximately U.S. $40 billion annually (UNESCOPRESS, 2005) with USA, United Kingdom and Australia leading the way in the provision of international education (Hatakenaka, 2004). Thus direct export is applicable to HE internationalization.

2.2.1.2 Indirect export

With indirect exporting, a company uses a domestic intermediary which then sells the products abroad. Thus from the exporting company’s perspective, the sale is strictly speaking domestic (Czinkota, 1994). Domestic intermediaries include independent organizations, such as brokers and piggybacks. In fact, the exporting organization is not really engaging in global marketing because its products are carried abroad by others. Smaller companies often engage in piggyback where a company (rider) with limited experience and/or resources uses the infrastructure of a larger company (carrier) to introduce its products in a foreign market (Hollensen, 1998). In compensation, the carrier either receives a commission or acts as a distributor buying the product from the producer and selling it on international markets. However, besides the benefits, there are certain risks for both parties (carrier and rider): the carrier often puts his reputation on the line, so it is the carrier whose name stands for the product quality, warranty and the continuity of supply (Hollensen, 2004). The rider, on the other hand, has a financial disadvantage of having to pay commission that he otherwise could earn himself, and is extremely dependent on the larger carrier. Neither the carrier nor the rider works in HE internationalization. Education is a knowledge-based service that requires a higher level of academic commitment. Generally, the products (programmes / courses) cannot be carried by non-academic parties, such as broker or piggyback. The nature of education eliminates indirect export from the analysis of HE internationalization.

2.2.2 Intermediate mode of entry

Intermediate entry modes are primarily vehicles for the transfer of knowledge and skills. They are different from the hierarchical entry modes (as discussed later, see section 2.2.3) in a way that there is no full ownership by the parent company, but the ownership and
management are shared between the home organization and the overseas partner. The organization with intermediate mode of entry does not export products to foreign markets, but implements operations through licensing, alliance, joint venture, contract manufacturing, management contracting and franchise.

2.2.2.1 Licensing
Wild (2006) explains licensing as a method of foreign market operations where a company in one country (the licensor) enters into a contractual agreement with a company in another country (the licensee), whereby the licensee is given the right to use something owned by the licensor. The licensor normally receives loyalty payments based on a percentage of the licensee's sales revenue generated from the licensed property (Wild, Wild and Han 2006). The soft drink giants Coca Cola and Pepsi are typical examples. Through licensing, the parent company can easily enter a foreign market as there is no capital investment needed and the risk is relatively limited (Aulakh, Cavusgil and Sarkar, 1998). The parent company may license its available intangible assets, such as patterns, know-how and the company trademark to foreign licensees. The major advantage is that a licensor can finance international expansion as licensees often have to contribute resources (Wild, Wild and Han, 2006). Another advantage is that licensing reduces the level of uncertainty in foreign markets because licensing does not require a high level of investment and commitment by licensors, thus the associated risk is low. The disadvantage of license is that the licensees may threaten licensors by producing and marketing similar products especially when the license agreement expires. In order to avoid this threat, licensor companies usually do not license their core competence or advanced technology to licensees. For example, both Coca Cola and Pepsi’s licensees are responsible for adding liquid (such as water or other simple material) to the core formula, as well as packing, delivering and marketing products. The core formula of ingredients has been made in the United States and delivered to the licensees’ sites, while local licensees focus on labour with lower technology requirements. In addition, the licensing agreement may restrict licensors’ further expansion abroad as licensors cannot start selling on their own in the countries where they have a license agreement (Root, 1994). This may limit the amount of income from a licensing arrangement. Another disadvantage is the licensor’s lack of control over the marketing
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plan that is usually fully managed by licensees in the target country. In short, licensing is a ‘budget’ mode of entry that mainly reaps the benefits through lower cost of labour and materials in foreign markets. This entry mode does not require high levels of knowledge, technology, experience and management.

However, licensing does not work in HE internationalization because HE internationalization is resource-based. It relies heavily on intangible resources, such as professional knowledge, human resource and experience. Licensing arrangement depends on licensees’ tangible resources, such as facilities, materials and factory equipments. And usually, these facilities do not contain higher level of technology because licensees are not allowed to handle core competences. In HE internationalization, the academic standards of service provision must be achieved equally by both home and partner institutions. Curriculum is the kind of intellectual property that is difficult to transfer to foreign markets through licensing. The nature of licensing agreement is not compatible with HE internationalization, and therefore licensing is eliminated from implementation in HE internationalization.

2.2.2.2 Alliance

The use of strategic alliances across a wide spectrum of industries has accelerated substantially since the early 1990s. Strategic alliances are used as a policy tool in car manufacturing, commercial airlines, biotechnology and pharmaceuticals (Butler, Kenny and Anchor, 2000). Much of the literature on strategic alliance is not industry-specific but results from cross-sectoral studies (Kogut, 1988; Hamel, Doz and Prahalad, 1989; Hagedoorn, 1993; Parkhe, 1993; Kanter, 1994; Beamish and Inkpen, 1995; Yoshino and Rangan, 1995). Strategic alliances are agreements between two or more organizations to cooperate with each other in some way for varying lengths of time (Glaister and Buckley, 1996). The degree of cooperation falls within a broad range of parameters from informal swapping of resources or knowledge to more formal agreements, such as joint ventures (Yoshino and Rangan, 1995). Nooteboom (1999) classifies alliances as vertical (alliances between buyers and suppliers), horizontal (alliances between competitors), and diagonal (alliances between firms in different industries). The common theme running through each
type of alliance is knowledge transfer. In each case, knowledge exchange between organizations is normally in both directions but not always in equal measure.

Alliance is one of the common entry modes of HE internationalization. It is often reflected in academic collaboration. Institutions conduct formal and informal strategic alliance, such as collaboration, validation, articulation, joint research and joint projects, and student and faculty mobility. Saffu and Mamman (1999) view strategic alliance as a collaborative relationship between a local institution and an overseas counterpart (public or private), encompassing agreements to cooperate in joint activities, such as the development of on-shore or off-shore offers in teaching, research and consultancy, technology, and marketing new or existing programmes to a new market. Chan (2004) states that universities today develop collaboration and networking to strengthen their competitive advantage. Massification and marketing of higher education, as Chan suggests, have led to severe competition and globalization, as well as more strategic alliances among multiple partners across national borders. Alliance also can be seen as the cooperation between universities and corporations, such as the internal training and staff development. Mazzarol, Soutar and Seng (2003) state that alliances have developed between large corporations and universities or university consortia. These alliances provide opportunities to educate corporations through advanced training and education services.

In HE internationalization, alliance enhances collaboration and partnership. Alliance can be reflected in an informal progression arrangement where students (such as advanced standing students) are recruited through informal interviews. Alliance is a common mode of entry for any informal progression arrangement or academic collaboration in HE internationalization.

2.2.2.3 Joint ventures

Joint venture is a separate company that is created and mutually owned by two or more independent entities to achieve a common business purpose (Karkkainen, 2006). Each partner agrees to a joint venture to gain access to the other partner's skills and resources. Typically, international partners contribute financial resources, technology or products.
The local partner provides skills, staff and knowledge required to manage a business in its own country. Each partner can concentrate on a part of the value chain where its core competence lies.

The formal difference between a joint venture and a strategic alliance is that a strategic alliance is typically a non-equity cooperation, meaning that the partners do not commit equity or invest into the alliance (Das and Kumar, 2007). The joint venture can be either a contractual non-equity joint venture or an equity joint venture.

The reasons for setting up a joint venture are various: for example, local companies may seek access to additional know-how from the partner and learn from it, while the internationalizing firm benefits from tacit and explicit knowledge and network of the domestic partner (Glaister and Buckley, 1996). The advantages of this entry mode include reduced market and political risk, shared knowledge and resources and shared risk of failure. However, Hollensen (2005) mentions that the parent company may lose control over a foreign market because the cultural dimension and different objectives of each partner may lead to friction during implementation.

Regarding education industry, the corporate university (usually a new institute that formed by the union of a large corporation and a university) appeared in the 1980s, with the number of such institutions growing ever since (Mazzarol, Soutar and Seng, 2003). This growth has been motivated by the recognition by many large companies that ‘training’ needed to be replaced by a more sustained investment in their intellectual and human capital (ibid). For instance, in 1999, Australia’s Coles-Myer Limited jointed with Deakin University to create a corporate university called the Coles Institute. This joint venture offered Coles-Myer’s 50,000 employees an opportunity to pursue higher education (Deakin University, 1999).

2.2.2.4 Contract manufacturing

Contract manufacturing is a cross between licensing and investment entry. This entry mode is also known as international subcontracting and involves an organization (the principal)
in one country placing an order, with specifications as to the conditions of sales and products required, with a company in another country (Jobber, 2007). The contract would be limited to production and marketing would be handled by the principal’s home market. The principal company transfers technology and technical assistance to the local manufacturer. For example, Benetton and IKEA rely heavily on the contractual network of small overseas manufactures. Contract manufacturing enables an organization to have foreign outsourcing (production) without making a financial commitment. Management in the principal company may lack resources or be unwilling to invest equity to establish and enhance manufacturing or selling operations. Advantages of this mode include small commitment of financial and management resources, quick entry into the target market, avoidance of friction on the issue of ownership, permission for the principal company to control marketing and after-sale services (Kotabe and Helsen, 2004). Disadvantages are similar to those of licensing (see section 2.2.2.1). Contract manufacturing is a typical ‘tailored’ mode of entry for goods manufacturers, which is inconsistent with nature of the service industry and therefore incompatible with education; thus contract manufacturing is eliminated as a mode of entry for HE internationalization.

2.2.2.5 Management contracting
Management contracting emphasises the growing importance of service and management know-how. Usually, the contracts are concerned with management operating, control systems and training local staff to take over the operation when the contracts are completed (Burstow, 1994). Management contracting gives a company the right to manage the day-to-day operations of an enterprise in a foreign target country. Services may include general management, financial administration, production management and marketing, but are generally limited to ongoing operations and do not give the authority to the management contractor to make new capital investments, assume long-term debt or initiate basic management or policy changes. Young, Hamill, Wheeler and Davies (1989) state that management contracting usually does not extend to the contractor operating after the contract expires. Management contract is a short-term commitment, which is commonly found as a supplement to other modes of entry, such as license, joint venture and alliance. HE internationalization, especially the academic collaboration requires a stable continuous
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development that enables to maintain partnership, academic standards of service provision, institutional profile and reputation. The short-term nature of management contracting eliminates it as a mode of entry for HE internationalization.

2.2.2.6 Franchise

Franchising is a marketing-oriented method of selling a business service, often to small independent investors who have working capital but little or no prior business experience (Saleh and Kleiner, 2005). The main characteristic of franchise is that it is a way of distributing the franchisor’s management system. There are two major types of franchising: one is the traditional franchising with products and trademarks, whereby franchisors make contracts with franchisees to buy / sell products or product lines. Franchisees use franchisors’ trademarks and product lines; this approach is typically adopted by the fashion industry: “One of the major factors which motivate fashion retailers to franchise is the presence of a strong retail brand or brands which are attractive to franchise partners and by employing franchising the franchisor company can benefit from the franchisee’s knowledge of local market” (Doherty, 2007, p. 195). The other form is the business format franchising. The franchisee establishes a business and runs it profitably in the host country, especially with retail organizations. Franchising “enables them (franchisees) to operate their own business to exactly the same standards and format as the other units in the franchised chain” (id., p. 184). The fast-food industry (such as McDonalds, Burger King and Pizza Hut) is the best-known global franchising business.

Cavusgil, Knight and Riesenberger (2008) states that franchising can be a huge success as it combines economies of scale provided by the franchisor and entrepreneurial spirit and local knowledge provided by the franchisee. With franchise, the organization is able to enter a foreign country through a rapid market expansion with low capital outlays. The difficulty lies in establishing a well functioning franchisor-franchisee relationship, which is reflected in the handling of potential conflicts (for example, franchisees are forced to purchase materials and packages from franchisors). Other disadvantages include lack of full control over franchisees’ operations; franchisors’ attempts to shape franchisees’ profit
through loyalty fees; restrictions imposed by local governments in terms of franchise agreement in the foreign markets.

Comparing franchising and licensing, Hollensen (2004, p. 315) states that “franchising is all-encompassing; whereas licensing concerns just one part of the business”. In fact, the franchisor usually grants the franchisee the use of its whole business system including all processes and know-how, the patents and brand names in exchange for loyalty fees. There is a significant difference between the licensee and the franchisee: the former is an established business with abundant experience; the latter is often in a start-up situation.

Regarding HE internationalization, franchise is not a new concept. The provision of mass education (Scott, 1996) has motivated many U.K. universities to establish collaborations with overseas institutions. Programmes can be taught by the staff based at counterpart institutions; and U.K. universities are usually responsible for quality assurance, moderation and staff training. On the one hand, academic collaboration increases the home institution’s international profile and reputation; on the other hand, it also strengthens the foreign partner’s competitive advantage in the local region. As Shattock (2009 a, b) states, franchise partnership envisages that the demarcation between institutions of further and higher education will diminish because through franchise, institutions of further education in developing countries are allowed to teach higher education programmes of home universities in developed countries, thus the difference in terms of academic standard is reduced. Further collaboration between these institutions will result in new approaches to managing partnership arrangements (Leech, 1995).

Franchise is a kind of hands-off method in terms of HE internationalization. The associated cost will not be high because partner institutions are responsible for teaching, assessment, marking. However, the hands-off way means higher risk because it is difficult for the home institution to monitor and evaluate the actual operational process on the partner’s site. This is consistent with the lack of full control over franchisees’ operations, which is one of the disadvantages of franchise.
2.2.3 Hierarchical mode of entry

Hierarchical modes of entry involve foreign investment in a completely owned subsidiary (Hollensen, 2004). With the hierarchical mode of entry, the organization completely owns and controls the foreign company. Hierarchical mode of entry requires a higher degree of control by parent company, for example, a head office can fully manage the subsidiary. Organization with hierarchical mode of entry achieves internationalization through internal expansion across overseas markets.

Two modes of entry are included: greenfield and acquisition (Root, 1987). A company can either set up a completely new business (greenfield) or acquire an existing organization (such as its competitor). In commercial internationalization, greenfield is much less used than acquisition. A survey in 1999 shows that only 22% of all foreign direct investment (FDI) consists of greenfield, while more than 75% are acquisitions (UNCTAD, 2000). Acquisition occurs through a transfer of existing assets from local organizations to foreign organizations where there is need for less strategic flexibility and the company has limited resources (Karkkainen, 2006). Acquisition enables rapid market expansion and often provides access to distribution channels. In saturated markets or those with substantial entry barriers (such as banking industry) where there is little room for a new entrant, acquisition may be the only feasible entry mode.

Although acquisition is more favored than greenfield in commercial internationalization, compared to acquisition, greenfield is more adoptable in HE internationalization. Foreign governments rarely allow an overseas university to acquire their local institutions may be one reason of this phenomena. Some reputable universities have established their own satellite campuses in foreign markets. Local government also supports these branch campuses. Home institutions are given opportunities to be responsible for social development in foreign markets. For example, in Malaysia, the Education Act (1998) permits foreign universities to establish branch campuses inland with their policy to make Malaysia a regional hub for education service provision. Australian Monash University and Curtin University of Technology, and U.K. University of Nottingham reacted quickly
to this policy and established branch campuses in Malaysia. Satellite campuses of U.S. universities in Singapore include the University of Chicago Graduate School of Business, INSEAD, Wharton Business School and Johns Hopkins University. These activities are corresponding to Mazzarol, Soutar and Seng's (2003) ‘third-wave’ model (as discussed later, see section 2.6.2.2), in which they conclude that the satellite campus is the ultimate step for HE internationalization.

However, the weakness of greenfield is that this mode of entry does not fit small or medium enterprises. This is corresponding with Karkkainen’s (2006) view that greenfield is more suitable for large organizations because small or medium businesses lack resources and experience and, therefore do not have the capability to ‘pay off’ potential ‘expensive’ mistakes. This drawback is partially reflected in HE internationalization as well. Only highly reputable universities move forwards to establishing satellite campuses abroad. Most universities (including the case study university) choose to internationalize through partnerships and agents. Furthermore, it is impossible for local governments to support every university’s international initiatives; usually they prefer to support the reputable ones. This results in little room for most universities (especially those with middle or lower ranking) to adopt greenfield and establish overseas branch campus. Another weakness of greenfield is that it takes longer to build up full functional overseas subsidiaries than in the case of acquisition. On the other hand, the inevitable culture clash and friction are the main drawback of acquisition. Both greenfield and acquisition offer organizations the highest degree of control, promise high return on investment (ROI), but only greenfield is applicable to HE internationalization.

2.2.4 Integration / control level of entry mode

The choice of foreign market entry mode is related to the degree of control by the parent organization, which is crucial as it ensures the ultimate success of its strategic goals (Anderson and Gatignon, 1986). Control is important in the selection of entry mode as it determines risks and returns, the degree of interaction between overseas partners and parent companies, and ultimately, performance in a foreign market (Erramilli and Rao, 1993). High-control entry modes demand more resource commitment abroad, and the
international organization is exposed to a higher degree of uncertainty. Low-control modes require less resource commitment, thus reducing the uncertainty level. A high-control entry mode offers the highest mode of integration, whereas low control entry modes, such as cooperative agreements, offer the lowest (Vandermerwe and Rada, 1988).

High control entry modes may be preferred in order to build up personal relationships, conduct on-site research, and adapt to the needs of the foreign buyers and markets (Hastings and Perry, 2000). It is also preferred when the brand name value is high (Klein and Leffler, 1981). Organizations operate for low control entry modes and low resource commitment when they are exposed to risk or when demand conditions are uncertain (Gatignon and Anderson, 1988; Kim and Hwang, 1992). HE internationalization requires more experiential knowledge of foreign markets, partners and students, and calls for integrated resources control; thus competitive and experienced universities (such as University of Nottingham, University of Middlesex, University of Liverpool, University of Chicago, Wharton Business School and Johns Hopkins University) are more likely to operate in moderate and high control market entry modes. Other institutions (including the case study university) without strong competitive advantages, may choose low or moderate level entry modes to manage risks and uncertainty.

In commercial internationalization, usually one organization adopts a single mode of entry; for example, McDonalds uses franchise, and Coca Cola adopts licensing. However, HE internationalization is more flexible and therefore can adopt more than one mode of entry simultaneously.

However, one mode is left out of the literature on mode of entry: E-learning (online and distance learning), which is usually referred to as E-commerce in literature on commercial internationalization. “The development of information technology has provided a major avenue for the import and export of higher education” (Craft, Carr and Fund, 1998, p. 33), in which the global competencies can be provided for students who need to live and work in a borderless world (American Council of Education, 2002). The flexibility and accessibility of E-learning enhance the development of HE internationalization. E-learning
is not a new notion today; however, there is no literature on commercial internationalization or HE internationalization categorizing it as a formal mode of entry. The existing literature on E-learning is fragmented and chiefly focused upon conceptual description (Mason, 1998). Yet, E-learning is an efficient and common entry mode in education, and has been widely adopted in HE internationalization. Nicholls (1997) and Mazzarol (1998) state that E-learning has become a substitute for international mobility. Information communication technologies (ICT), particularly the Internet, are driving higher education development towards globalization (Windhan, 1996). Thus, it is necessary to add E-learning as a formal mode of entry for HE internationalization.

2.2.5 Summary
This section discusses three groups of existing modes of entry in commercial internationalization. Export mode means low risk, low control and high flexibility; intermediate mode is endowed with shared risk and control and low flexibility; finally, hierarchical entry implies high control, high risk with lower flexibility. Four modes of entry compatible with education are export, alliance, franchise, and greenfield. Export is reflected in student mobility of HE internationalization. Alliance and franchise correspond to international academic collaboration. Using greenfield, some universities have established their foreign satellite campuses in other countries. The remaining modes of entry are eliminated as they are primarily manufactured-based and therefore not relevant to HE internationalization.

2.3 Strategy implementation and obstacles
This section discusses literature on strategy implementation, focusing primarily on the obstacles and frameworks of strategy implementations. These are used as the theoretical underpinning in comparison with the potential implementation issues that may rise in the case study. Although some issues have already been highlighted in previous research, they may still exist at implementation stage because good planning and clear frameworks cannot guarantee the success of strategy implementation. Deviation always exists and often results in problems. The matched issues will be discussed in detail to find out the reasons
why they are still unsolved in the case study. Strategy implementation being impeded may be explained by the fact that, within an organization, different departments have different job scopes, responsibilities and structures.

The literature on strategy implementation is addressed by many authors; however, it is still on the margins compared to the volume of research on strategy formulation. Okumus and Roper (1998, p. 219) note that “despite the importance of the strategy execution process, far more research has been carried out into strategy formulation rather than into strategy implementation”, and Alexander observes that literature is dominated by the focus on long-range planning and strategy content rather than the actual implementation of strategies, on which “little is written or researched” (Alexander, 1985, p. 91). There are many frameworks for strategy formulation, such as Porter’s five forces (Porter, 1985 and 1990), BCG matrix (Hax and Majluf, 1992), Ansoff’s (1988) strategic directions matrix, Value Chain (Porter, 1998), SWOT (Jacobs, Shepherd and Johnson, 1998), and PESTEL (Johnson, Scholes, and Whittington, 2006), covering the areas of industrial analysis, competitive analysis, environment analysis and strategic directions. However, most strategies still fail during implementation. Miller (2002) states that organizations fail to implement a hefty majority of about 70% of their new strategies. Another study is somewhat less alarming, saying that 40% of the value anticipated in strategic plans is never realized (Mankins and Steele, 2005). The issues raised in the case study also indicate that many implementation problems are on the operational level. Strategy implementation is not successful at the case study university, either. The next question is why. Is it just because the front line staff do not execute correctly? The answer is most likely ‘no’. There may be many factors and obstacles on most levels of the case study.

The impeders to strategy implementation include inappropriate organizational structure; higher complexity in the process of strategy implementation; strategy implementation being considered to be less glamorous than formulation; practical difficulties for mid-level managers; inadequate resource allocation; inefficient communication; supervisors and managers not having practical experiences and being trained for strategy formulation rather than implementation; and inability to manage change (Alexander 1985 and 1991; Aaltonen
and Ikavalko, 2002; Hrebiniak 1992 and 2009). Some authors highlight the lack of formal implementation framework as the major reason that contributes to the failure of implementation: for example, Noble (1999b, p. 132) notes that "[t]here is a significant need for detailed and comprehensive conceptual models related to strategy implementation. To date, implementation research has been fairly fragmented due to a lack of clear models on which to build." Similarly, Alexander (1991, p. 74) states that "[m]anagers do not have practical, yet, theoretically sound, models to guide their actions during implementation. Without adequate models, they try to implement strategies without a good understanding of the multiple factors that must be addressed, often simultaneously, to make implementation work." Recently, Hrebiniak (2009, p. 23) says that "[m]anagers need a logical model to guide execution actions. Without guideline, execution becomes a helter-skelter affair. Without guidance, individuals do the things they think are important, often resulting in uncoordinated, divergent, even conflicting decisions and actions. Without the benefit of a logical approach, execution suffers or fails because managers do not know what steps to take and when to take them. Having a model or roadmap positively affects execution success." It is clear that many authors realize the importance of implementation frameworks. They believe that with appropriate guidance, the implementation process should be smooth and successful. And the aforementioned obstacles can be sorted out consequently. But field operation does not work in that way. Even a comprehensive implementation framework cannot guarantee success of implementation. Since managers and individual may have different thinking and concerning, this may result in disjointed and conflicting actions.

Resistance to change takes a number of forms: reluctance of individuals to change roles (Riis, Luxhoj and Thorsteinsson, 1977; Cooke, 2000), inability to create satisfaction with the present situation (reason to change) (Maggard and Rhyne, 1992; Ireland and Dale, 2001), and inability to change organizational roles and culture (Patterson, Kennedy and Fredendall, 1995; Lawrence, 1999). Based on these individual issues, the existing framework can only serve as a guide. The real solution should address particular problems fundamentally at the implementation level by both managers and operational staff.
2.3.1 Previous research of strategy implementation factors

Numerous scholars realize the gap between strategy formulation and strategy implementations. They intend to fill that gap by identifying various factors and frameworks. One of the earlier popular implementation frameworks is McKinsey’s 7-S framework that was proposed by Waterman, Peters and Phillips (1980). The authors argue that effective strategy implementation means attending to the relationship among seven factors (7-S): Strategy, Structure, System, Style, Staff, Skills and Subordinate goals. Waterman, Peters and Phillips (1980) call it a framework, but actually these are seven individual factors with no clear explanation of the relationship and interactions among them. The similar criticism applies to Pettigrew and Whipp’s (1991) five factors analysis (environmental assessment, leading change, human resource, link strategic and operational change and coherence). Stonich (1982), Hrebiniak and Joyce (1984), Galbraith and Kazanjian (1986) and Read and Buckley (1988) identify the key implementation factors including understanding of strategy, culture, system, power, conflict, coordination and environment impact. But none of them have been subsequently or empirically tested. Joyce, Nohria and Roberson’s (2003) comprehensive study of what contributes to a company’s success analyzed 160 companies over a five-year period and found that success was strongly correlated, among other things, with the ability to execute a strategy flawlessly. Factors such as culture, organizational structure, and aspects of operational execution were vital to a company’s success, with success measured by total return to shareholders. Other recent works have added their support to the idea that execution is important for strategic success, even if the approach and analysis are less rigorous or complete (Collin, 2001; Hartman, 2004). Scholars define the common impeders of strategy implementation from different aspects. These include, for example, planning consequences: lack of exact strategic planning, insufficient lining of the strategy to goals, and unclear regulation and executive policies (Alexander, 1985; Hambrick and Cannella, 1989; Al-Ghamdi, 1998; Noble, 1999a; Pechlaner and Sauerwein, 2002); organizational issues, such as incompatible structure with the strategy, unsuitable resource allocation, lack of adequate communication, lack of effective coordination, lack of adequate information system, and incompatible organizational culture (Alexander, 1991; Olsen, Tse and West, 1992;
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Schmelzer and Olsen, 1994; Al-Ghamdi, 1998; Noble, 1999b; Aaltonen and Ikavaiko, 2002; Heide, Gronhaug and Johannessen, 2002; Okumus, 2001 and 2003; Dobni, 2003; managerial issues, such as unsuitable leadership, lack of adequate organizational support, lack of adequate manager commitment, and uncontrollable factors (Alexander, 1985; Reed and Buckley, 1988; Mintzberg and Quinn, 1991; Al-Ghamdi, 1998; Noble, 1999a; Okumus and Roper, 1999; Beer and Nohria, 2000; Heide, Gronhaug and Johannessen, 2002); and individual issues, such as lack of understanding of strategy, insufficient compatibility of employees, resistance to change among people, resistance to change among units, and fear of insecurity in the new territory (Alexander, 1985; Hambrick and Cannella, 1989; Al-Ghamdi, 1998; Okumus and Roper, 1999; Okumus, 2001 and 2003; Pechlaner and Sauerwein, 2002; Freedman, 2003).

Some issues are derived from empirical researches; some are based on the conceptual analysis. Scholars’ research findings overlap and support each other’s propositions. But they have the same weakness: there is no discussion of relationships among these factors. An organization normally has a hierarchical structure, many decentralized departments or even outsourcing subsidiaries. It is difficult to cope with each factor individually at every level of the organization and to follow in complex situations; thus implementation still remains a problem. Hence, firstly, system thinking (Checkland, 1981; Senn, 1990) is critical for the success of strategy implementation. This results in the study of strategy implementation shifting from factors analysis to framework formulation.

### 2.3.2 Previous research on strategy implementation frameworks

Unlike individual factors, the frameworks aim to illustrate the relationship among identified factors, the influence between context and process. For example, they demonstrate how context factors (such as organizational culture, resistance of change, organizational system) affect the process factors (for example, coordination, operation conflict, communication, cooperation) and the subsequent outcomes. Three recognized implementation frameworks are discussed in this section, by reviewing the literature on implementation framework, Okumus’s (2003) framework (see figure 2.2) is the most cited.
Okumus (2003) identifies similar factors (such as organizational structure, organizational culture, operational planning, resources, communications, people and controls) as corresponding to the ones identified by the 'factor-group' authors (see section 2.3.1). The difference between these is that, rather than simply listing the factors, Okumus presents them into five sub-systemic positions: strategic content, external context, internal context, organizational process and outcome. The strategic content is about how and why strategy is initiated; external context refers to environment uncertainty and changes; internal context addresses the organizational configuration (for example, power, culture, responsibilities, job duty and roles); organizational process is the operation process of initiating the strategy, related activities and tasks (for example, resource allocation, communication, people, control and feedback); finally, outcomes conclude and compare the intended and unintended results of strategy implementation. Kazmi (2008, p. 1578) discusses Okumus's framework and states that Okumus delivers a clear message of coherence: "... the overriding assumption among a very high majority of the frameworks discussed is that there must be 'coherence' among the implementation factors if the strategy implementation process is to be successful..." Strategies are initiated and
implemented in a strategic context and the implementation factors in this grouping greatly influence the implementation process (Bryson and Bromiley, 1993; Schmelzer and Olsen, 1994; Okumus, 2001). The process factors are primarily utilized within the implementation process and cover nearly all possible aspects of implementation. However there could still be scope for improvement.

Over five years after 2003, Okumus reviewed his framework and found some new industries where it could be developed further. These industries include accounting, marketing, human resource management, information management and non-profit public industries, for example, national health care, education and local government authorities (Naranjo-Gil and Hartmann, 2006). These areas go beyond the preview themes as they move vertically, in depth into the finer aspects of strategy implementation, while the concern is that new industry-related factors may emerge, but not be addressed within Okumus's framework. These new factors only exist within the particular industries and are not generalized for any given case: for example, audit implementation for accounting, QAA (Quality Assurance Agency) examination for U.K. higher education, implementation of effectiveness evaluation in hospitals. These are particular issues needing particular solutions. But it is impossible to design a framework to cover each particular case. That is not what a framework is supposed to do; it is supposed to be more generalized for a group of similar cases. Even within same industry, each organization may face different challenges.

The second famous framework is Kaplan and Norton's (1992, 1993, 1996a, 1996b) Balanced Scorecard Concept (BSC, see figure 2.3). BSC framework has been widely applied to strategy implementation in recent years (Creelman, 1998; Epstein and Manzoni, 1998; Kaplan and Norton, 1996, 2001). It provides executives with a summary of four key perspectives (for example, financial, customer, internal business, learning and growth perspectives) to facilitate the alignment of business implementation with the overall strategy.
This framework aims to translate strategy into operation; to make strategy for everyone's work; to mobilize change through leadership, and to build up a continual process. Four factors are identified by Kaplan and Norton (1996): clarification, communication, planning and feedback. Although BSC intends to improve operation by evaluating the four key perspectives, there is great diversity in the field (Neely, 2000). Most BSC implementations fail somehow (McCunn, 1998; Bourne, Neely, Mills and Platts, 2003). BSC is not the right solution for implementation problems because its design is not suitable for problem solving. All four key perspectives are kind of abstract concepts and lack empirical guidance. Furthermore, BSC does not highlight new issues. The four factors (clarification, communication, planning and feedback) have already been identified by previous authors. According to Norreklit (2000), BSC is a top-down control approach with little participation from bottom levels. Thus some operational process issues are missed, such as resources, culture, internal support, training and learning.

The last framework introduced here is Hambrick and Fredrickson's (2005) model that is presented in a number of themes, like vehicles, stage, economy and differentiation. The
main concept of Hambrik and Fredrickson's model is that a business must necessarily have parts, if it has to have a single, unified strategy. The parts of framework include 'where', 'vehicles', 'differentiation', 'stage' and 'economic logic'. These themes make up Hambrik and Fredrickson's framework. First, where will be active? Second, vehicles: how will the business achieve the goal? Third, differentiation: how to beat competitors and win in the marketplace? Fourth, stage: what will be the speed and sequence of moves? Fifth, economic logic: how will the business obtain its return? and how much? However, these themes are still vague. Most of them start with 'how'? The answers to 'how' can vary. These themes lead to a divergent reaction of 'how'? The difficulty is how to apply this framework if it does not sound like a framework. Carpenter and Sander (2007) apply this framework in their text on strategic management of organizational structure, system and process. But what about other aspects, such as resource, people, culture and motivation? Whether it can address other common factors identified by previous scholars or any new issues, is doubtful. Thus, the limited extent of field application is the main drawback of this framework.

2.3.3 Implementation issues in case study
The issues raised in the case study university are corresponding to the findings of previous researches. The following issues will be addressed in the case study: resource allocation, communication, motivation and incentive, cooperation and coordination, organizational culture, and resistance to change. They are common issues that have already been identified by previous authors. The paradox is, why they remain as problems. Literature provides a strong theoretical basis with numerous factors and famous frameworks. From the empirical perspective, the corporate management is already aware of certain issues (see Q 6.1, Chapter 4). However, some issues may still remain as challenges in strategy implementation (see Q 6.1, Chapter 4). This indicates that the problems cannot be solved in practice even though there are many apparent ideal 'backup' options. Some existing issues are worthy re-investigating and analyzing in depth. The following section discusses them individually.
2.3.3.1 Resource allocation

In literature, resource is always linked to competence and RBV (resource-based view, also known as resource-based approach). The relationship between them is that resource can be developed into competence. Resource is an organization’s foundation to create value and core competence. It is a common view shared by many authors. For example, Grant (1991, p. 120) says that “the capabilities of a firm are what it can do as a result of teams of resource work together”. Sanchez (2001, p. 7) states that competences are “the ability of an organization to sustain coordinated developments of assets and capabilities in ways that help the organization achieve its goal.” Hamel (1994, p. 12) suggests that “a competence is a bundle of constituent skills and technologies, rather than a single, discrete skill or technology”. It is agreed that resources can be converted into competence. Organizations compete in marketplace through competence and competitive advantage is only gained if core competence is developed. Johnson, Scholes and Whittington (2008, p. 96) identify core competence as “the skills and abilities by which resources are deployed through an organization’s activities and processes, such as to achieve competitive advantage in ways that others cannot imitate or obtain”. They also separate resources into tangible (for example, physical, financial and human), and intangible (for example, intellectual resource like reputation, value and culture). For instance, resources can be a company’s physical facilities, such as building, equipments and finance, and human resource can be the skilled employees. Mills, Platts, Bourne and Richards (2002) state that a competence results from a set of resources coordinated in a way that provides a particular level of performance in a firm. However, Hrebiniak (2009) states that top managers lack empirical implementation experience and are always trained for planning rather than operation. But how many organizations realize that? When implementation fails, the first group that is affected is likely to be the implementation staff – the ‘doers’. This may frustrate and de-motivate front line employees and further lead to strong resistance to change. Although literature have highlighted the importance of resources for organizations, the practical implementation may still not sound smooth as acknowledged issues during corporate planning do not eliminate field failure. In order to avoid this situation, efficient communication is vital.
2.3.3.2 Communication and information sharing

The importance of communication in strategy implementation is discussed by many scholars. Communication in implementation is a subject area that is important to develop (Taylor, Flanagin, Cheney and Seibold, 2001; Jones, Watson, Gardner and Gallois; 2004). Lewis (2006) points out that the importance of communication and information sharing as wide participation in the implementation process to make organizational members feel more involved, committed and responsible for the situation. Kotter (1990, 1995) also stresses the important role of communication in strategy implementation as wide dissemination of information together with openness, early notification and discussion possibilities. "Poor or inadequate information sharing between individuals or business units responsible for strategy execution" was ranked as one of the largest obstacles to execution by managers responding to surveys in Hrebišniak’s (2009, p. 27) research. Information sharing, knowledge transfer, and communication are vital factors to make a strategy work. In some organizations, formal teams or committees are created to facilitate communication and information flow. This activity reflects that the organization realizes the importance of communication. Communication has been formally arranged as someone’s job to ensure the efficiency of communication, information sharing and feedback. Formal teams or committees help the organization efficiently evaluate its performance and consequently re-plan.

Other authors present a similar view that communication is a tool to enhance implementation and provide further justification in terms of objective setting, strategy implantation and understanding. Johansson and Heide (2008) suggest that implementation problems will disappear if and when organization members are offered sufficient information and thereby understand the changes and their roles in this process. Thus communication is reduced to a tool for declaring and explaining planned changes, often with the focus on the what, when, who and how, and as a way to transport organizational members’ feedback regarding their attitudes and feelings. Theoretically, the implementation problem should disappear consequently, as effective communication reduces or overcome the resistance to change. For instance, Sillince (1999) discusses managers’ problems of how to motivate employees to see the need for change, so that they
are willing to participate in changes. Elving (2005) argues that the relationship between communication and the creation of readiness for change is seen as a prerequisite for effective change. Reducing resistance to change and building the foundation of implementation are the purpose of communication, because communication can reduce people's feeling of uncertainty, turn the 'unknown' into 'known', and further create readiness for change and implementation. Difonzo, Bordia and Rosnow (1994) and Bordia, Hunt, Paulsen, Tourish and Difonzo (2004) state that effective communication depends on the accurate management of uncertainty associated with changes, since poor or insufficient information will lead to rumours. They also have the opinion that more and accurate information can reduce the perception of uncertainty and build up trust. Daly, Teague and Kitchen (2003) comment on Bordia's (2004) opinion regarding internal communication within the organization, stating that efficient communication lessens people's feeling of uncertainty and increases job satisfaction and better understanding of the organization. However, all the above studies are based on an 'ideal' situation where a positive impact of communication reduces resistance to change and implementation becomes effective. But empirically, communication may still remain a problem.

Thus a gap emerges between theory and practice. At a certain point, the gap is inevitable, because when management shares information with staff, there is a concern about how much information can be released, in particular sensitive information on cost or technology. Furthermore, even if managers enhance effective communication, the quality of communication is difficult to measure because immediate replies (such as 'all right', 'ok' or 'no problem') do not guarantee understanding and action. A cooperative reply does not mean that people are willing to participate without resistance. The true answers may only emerge during the strategy implementation process or appear at the end of initiatives or projects. According to Harkness (2000), employees' satisfaction with the organization's internal communication has hardly changed since the 1970s, and this can be explained by the absence of effective tools to measure communication. Different forms of communication make the measurement harder, since communication does not only mean information sharing; it also includes the forms of sharing information, such as through formal meetings, face-to-face interaction, email and phonecalls. The effectiveness of
communication can vary depending on different forms of communication. Both the process and content of communication are crucial to the outcomes. The difficulty of evaluating the efficiency and quality of communication contributes to the situation where communication remains an unsolved problem within organizations.

### 2.3.3.3 Coordination and cooperation

Coordination is the process of achieving unity of action among interdependent activities. Coordination is required when two or more interdependent individuals, groups, or departments must work together to achieve a common goal (Hrebiniak, 2009). Cooperation concerns building certain mechanisms and linking individuals in ways that permit them to perform given tasks, such as efficiently implementing a strategy (Thorpe and Morgan, 2007). Coordination and cooperation are important for all types of organizations. Coordination and cooperation are reflected in different departments working together and key units or individuals supporting each other cooperatively to pursue the same organizational goal.

Coordination is critical to any organization in relation to vitality, interaction and ultimately the execution of a strategy. According to Thorpe and Morgan (2007), the specialist implementation skills possessed by a single marketing manager as an individual do not fully contribute to the organizational skills base, unless these individuals can coordinate their efforts. The challenge for any manager is how to coordinate the effort of talented employees within a limited time frame and to ensure that the intended strategy is clearly understood. Grant (2002) suggests aiding this process by rules and routines. Other authors argue that the coordination process is an understanding-sharing process, which enhances commitment and reduces uncertainty. The benefit of a shared understanding and perception that the strategy is being coordinated is the development of a commitment among managers and the reduction of uncertainty in the organization as a whole (Whitney and Smith, 1983; Noble, 1999). The shared understanding of a strategy and a degree of direction from senior management should improve strategic performance and overall efficiency of the implementation effort.
Cooperation integrates cooperative planning among actors and leads to better results than isolated planning (Handfield and Nicols, 1999; Udomleartprasert and Junghirapanich, 2006). Wyner and Malone (1996) identify three cooperation scenarios that can be found in most organizations (see figure 2.4).

In the case of 'No Cooperation', there is neither information sharing nor any other kind of cooperation of the planning processes between the members. 'Decentralized Cooperation' implies that the members first plan independently, but in the next step exchange information about their individual plans that may be relevant to the planning processes of other members. In the scenario of 'Centralized Cooperation', a central entity conducts the planning for all involved.

In order to achieve high levels of cooperation, similar opinions of key coordinators from different departments are critical. The more similar the opinions are, the more possible it is to achieve higher levels of cooperation. The less similar the opinions are, the lower the possibility of achieving agreement. The diversity of views may result in operational conflicts, ineffective performance and, finally, implementation failure.

In addition, cooperation and coordination should clarify the roles of responsibility and accountability. Clarifying responsibility and accountability presumes that all individuals know what their roles or jobs are. Managers know with whom they must interact, when,
and why, and are fully cognizant of others' tasks or duties. Confusion often results from multiple points of responsibility or when many departments or managers share responsibility. Roles and responsibilities transform quickly as managers try to cope with change. Hence, when everyone is responsible and claims to be accountable, problems are never resolved efficiently. Muddled responsibility and accountability in an execution plan or process can impede strategy implementation.

2.3.3.4 Motivation and incentives

Motivation is the intensity of a person's desire to engage in some activity (Hrebiniak, 2009). Motivation can build staff's skills and self-confidence by empowering them, which should bolster their self-efficacy. Psychologist Abraham Maslow initially introduced the concept of a hierarchy of human needs and suggested that people were motivated to fulfill basic needs before moving on to other needs (Maslow, 1943, 1954). Based on Maslow's theory, Buchaman and Huczynski (1997) divide motivation concerns into needs towards which behavior is directed (content needs, including basic biological needs, safety needs, social or affiliation needs), and those concerned with the dynamic, mental processes that lead to individuals following certain goals (process needs, including esteem needs, needs to know and understand, aesthetic needs, self-actualization and transcendence). Locke and Latham (2004) state a similar view that motivation refers to internal factors that impel action and external factors that can act as inducement to action.

A highly influential theory classifies motivation into intrinsic and extrinsic (Cellar, Posig, Johnson and Janega, 1993; Ryan and Deci, 2000; Wigfield and Eccles, 2000; Mohd-Sanusi and Mohd-Iskandar, 2006). Intrinsic motivation implies doing a task of interest and enjoyment, or being willing to engage in a task for its own sake because it results in a sense of self-determined competence; extrinsic motivation involves engaging in a task not for its own sake but to reach some desired end state. Motivation generated by perceptions of utility or instrumentality is inherently extrinsic (Ryan and Deci, 2000). Compared with Buchaman and Huczynski's (1997) study of content needs and process needs, the theory of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation is more suitable for the case study because it is more related to job satisfaction, effort recognition and incentives (such as allowance). Previous
studies have found that the presence of extrinsic motivation (for example, performance incentives) may increase the effect of intrinsic motivation on performance (Jordan, 1986). Incentive-based compensation is used frequently by organizations to improve overall performance, with the most commonly used performance incentives in organization being financial and non-financial (Stajkovic and Luthans, 1997).

A long history of experimental literature generally supports the common belief that financial incentives affect performance across a wide variety of tasks (Ashton, 1990; Awasthin and Pratt, 1990; Libby and Lipe, 1992; Bailey, Brown and Cocco, 1998; Mohd-Sanusi and Mohd-Iskandar, 2006). Pay for performance is probably the first thing that comes to mind when people think about motivating employees. Pay for performance refers to any compensation method that ties pay to the quality or quantity of work the person produces. Initial research about job satisfaction was conducted by Herzberg (1966), who directly asked the questions like “what made people feel good about their job?” and “what made people feel bad about their job?” Herzberg noted that the factors that contributed to higher satisfaction were fundamentally different from those that contributed to dissatisfaction. He called the factors that led to dissatisfaction hygiene factors; these included working conditions, salaries, relationship with colleagues. If these factors were deficient in any way then they led to job dissatisfaction. The converse, however, is not true. If all hygiene factors are satisfactory then an employee would not necessarily be satisfied. The factors associated with job satisfaction were termed motivators; these included recognition for doing a job well, a sense of achievement from learning something new or solving a tricky problem, or having a sense of responsibility or autonomy. More recent research comes up with a similar view. Hrebiniak (2009) states that appropriate motivation or incentives are positive and come into two packages: utilitarian and psychological. The former includes things of extrinsic value (salary, bonus, promotion), while the latter is more intrinsic or personal (autonomy, enjoying work, include psychological identification with a job or its outcomes). Many rewards, of course, incorporate both, as when someone receives recognition for a job well done, which certainly also bodes well for the prospect of a healthy pay raise or promotion in the future. But senior management may overlook the
importance of motivation and think that staff at a lower level should or must do whatever they are told. If this approach works, why should allowance be given?

Awasthi and Pratt (1990) have found that monetary incentives would increase the employees' effort in activities or actions, for example, seeking additional information, performing additional supporting computations, or carefully attending to the task. Similarly, Libby and Lipe (1992) have examined the effect of monetary incentives on performance. Their conclusions show that monetary incentives increase the effort devoted to cognitive tasks. Rosenthal, Frank and Epstein (2005) state that there is a growing international interest in using financial incentives to improve quality of care. They also give an example of Britain General Medical Service (BGMS) contract adopting Quality and Outcomes Frameworks (QOF) and providing financial rewards for meeting contract targets. High levels of achievements have been demonstrated in the first year of new QOF contract (Cole, 2005). Epstein (2006) states that pay for performance contracts are becoming increasingly popular. More and more CEOs are striking deals that tie pay to performance (Hrebiniak, 2009). Although other authors (Frey, 1997; Deci, Koestner and Ryan, 1999; Benabou and Tirole, 2003; Davies, Anand, Artigas, Holloway, McConway and Newman, 2004) criticize the negative impact of monetary incentive 'crowding out' intrinsic motivation (the individual's desire or interest to perform a task for its own sake), the positive impact of financial incentive is still obvious.

Another aspect of motivation is recognition of staff's contribution and effort. It is important to let employees know that their work is recognized and appreciated because most people like to feel appreciated. For non-financial incentives, accountability or justification was applied in a number of studies (Kennedy, 1993; Kovar, 1996; Pecher, 1996; Chang, Ho and Liao; 1997; Kennedy, Kleinmuntz and Pecher, 1997; Tan and Kao, 1999; Tan, Jubb and Houghton, 2002; Mohd-Sanusi and Mohd-Iskandar, 2006), together with feedback (Ashton, 1990; Leung and Trotman, 2005). In Seltzer and Bass's study (1990), respondents said that they highly valued day-to-day recognition from their supervisors, peers, and team members; over two-thirds said that it was important to believe that their work was appreciated by others. Efficient recognition can be a powerful
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reinforcer of employees' enthusiasm at work. Recognition also underscores the performance-reward-expectancy link, and helps appeal to and satisfy the need of efficient recognition of employees' achievements.

Recognition is usually reflected in highlighting incentives or rewards. This is becoming an increasingly important issue of the need to reward the doers. Hrebiniak (2009) stresses the fact that if organizations reward individual performance much more than cooperative team achievement, it can consequently damage strategy implementation as other team members may feel left out of the organizations' focus. Marshall and Harrison (2005) express a similar view, and much of the literature on incentive focuses on individual rather than group motivation. Strategy execution is becoming increasing complex, and it is often the case that task interdependence is high. Individuals' effort in different functional areas must be combined and coordinated to achieve positive outcomes. Cooperative efforts are needed to achieve integrated results. Individual effort is important, of course, but it is the coordination of the effort and the cooperation across diverse functions or units that are often vital to the success of strategy implementation. Rewarding individuals rather than groups may lower the effectiveness of strategy implementation and upset other cooperators in other departments. The negative impact of individual rewarding and recognition can hurt organization's long-term development, especially at the operational level.

2.3.3.5 Organizational culture and resistance to change
Organizational culture includes the norms and values of an organization, including the vision shared by organizational members. Buono, Bowditch and Lewis (1985, p. 482) identify organizational culture as "unique to a particular organization, composed of an objective and subjective dimension, and concerned with tradition and the nature of shared beliefs and expectations about organizational life. It is a powerful determinant of individual and group behaviour. Organizational culture affects practically all aspects of organizational life from the way in which people interact with each other, perform their work and dress, to the types of decisions made in a firm, its organizational policies and procedures, and strategy considerations". Gordon (1991, p. 404) suggests that "organizational culture formation is neither a random event nor an action dependent solely
on the personalities of founders or current leaders, but it is, to a significant degree, an internal reaction to external imperatives”. Gordon states that organizational culture is a product of successful adaptation to the environment and, as a result, will resist change. Hofstede, Neuijen, Ohayv and Sanders (1990) identify the characteristics of organizational culture as holistic, soft, difficult to change, with a historical basis, and socially constructed. Different authors have given similar definitions of organizational culture as the way an organization acts, makes decisions and competes; how much risk it tolerates; the emphasis it places on ethics or fairness in its transactions; and how people treat or evaluate one another’s actions and contributions to the organization. Hofstede (1997) further defines organizational culture as the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one organization from another. He separates culture into national and organizational. At the national level, culture difference would reside, mainly, in values, while at the organizational level, the difference would be mainly in practice. The culture issue in this research is closer to the organizational level, mainly in the practice of implementation of HE internationalization.

Organizational culture is one of the most popular topics in emerging and acquisition markets (Adriana, Ursula and Vicente, 2009). Bijlisma-Frankema (2002) state that there is increasing evidence that cultural incompatibility is the single largest cause of lack of projected performance, departure of key executives and time-consuming conflicts in the consolidation of business. The term ‘culture clash’ has been coined to describe the conflicts of two company philosophies, styles, values and missions (Nguyen and Kleiner, 2003), including employees’ fears over the loss of situational control, the possible loss of their jobs, unknown circumstances with a new manager, the loss of effective team members and the uncertainty about new team members. Consequently, employees may adopt an ‘us versus them’ thinking, where trust for the new company will be minimal. However, culture clash does not occur only between emerged or acquired organizations; it can happen within the same organization across different departments or units.
2.3.3.5.1 Relationship between organizational culture and employees’ behaviour

Organizational culture has a profound influence on the behaviour of individuals within the organization (Barney, 1986; Trice and Beyer, 1993). According to Barney (1986, p. 660), “firms that are successful at obtaining productivity through their people generally have an organizational culture that supports and values the worth of the employee.” Hrebiniak (2009) holds the similar view that organizational culture is reflected in employees’ behaviour that affects execution and organizational performance. Hrebiniak also suggests that the organizational performance can impact on culture as well. And this is the starting point of changing organizational culture.

There are two principal types of outcomes: the cooperative reaction and the resistance reaction. The former can enhance organizational performance; the latter can create obstacles to the performance. Piderit (2000) and Oreg (2006) clarify that resistance is viewed as multi-dimensional, involving how individuals behave in response to change (behavioural dimension), what they think about the change (cognitive dimension), and how they feel about the change (affective dimension). Bovey and Hede (2001, a, b) found that behaviours in response to change included supportive versus resistance, active versus passive, and overt versus covert. The forms of resistance can be reflected as employees do not actively support change initiatives or behave in ways that more covertly impede the effectiveness or rate of change; doing the minimum required, not actively cooperating or promoting the change initiatives; not making an effort to ensure that subordinates understand the consequents of change; purposely 'slowing down' or 'terminating' a change effort. Lines (2005) states that these types of behaviour are more likely to be in response to the attitude towards organizational change.

Oreg (2006, p. 76) describes resistance as a “tridimensional (negative) attitude towards change” involving interaction among cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions. The cognitive dimension represents how an individual conceptualizes or thinks about change. For example, what is the value of the change? Will the change benefit or harm my department, the organization, or me? Cognitive negative reactions or attitudes towards change include a lack of commitment to the change and negative evaluations of change.
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The affective dimension of individual reactions reflects how one feels about change. Affective reactions to change include experiencing such emotions as elation, anxiety, anger, fear, enthusiasm, and apprehension. The behavioral dimension of individual reaction represents how an individual behaves in response to change, such as embracing it, or complaining about it. Chreim (2006) found another key concern of individuals as being capable of accomplishing change because individuals may consider their own skills and competencies and make a determination of the likelihood of their success in new roles.

2.3.3.5.2 How to change culture and reduce resistance

Cultural effects on performance are straightforward, while the effects of performance on culture are compelling. The underlying logic is as follows: if organizational performance is poor, the questions asked are 'why?' and 'what are the reasons of negative deviation?' This usually results in decisions about what must be changed to improve performance. The changing content includes organizational culture, staff attitude and staff development. Other options include creating common culture (Cartwright and Cooper, 1993) and training (Valle, 1999). However, whether these options can achieve effective outcomes is questioned: firstly, changing staff attitude and organizational culture is difficult. Personal attitude cannot be changed simply by providing more training, such as staff development programmes. Although Jreisat (1997, p. 181) and Valle (1999) state that training can play an important role in bringing about changes in organizational culture and "training programmes assist employees in accepting the new values and designs", it is hard to measure the efficiency of outcome. Changing attitudes is a long-term endeavour and personal traits cannot be changed easily. Secondly, the weakness of cross-cultural concept leads to the inefficiency of culture change because the cross-cultural concept (Cartwright and Cooper, 1993) intends to create a common culture that can be used to bridge the gap. According to Chatterje, Lubatkin, Schweiger and Weber (1992), when attempting to bridge cultural differences, organizations may try to form a common culture between them. The common culture focuses mainly on agreeable aspects and aims to create synergies between organizations. However, it ignores the pressing need to understand the culture that obviously greatly influences organization. Actually, common culture should be the final
outcome where the sub-cultures are more similar or more overlapping, rather than being a starting point. Then, the question is still how to change organizational culture.

The answer is to start with changing behaviour and performance. Gordon (1991) and Hrebiniak (2009) state that changes in critical variables aimed at improving performance, such as changes in behaviour, performance, incentives, people (especially senior management), capabilities, or organizational structure can affect culture. Trice and Beyer (1993, p. 365) also state that "managerial practice are probably the most potent carriers of cultural meaning. As the proverb says, actions speak louder than words". Smith (2006), Self and Schraeder (2009) present a similar view: effective change requires good and sustained influence from senior management at all organizational levels. Instead of just using the language of change, they emphasize managers' performance and actions. In other words, leaders' influence should be used to affect employees' perception, and these perception can include whether an organization has the flexibility to achieve change and the degree to which employees can participate in decision making about the change. The key is to demonstrate the new ways of making change which are adopted by an organization. These changes and the modification in behaviour can shape the 'way an organization does things', and affect core values and norms in which organizational attributes are seen as important or significant. Thus, senior management should be more hands-on showing their reaction to staff's performance and mistakes, and giving feedback to create the right climate of promoting change or new initiatives. Furthermore, it needs to set up a mechanism for monitoring and controlling implementation at both the corporate and operational levels to enhance performance.

2.3.4 Summary
Numerous scholars realize the gap between strategy formulation and strategy implementation. In order to fill the gap, scholars identify various factors and frameworks of strategy implementation. Some authors state that the lack of a formal implementation framework is the major reason for the failure of strategy implementation. They believe that with appropriate guidance, the implementation process should be smooth and the aforementioned obstacles should also be overcome. However, some issues still remain
even though they have already been highlighted in literature and considered with a well designed corporate plan or formal procedure. The issues raised in this research include resource allocation, communication and information sharing, operational process, coordination and cooperation, motivation and incentives, organizational culture and resistance to change, student support and external environment. Besides student support, most remaining issues have already been identified by previous scholars. However, they still remain as problems during strategy implementation. Thus, a comprehensive implementation framework or a set of highlighted factors cannot guarantee successful implementation. The efficiency of strategy implementation needs to be further evaluated and scrutinized. The following section mainly addresses external issues in terms of the choice of international markets.

2.4 Choice of international market
Selecting right target countries for foreign operations is an important managerial decision and has a major impact on the success or failure of an international operation. The choice of markets is not a new topic in international marketing. A number of studies (for example, O'Farrell and Wood, 1994; Papadopoulos, Chen and Thomas; 2002; Rothaermel, Frank, Li and Epatein, 2005; Ojala and Tyrvainen, 2007a) in the field of international marketing and management have investigated how organizations choose their target markets. From Porter's (1990) five forces model to PESTEL analysis framework and the associated key criteria (as discussed later, see section 2.4.2), most scholars concentrate their attention on external factors and environment when choosing international markets. These external factors include economy, politics, competition, environment, market size, opportunity and risk. It seems that the choice of international market has an external tendency. External environment has primary effects on internationalization. Standardization and adaptation are the common approaches of international market expansion, especially in manufacturing and retail industries. But none of these concerns have much impact on HE internationalization. Up to now, there has been no literature focusing on HE internationalization from an internal perspective. The following content discusses the
literature on the choice of international market with the focus on market analysis (frameworks and factors) and international market expansion approaches.

2.4.1 Market analysis frameworks: Porter's five forces and PESTEL

As one of the most famous market analysis frameworks, Porter's (1985, 1990) five forces (supplier power, buyer power, competitive rivalry, threat of subsidiary and threat of new entry) guide organizations to make the decision whether they should or should not enter certain market or industry. Porter's framework is oriented towards competition (Solberg and Durrie, 2008), a typical external factor. Although Porter's theory is well established, its limitation is that this framework always views the key players (such as customers, competitors, buyers and suppliers) in a critical position against each other. Porter may argue that it is how competition works: when the barriers of five forces are high in a certain market, it means that this market is less attractive for an organization to enter and compete. However, Morrison (1989) criticizes Porter's framework as lacking precision; and Golden (1992) further challenges it as having insufficient empirical evidence. Solberg and Durrie (2008) hold a similar view that the operation mode in international markets has not been directly linked to Porter's strategy. They conclude that Porter's five forces have less practical basis.

PESTEL analysis is another well acknowledged framework. PESTEL stands for political, economics, social, technical, environment, and legislative factors in which an organization must operate (Mayer-Wittman, 1989; Day, 1990; Hopkinson, 1993; Sanchez and Heene, 1997; Gay, 2002). The PESTEL analysis has been employed to explore the general environment (Luffman, 1996; and Lynch, 1997). PESTEL is a strategic planning technique that provides a useful framework for analyzing environmental pressure on an organization. However, this framework focuses on the objective external environment analysis and ignores the organization's capability and internal issues. Roger (1999) stresses that competition as an important external factor is overlooked in PESTEL.

Many studies of internationalization have suggested both explicitly (Burt, 1993; Myers and Alexander, 1996) and implicitly (Knee and Walters, 1985; Robinson and Clarke-Hii, 1990;
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Pellegrini, 1994), that the direction of international market expansion stems from the outcomes of three factors: firstly, geographical proximity between the host and home markets; secondly, cultural or psychological proximity; and finally the variation in structure development between domestic and chosen markets. Evans, Treadgold and Movando (2000 a, b) pick up Burt’s (1993) assertion that the most advantageous host markets are those that are culturally close. This echoes Carlson’s (1975) and Bell’s (1995) conclusion that organizations would initially seek to enter host markets that are geographically and culturally close, and as they become more experienced, they are more willing to seek entry into more distant markets in terms of geography, culture and economic and political environment. However, culture and geographic distance are not the main concerns in HE internationalization. The choice of markets and academic partners depends primarily on whether the partner’s educational ethos (such as resource, language, management and academic standard of service provision) fits the home institution’s ethos (see Q 3.2, Chapter 4).

2.4.2 Market analysis factors

Macroeconomic conditions can impact the flow of international expansion and either disrupt or enhance specific linkages between markets (Myers and Alexander, 2007). McGoldrick and Davies (1995) highlight four key factors of market expansion: culture and languages, regulatory controls, transactional costs and competitor environment. Alexander and De Lira e Silva’s (2002, p. 301) add three more factors: “geopolitical, economic and competitive conditions fundamentally altered the direction of market expansion”. Although the influence of above factors is unquestionable, several authors (Bell, 1995; Coviello and Munro, 1997; Chetty and Campbell-Hunt, 2004; Moen, Gavlen and Endresen, 2004; Rothaermel, Kotha and Steensma; 2006) have found that the major determinants of the international market selection are cultural (psychic) distance, geographical distance, country risk (such as economic and political situation and security issues) and market size.

In many studies, the terms cultural distance and psychic distance have been used interchangeably to explain differences in cultural values among countries either at a national or individual level (Sousa and Bradley, 2006). However, the difference of national
cultures between the United Kingdom and foreign countries may not be a key concern in the case study.

Geographical distance has been found to be a significant factor when an organization selects its target countries; a short geographical distance can often be equated with a familiar business environment and lower operational costs (Luostarinen, 1979; Chetty, 1999; Dow, 2000; Clarks and Pugh, 2001). Geographical distance does not impact much on HE internationalization. International recruitment is not much limited by geographical distance; conversely, students are recruited from different continents and countries. Thus, this factor does not affect HE internationalization, either.

The level of country risk has been recognized as having a major impact on market entry decision (Miller, 1992; Ellis and Pecotich, 2001; Quer, Claver and Rienda, 2007). Generally, organizations avoid making direct investment in the countries with a greater risk level (Rothaermel, Kotha and Steensma, 2006; Quer, Claver and Rienda, 2007) and use entry modes that do not require higher investment (Shrander, Oviatt and McDougall, 2000). Brouther's (1995) significant conclusion is that when the country risk is high, in respect to the market entry strategy, organizations will favor independent entry modes, such as licensing, instead of integrated entry modes, like wholly owned subsidiaries. This point is consistent with the evaluation of the mode of entry in terms of risk, involvement and control (Anderson and Gatignon, 1986; Erramilli, 1990; Erramilli and Rao, 1993; see previous discussion of integration / control level of entry mode, section 2.2.4).

Several studies (Terpstra and Yu, 1988; Dunning, 1992; Rothaermel, Kotha and Steensma; 2006) propose that when making market entry decisions, organizations tend to favor countries which provide large markets and a large customer base for their products and services. Bell, McNaughton, Young and Crick, (2003) state that entrepreneurial organizations favor larger markets for their products. Most organizations prefer big market size, which means large customer basis and more potential benefit. By the same token, this concern of commercial internationalization should be transferrable and applicable to HE internationalization. But there is an exception. In education, academic quality of service
provision is always institutions’ priority. During internationalization, although universities may prefer to collaborate with large partners, quality cannot be eclipsed by the quantity of international recruitment (see Q 6.2, Chapter 4).

Most studies of the above factors have focused mainly on case studies (Coviello and Munro, 1997; Moen, Gavlen and Endresen, 2004; Zain and Ng, 2006) or surveys (Bell, 1995) without in-depth qualitative analysis. The study of Oviatt and McDougall (1997) also notes this problem and calls for more research on the internationalization, especially for SMEs (small or medium size enterprises). Furthermore, since these factors are all external concerns, it would appear that internationalization is linked directly to external environment.

2.4.3 International expansion approaches: standardization and adaptation

Standardization and adaptation of the marketing mix (7Ps)\(^\text{17}\) is one of the most important hallmarks of international marketing, especially in manufacturing and retail industries. Both approaches have been discussed by many scholars over the years (Levitt, 1983; Douglas and Wind, 1988; Samiee and Roth, 1992; Cavusgil and Zou, 1994; Roth, 1995; Ozsomer and Prussia, 2000; Solberg, 2002; Fastoso and Whitelock, 2007). Their discussion concentrated on two main opposing arguments: standardization and adaptation.

Standardization reduces costs and gives the brand a globally recognizable image. Supporters of standardization view markets as increasingly homogeneous and global in scope and scale and believe that the key for survival and growth is a multinational company’s ability to standardize goods and service (Fatt, 1967; Buzzell, 1968; Levitt, 1983, Yip, 1996). They also stipulate that consumer needs, wants and requirements do not vary significantly across markets or nations. The overall conceptual argument is that the world is becoming increasingly similar in terms of environmental factors and customer requirements and irrespective of geographical locations, consumers have the same

demands. For example, Levitt (1983) argues that the standardization of marketing mix and the creation of a single strategy for the entire global market offers economies of scale in production and marketing, which is consistent with what he describes as the 'mobile consumers' who have similar demands. However, due to the characteristics of education, standardization has less effect on HE internationalization. First, the selling point of education is academic quality of service provision rather than quantity of manufactured products, thus the economy of scale is not applicable. Next, in education, there is less homogeneity of customer requirements. Market demand for certain programmes can vary due to particular regional circumstances. For example, technology programmes are very popular with Middle East students; computing is the most popular programme in India; business and management programmes are preferred by Chinese students. Thus, the similarity of customer requirements or demands in education is not as obvious as in retail and manufacturing industries. This point is corresponding with other studies; for example, Guseman (1981) states that since services are more people-based than machine-based, service products are much less 'standardized' than tangible products. Finally, in respect to international academic collaboration, the only standardized content is the home institution's curriculum that can be franchised to overseas partners as main teaching materials. Besides that, neither recruitment of foreign students nor overseas branch campus involves a standardized operation.

Adaptation implies that there are many local differences between buyers in different countries and regions. Proponents of adaptation, such as Kashani (1989), indicate difficulties in using a standardized approach and therefore support market tailoring and adaptation to fit the 'unique dimensions' of different international markets (Thrassou and Vrontis, 2006). More specifically, supporters of the international adaptation school of thought argue that there are insurmountable differences between countries and even between regions in the same country (Papavassiliou and Stathakopoulos, 1997). Marketers are subject to a number of macro-environmental factors, such as climate, race, topography, occupation, taste, law culture, technology and society (Czinkota and Ronkainen, 1998). Paliwoda and Thomas (1999) expand this list to include customer tastes, disposable income, taxation, nationalism, local labour costs, literacy and levels of education.
Followers of this school stipulate that multinational companies should find out how to adjust their marketing strategy and tactics in order to meet market requirements. However, adaptation is not applicable to HE internationalization either because designing new programmes in education to meet local requirements is different from creating a brand new commercial product in business. The extent of adaption in terms of re-designing new programmes is constrained by the nature of programmes (see Q 6.1 and Q 7.2, Chapter 4), professional association and government regulation, such as the policy and regulations of the Ministry of Education. Random adaption in HE internationalization may eclipse the quality of academic service provision, lose certain markets (including U.K. home market) and drive higher education in a more commercial direction. This potential risk is corresponding with the weakness of Trim's (2003) HE internationalization framework (as discussed later, see section 2.6.2.3).

2.4.4 Summary
Most aforementioned factors focus on external environment, such as competition, culture, market size and geographic distance. Although both standardization and adaptation appear to be sensible, logical and coherent approaches in commercial internationalization, they are not compatible with HE internationalization. In respect to standardization, HE internationalization is not similar to manufacturing; the economy of scale and scope does not apply to education; for adaptation, redesigning new programmes or syllabus is different from creating new commercial products, and in the U.K. curriculum is partially constrained by the Ministry of Education. Universities do not have the full authority to change curriculum; thus adaptation is eliminated from the analysis of HE internationalization as well. Although some scholars (Kitchen, 2003; Vrontis, 2003; Soufani, Vrontis and Poutziouris, 2006) suggest balancing the two approaches within one organization or even within the same product line or brand, it seems not a 'happy marriage' for HE internationalization.
2.5 Internationalization of higher education (HE)

The section discusses the development of HE internationalization. Since the case study university does not have an overseas branch campus, curriculum internationalization (through, for example, re-validation of existing programmes) is one of the main strategies for HE internationalization.

2.5.1 Discussion of HE internationalization

HE internationalization is often used to describe individual mobility and internationalization of institutions and higher education systems across national boundaries. Porter (1990, p. 78), for example, defines HE internationalization as "a process by which teaching, research and service functions of a higher education system become internationally and cross-culturally compatible". Van Der Wende (1999, p. 11) states that "internationalization cannot be considered any longer as a marginal, add-on activity focusing mainly on the international mobility of student and teachers. But HE internationalization is becoming an important dimension in higher education policy as developed at the institutional and the national level, related to the challenges of globalization, which are increasingly affecting the higher education sector". Echevin and Ray (2002) present a broad conceptualization of HE internationalization at the programme level, covering internationalization via enrolment, teaching process, resources and locations. This broadening of the concept also involves branch campuses and distance learning.

Knight and De Wit (1997) state that HE internationalization is a process of integrating an international / intercultural dimension into teaching, research and service functions of the institution. Wachter (1999) expresses the similar view, having looked at the trends over the last 30 years in Europe. In 2003, he further stated that HE internationalization had widened and moved from the focus on the individual, via the focus on networks of persons or small sub-units of HE institutions, to the focus on the institution as a whole, to the system level, such as the formal structure of higher education. A more recent definition of HE internationalization (Knight, 2005, p. 9) is as follows: "the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of
post-secondary education”. Knight (2005) considers HE internationalization within an ongoing and continuing context. His definition integrates various strands or aspects of internationalization, including institutional strategy, mobility of students and academic staff, curriculum and teaching process, and embraces other matters, such as curriculum reform and the improvement of quality, research collaboration, international development projects, staff development and cross-border delivery of university programmes.

HE internationalization can also be defined through various perspectives, such as in terms of the context (De Wit, 1997; Wachter, 1999; Knight, 2005), activities (Black, 1996; De Wit, 2002) and outcomes (Francis, 1993; Hamilton, 1997; Whalley, 1997). For example, some scholars identify HE internationalization from an activities perspective, in which higher education institutions engage in order to deal with the complexities of internationalization. De Wit (1998) argues Knight’s point of view that in most studies, HE internationalization is narrowed down to one or a few activities; for example, academic mobility, global or multicultural education, area studies, and study abroad. HE internationalization is also frequently considered either as an activity or as a process. Several U.S. authors present HE internationalization mainly as a process of building up international campuses (Harari, 1992; Pickert and Turlington, 1992; Hanson and Meyerson, 1995) or as a process of integrating international education into the curriculum (Tonkin and Edwards, 1981; Lambert, 1989; Harari, 1992; Klasek, 1992). Other literature addressing HE internationalization tends to focus on the desired outcomes perspective. For example, Francis (1993) argues that internationalization of education is preparing the community for successful participation in an increasingly interdependent world. Hamilton (1997) states that internationalization of HE should infuse all facets of the university system, foster global understanding and develop skills for effective living and working in a diverse environment. Whalley (1997) holds a similar view by observing HE internationalization from a graduate employment point of view and argues that HE internationalization transforms the occupational landscape for graduates who need to be knowledgeable about internationalization and open to view a broad international context.
2.5.2 Curriculum internationalization

Curriculum internationalization is an initial vehicle to carry the message of internationalization to stakeholders including students, academics and institutions (Abdullahi, Kajberg and Virkus, 2007). It is a centralized approach to promote HE internationalization, particularly for the institutions that do not have an overseas branch campus. The purpose to re-form / re-validate the curriculum is to give graduates a standard of international perception. Curriculum internationalization can have various forms, such as textbooks on global business development, foreign events, case studies, guest speakers, and debates on international issues. Curriculum internationalization is a traditional way to allow students to gradually acquire international perspectives from secondary sources, like books, journals, lectures / classes and research results, without changing their original reference point (Van Der Wende, 1996a). This centralized approach enables students to experience internationalization locally through related curriculum instead of traveling abroad. Van Der Wende (2001) has conducted comparative research of curriculum internationalization, using a broad OECD-typology of international curriculum ranging from curriculum with some international content, curriculum that addresses cross-cultural skills, to curriculum leading to internationally recognized professions and special curriculum designed for foreign students. Van Der Wende encourages institutions to design special curriculum for foreign students, which is corresponding with Trim’s (2003) view in terms of international partnership management (as discussed later, see section 2.6.2.3). From the business point of view, they argue that the demand in foreign markets is the main driver of curriculum internationalization. However, home students are the major beneficiaries of curriculum internationalization. In addition, designing new curriculum is not the same as creating new commercial goods. Quality assurance in terms of service provision may challenge academic standards, especially when partners are involved in teaching. In education, curriculum design is not random, but needs formal approval from the government (such as the Ministry of Education) or relevant professional associations. For example, ACCA accounting curriculum must be compatible with the standards of

---

18 Secondary sources of international curriculum include guest speakers or visitors from different countries. Most students prefer their native language, so the filter effects of translation on the communication process is normally not students' reference point (Van Der Wende, 1996a).
ACCA. Many international professional associations deal with issues of education and training, such as quality assurance (Quality Assurance Agency QAA\textsuperscript{19} in the United Kingdom), international minimum standards (launched by the European Union), criteria of professionalism, and accreditation (NAFTA, North American Free Trade Agreement, and ASEAN, Association of Southeast Asian Nations), which often contains mutual recognition of licensing or certification.

Furthermore, not every subject is suitable to be internationalized. Some Anglo-centric programmes, such as U.K. law, accounting audit, education and health offer little room for internationalization. These programmes are in high demand from U.K. home students. Internationalizing these programmes may result in the loss of U.K. market. Thus, internationalizing curriculum is not an easy decision, and Mestenhauser (1997, p. 9) calls curriculum internationalization the ‘sacred cow’ and refers to the president of Princeton University Woodrow Wilson’s saying that “it is easier to move cemeteries than to change the curriculum”.

In contrast, other programmes, such as business, IT, art, design and science are more likely to be internationalized. According to Van Der Wende (1996a), most of the international curriculum is found in the areas of economics and business studies, and humanities and social sciences, while some professional programmes, such as nursing, law, health and education, are difficult to internationalize. The characteristics of programmes, placement availability, resource, market demand and English language proficiency are the potential obstacles for curriculum internationalization. Furthermore, staff’s willingness and attitudes can also challenge curriculum internationalization (see Q 6.1, Chapter 4).

Curriculum internationalization is evident as faculties revise the curriculum more in line with international standards. For example, accounting curriculum is re-validated to follow\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{19} Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) for Higher Education works to develop a set of reference points known as the academic infrastructure. Institutions use these and other reference points to guide their policies for maintaining academic standards and quality. The key role of QAA is to evaluate and benchmark academic quality of U.K. institutions (source: www.qaa.ac.uk).
the international accounting system; international law programmes (except U.K. law programmes) follow international standards. Besides textbooks and journals, teaching activities abroad also enhance the dissemination of internationalized curriculum. The most important contribution of curriculum internationalization is to benefit the majority of home students who graduate as global citizens without studying abroad. Curriculum internationalization helps the home institution gain an appropriate status for further collaboration (such as international partnership), and based on that, the resource-based compatibilities (between home university and partner) are possible to achieve.

2.5.3 Summary
HE internationalization usually describes individual mobility and internationalization of institutions and higher education systems across national boundaries. HE internationalization can also be defined through various perspectives, such as context, activities and outcomes. Curriculum internationalization is a traditional way to widen students' perspectives and generate international perceptions from secondary sources. It provides an opportunity for students (especially home students) to gain international knowledge and experience without traveling abroad. The next section examines particular forms and models of HE internationalization.

2.6 Models of HE internationalization
This section focuses on particular forms and models adopted by institutions to conduct HE internationalization. A total of five forms and three models are discussed. The literature on forms is introduced as the mode of entry in HE internationalization, and three related models are evaluated for later use to compare with the case study findings (see comparison and evaluation of dynamic framework, Chapter 5, section 5.4).

2.6.1 Forms of HE internationalization
The terms of HE internationalization refer to the activities of higher education institutions, often supported or framed by multilateral agreements or programmes to expand their reach over national borders. The forms of HE internationalization can serve a broad variety of
objectives, such as student and staff mobility, academic collaboration, diversification and growth of financial income by recruiting full fee-paying students, overseas branch campus and virtual university (Open University). The following sections discuss each form individually.

2.6.1.1 Student mobility

The best known form of HE internationalization is the increasing mobility of students studying abroad. Increasing student mobility itself has reinforced the conviction that one of the most effective means to prepare future graduates for the needs of an increasingly international professional life in a global economy is for students to study and live abroad. As knowledgeable future graduates, students may eventually demand a redistribution of resources and welfare to enable them to establish a satisfactory quality of life. The UNESCO conference\(^{20}\) stresses the important role of HE internationalization as a genuine endogenous and sustainable development for skilled and educated people (UNESCO, 1999). Student mobility includes both recruitment of overseas students and regional student exchanges.

Since the 1970s, international student flow has become a central feature of the global higher education system, and its quantitative development is impressive. Over more than forty years, the worldwide growth rate in international student outweighed even the overall higher education expansion rate (Throsby, 1998). According to the UNESCO statistics (UNESCO, 1998), there were approximately 1.5 million foreign students in the top 50 host countries in 1994-1995. Over the past 25 years, international student mobility has increased by more than 300% (UNESCO 1997, Bruch and Barty, 1998). With international student enrolment of over 415,000 students in the 2008/2009 academic year, the United

\(^{20}\) United National Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) states: "Without adequate higher education and research institutions providing a critical mass of skilled and educated people, no country can ensure genuine endogenous and sustainable development and, in particular, developing countries and least developed countries can not reduce the gap separating them from the industrially developed ones. Sharing knowledge, international co-operation and new technologies can offer new opportunities to reduce this gap." (source: UNESCO Conference on Higher Education (1999). Paris: UNESCO Publishing).
Kingdom is the second largest host of international students after the United States of America. The new increase in figures, now sees the U.K. numbers approaching those of the U.S., the world leader in international student recruitment. In 2008, the number of international students studying in the U.S. was 623,800. "We have believed for some time that we have many more international students in our universities and colleges than were being counted," said Pat Killingley (2009, n.p), the British Council's director of higher education. "Now we can see that the United Kingdom is challenging the U.S, the global leader in the market for international students".21 New figures revealed by the British Council (2009) show that there are 513,570 international students currently studying in British universities. The top five places of total international student enrolment in 2009 were China (total 50,460 students, 12%), India (total 36,105 students, 8.7%), United States (total 21,815 students, 5.2%), Germany (total 17,980 student, 4.3%), and France (total 17,660 students, 4.2%). A dramatic rise in recruitment figures meant that the number of Chinese international students increased from 49,000 to 55,000 and the number of Indian students from 28,000 to 35,000 (British Council, 2010). Around the world, many individual countries witness substantial growth rate of foreign student enrolment. Many observers expect this growth to continue for a while, even if the annual growth rates will diminish gradually. Some prognoses mention 2.8 million students studying aboard worldwide by 2010 and 4.9 million by 2025, including 2.9 million from Asia.

Regional student exchange makes a significant contribution to international student mobility. In 2008-2009, the total of 25,600 overseas exchange students (including short-term student visitors) were classed in the United Kingdom (Higher Education Statistics Agency, HESA 2009). Regional student exchange is supported and stimulated by various programmes. The well known schemes in Europe are the ERASMUS22 and SOCRATES.23

21 Felicity Pont, Title: "Student recount reveals UK international student figures at over half a million", 22nd May 2009, (source: http://www.hesa.ac.uk, last accessed 3 October 2010).

22 European Region Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students (ERASMUS) seeks to enhance the quality and reinforce the European dimension of higher education by encouraging transnational cooperation between universities, boosting European mobility and improving the transparency and full academic recognition of studies and qualifications throughout the Union. ERASMUS consists of many
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Started in 1987, the ERASMUS and SOCRATES programmes (and also other schemes such as COMMETT, LINGUA and TEMPUS that specifically deal with exchange with Eastern Europe) had the ambition, among other goals, to increase significantly the mobility of students in order to develop the European dimension of higher education. Student mobility has been seen as a powerful means to support the creation of an internal market of professional and qualified workers and the creation of a Eurocentric educational platform. As Teichler (1998) stresses, within less than 10 years, ERASMUS / SOCRATES programmes reached the level of more than 100,000 mobile European students a year and with this result these were considered to be one of the most successful European programmes in the field of education.

Besides European funding programmes, other schemes also encourage student mobility regionally, such as the UMAP\textsuperscript{24} programme in the Asia / Pacific and NORDPLUS\textsuperscript{25} programme in the Nordic countries. International market in education is becoming a booming sector. Some countries have developed well-known and well-organized national policies to encourage student mobility. For example, United Kingdom operates 211 British Council offices in 147 countries and France has 1,058 associations of the Alliance France different activities; student and teacher exchanges, joint development of study programmes (curriculum development), international intensive programmes, thematic networks between departments and faculties across Europe Intensive Language Courses (EILC), European Credit Transfer System (ECTS). ERASMUS action is aimed at higher education institutions and their students and staff in all 27 Member States of the European Union, the three countries of the European Economic Area (Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway), and Turkey (source: http://ec.europa.eu/education/programmes/llp/structure/erasmus_en.html).

\textsuperscript{23} System for Online Curriculum Review and Technical Education Support (SOCRATES) programme was an educational initiative of the European Commission. The initial SOCRATES programme ran from 1994 until 31 December 1999 when it was replaced by the SOCRATES II programme on 24 January 2000, which run until 2006. This, in turn, was replaced by the Lifelong Learning Programme 2007-2013; 25 EU countries took part.

\textsuperscript{24} University Mobility in Asia and the Pacific (UMAP, founded in 1993) is a voluntary association of government and non-government representatives of the higher education (university) sector in the Asia and the Pacific region including Japan, South Korea, Malaysia, Singapore, China and Hong Kong.

\textsuperscript{25} NORDPLUS is a cooperation programme within the Nordic countries and the Baltics. The programme comprises of action plans in several educational levels and is financed by the Nordic Council of Ministers. More than 10,000 students in the Nordic region benefit from it every year.
in 132 countries. Other countries, such as Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa (from 1994) have developed ambitious strategic plans in order to strengthen their market positions (Mallea, 1998; Kishun, 1998; Oettli, 1999).

Why are there so many programmes and organizations to promote student mobility? Income generation is one of the key reasons. According to Scott (1998), international student flow has become ‘more trade than aid’. The growth of international student mobility is market-driven rather than state-driven or aid-oriented. Scott further states that in most host institutions, especially in Anglo-centric countries, the income of fee-paying foreign students is a welcome addition to the diminishing domestic funding (see discussion of rationales of HE internationalization, in Chapter 1, section 1.0), without which many institutions would be threatened with closure. Other scholars argue that income generation should not be the main motive for HE internationalization, and the home country should always be the primary market for its institutions. It is risky for a university to rely heavily on the income from international students because then the institution can collapse if it does not recruit international students (see Q 6.2, Chapter 4).

2.6.1.2 Staff mobility
Staff mobility consists of staff exchange and staff teaching abroad. The former is combined with the promotion of student mobility programmes, such as ERASMUS / SOCRATES and UMAP, which also encourage staff mobility projects. In the preparatory phase of ERASMUS, the ‘Inter-university Cooperation Programmes’ provide opportunities for staff exchange as part of a regular cooperation between European higher education institutions. The latter (staff teaching abroad) is normally combined with international academic collaborations, where home institution academics teach foreign students abroad. Teaching periods can be arranged long-term (an entire semester) or short-term (few weeks). In addition, attending international conferences, guest speaking and making site visits can be categorized as staff mobility. However, teaching abroad may clash with teaching at the home institution, and lead to peak academic schedules. Enders (1998) states that many travelling professors point to problems with work overload. Furthermore, the issues
regarding limited financial and administrative support for cross-country teaching may put pressure on resource in terms of staff and capital.

2.6.1.3 Overseas branch campus

A rapidly growing number of universities across the world are establishing branch campuses in other countries. The number has almost doubled to 162 in the past three years and increased eight-fold since 2002 (Maslen, 2009). Universities tend to adopt a more market-oriented, entrepreneurial approach to recruit students. This entrepreneurial approach enables the home university to extend recruitment of foreign students in other countries by setting up local campuses under the full authority of the home institution. The full service branch campus is a physical presence, wholly operated by the awarding institution, providing degrees taught face-to-face and supported by traditional infrastructure including library, laboratories, classrooms, faculties and staff offices. Ideally, research and community engagement should be part of the profile, as well as teaching. The U.S. and Australian universities have the largest number of branch campuses; only few U.K. universities take part in the branch campus stage, such as the University of Nottingham, University of Liverpool and University of Middlesex.

Typical examples of overseas branch campuses can be found in Malaysia and Singapore. In Malaysia, the Education Act (1998) permits foreign universities to establish branch campuses inland with the local policy to make Malaysia a regional hub for education service provision. As a result of this policy, some universities (such as Monash University, Curtin University of Technology, and University of Nottingham) established branch campuses in Malaysia. The ‘first presence’ advantage is not the only motive for these practitioners. As stakeholders, Malaysian government, federal agencies and local private investors have strongly supported these new entrants by providing land, property and offering financial assistance for the initial setting up of the campus. For example, Curtin University of Technology, Miri campus (Miri is the second biggest city in Sarawak, Malaysia) in the state of Sarawak was initiated by a group of private stakeholders, but later supported by the Sarawak State Deputy Chief Minister. It has become something of a ‘pet’ project for the Sarawak State Government which has plans to expand the campus to around
10,000 students by 2010 (Mazzarol, Soutar and Seng, 2003). The Curtin campus project in Miri is understood to have received a grant of RM 500 million (more than £100 million) to assist with its development over the next ten years. The University of Nottingham branch campus in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia has received strong support from the Malaysian Minister for Education, who has personal links to the University of Nottingham (ibid). Monash University’s Kuala Lumpur campus has the backing of a prominent group of Malaysian politicians. In addition, the neighboring Singapore’s approach to internationalization in education sector is similar to Malaysia’s. Singapore established similar policies in 1997, when the Economic Development Board announced plans to attract the top ten international universities to set up in Singapore to create a regional education hub in Asia (EDB, 2008).

However, the overseas branch campus approach does not fit most U.K. institutions (including the case study university). Due to potential risk, cost and uncertainty, most universities prefer to conduct internationalization through partnership and agent development, and only few reputable universities move towards satellite campuses. This stage may not be the right direction for most institutions, especially those of middle or lower ranking in the league tables.

2.6.1.4 Academic collaboration

Academic collaboration has developed rapidly since 1990s. It is constructed on a deeper mutual institutional recognition. An inter-institutional agreement is established so that one institution would recognize the programmes of another. According to QAA’s (United Kingdom) definition (cited in Brown, 1997), the characteristics of international academic collaboration include: the award of a degree or other qualification of the U.K. institution to the students studying for all or part of their programmes through an overseas partner; the provision by the overseas partner of all or part of the programmes of study franchised to it by the U.K. institution; direct entry or entry with advanced standing of students at U.K. institutions by virtue of their satisfactory progress in approved programmes at an overseas partner institution; preferential or non-preferential consideration of applicants to study at a U.K. institution by virtue of their satisfactory completion of a preparatory or foundation
course provided by an overseas partner; the facilitation by an overseas partner of distance learning programmes offered by the U.K. institutions; and any other association which allows an overseas institution to use the name of a U.K. institution, or to refer to an award of that U.K. institution in any context.

The 'Global Alliance for Transnational Education' (GATE) is an important international organization of businesses, higher education institutions and governmental agencies in the field of quality assurance, accreditation and certification in international education, which distinguishes academic collaborations into the following three forms (McBurnie and Pollock, 1998; GATE, 2000): firstly, through franchising agreement, an institution grants a host institution in another country the permission to provide some of its programmes and degrees under mutually agreed conditions. Under this arrangement, the education provided is completely under the degree awarding capacity of the home institution, but the programme delivery is the responsibility of the host institution. Next, twinning agreements between higher education institutions in different countries are set up to offer joint programmes. In both universities, students follow exactly the same courses, have the same materials and sit same examinations. The academics involved in delivery and assessment are usually from local universities. Finally, contrary to twinning agreements, articulations are not jointly developed. Students are enrolled in programmes or parts of programmes in the host institution, leading to the credits recognized by other institutions. Students can follow the first years of their programmes in a local institution, leading to the credits or qualifications (such as diplomas) recognized by other institutions for entry into advanced programmes. For example, the case study university adopts articulation in the partnership with BA College, Botswana in the Masters programmes. The university runs the programmes as off-campus delivery on the premises of the BA College and has given advanced standing to the holders of the CIMA and ACCA qualifications to the MBA and MSc Strategic Financial Management respectively (see Q 3.1 and Q 4.1, Chapter 4; and discussion of market entry and programme delivery methods, section 5.3.1, Chapter 5).

A potential issue of articulation is that the lack of synergy between the education systems in different countries may result in un-equivalent credit transfer (see discussion of
recognition of credits and length of study abroad, Chapter 2, section 2.7.5) because home universities normally see their curriculum as standard. Based on that, they match their curriculum with the partner’s and decide how many credits can be transferred and how long the period of study should be. There is no governmental or official standard regulation to guide the process of articulation. Most agreements between the home institution and overseas partners are constructed on a mutual inter-university basis. Credit transfer depends mainly on the home institution, especially faculties or key persons (such as programme leaders). However, in respect to qualifications with international standard (such as ACCA and CIMA), the process of articulation and credit transfer is more objective and automatic (see discussion of market entry and programme delivery methods, section 5.3.1, Chapter 5).

2.6.1.5 Borderless education and transnational education

In recent years, the concepts of ‘borderless education’ and ‘transnational education’ have been introduced in the scholarly and policy literature on higher education (CVCP 2000; Adams 2001; Ryan 2002). “The term ‘borderless higher education’ refers to a range of interlocking activities including E-learning, other forms of transnational provision and new providers that cross a variety of ‘borders’, whether geographical, sectoral or conceptual” (Ryan, 2002, p. 21). Transnational education is more concise and refers to “all types of higher education study programmes, or sets of courses of study, or educational service (including distance learning) in which the learners are located in a country different from the one where the awarding country is based” (Adams 2001, p. 13). The transnational concept challenges the geographical perspective to a larger extent, but does not specifically emphasize technological modes of delivery (such as information and communication technologies, ICT). Van Damme (2001) combines the above two notions into an overall transnational education concept and states that transnational education is the delivery of programmes of a provider institution geographically situated in one part of the world, with the receivers in other parts of the globe through various forms of technologically supported distance education. Information and communication technologies (ICT) through the internet and satellite transmission open up avenues of development in educational delivery modes in which geographical limitations are eliminated. Host institutions are mainly
located in the USA, United Kingdom and Australia; and the target markets are primarily in South East Asia, Europe and Africa (Hosie and Mazzarol, 1999).

In addition, various Open Universities have done pioneering work in this field of courses (Van Der Wende, 2002), not only in the developed world but also in developing countries (including, Turkey, Malaysia, India and Brazil). Both borderless education and transnational education enhance HE internationalization. However, the disadvantage is the limited extent to which learning material can be launched online. Also, the level of technology in some regions (such as Africa) can challenge transnational education. Although online distance learning is directed at certain segments of the education market and confined to subject areas such as MBA and IT (Bluestain, Goldstein and Lozier. 1999; Adams, 2001; CVCP, Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals, 2000), it does require high levels of personal discipline because it is independent learning and students take the majority of responsibility for it. Thus, compared to undergraduate study, more adult students are engaged in online distance learning.

However, some authors (Wilson and Vlasceanu 2000; Adams 2001) consider these new methods of programme delivery a threat to traditional HE institutions from the point of view of competition. They point out that the link between technology and HE internationalization is primarily understood as the emergence of a market for education and growth of new actors (such as Open Universities) that attempt to ‘capture’ the traditional market (Ryan, 2001), thus creating threats to higher education institutions. Adams (2001) also argues that significant numbers of institutions view transnational education as some sorts of threat to traditional standards, market positioning and existence of traditional institutions.

However, these criticisms are not supported in this research because transnational education (such as online distance learning) only takes a complementary and compatible role in traditional education in terms of programme delivery and market entry. The enrollment in transnational education occupies a small proportion of the overall student numbers. Furthermore, some countries (like China) do not recognize transnational
education (such as E-learning) as having the same academic standard as traditional on-campus study (see discussion of recognition of foreign qualifications, section 2.7.4, Chapter 2). Foreign government policy also affects the development of transnational education. Thus transnational education is unlikely to threaten or replace the traditional education system.

2.6.2 Models of HE internationalization
This section provides an overview of relevant models of HE internationalization. Compared to commercial internationalization, few frameworks of HE internationalization exist. The study of HE internationalization is still a fresh area that requires more research. Up to the 2000s, only few education models have been identified for HE internationalization. The case study will compare and evaluate these models in reference to HE internationalization and determine whether these models fully explain the process observed at the case study university. The following content addresses each model individually.

2.6.2.1 LaRosa, Joseph and Javalg's (2009) model for servicing international education market
LaRosa, Joseph and Javalg (2009) propose a framework for servicing international student markets. Their framework shows that the interactive forces of market entry and delivery choices must fit learning styles in the target country.

The first section of this model is international market entry and delivery choices. Once the market analysis has been completed, the decision by an institution to enter a foreign market permits several entry modes. LaRosa, Joseph and Javalg (2009) cite Czinkota's (2006) four types of international delivery mode as the first part of their framework. The four types of international delivery modes relate directly to this research, although they present only a facet of HE internationalization (as discussed later, see section 5.4.1, Chapter 5). Other aspects, such as articulation, validation, progression arrangements are not addressed. The four types of international delivery mode are consumption, cross-border supply, delivery, and commercial presence.
Consumption abroad is the traditional and most popular delivery mode where students are recruited to study at the home institution’s campus. Bringing the students to the home campus is akin to ‘indirect exporting’ (Emmamilli, Agarwal and Dev, 2002), a less risky delivery mode that requires the students to leave their home country and consume the service abroad within the context and conditions set by the service provider (such as home universities). This notion is consistent with student mobility (see discussion of student mobility, section 2.6.1.1, Chapter 2).

Cross-border supply indicates that the programme is delivered to markets by transnational education (such as online distance learning). This is an efficient mode of entry to reach a large number of international students at less cost. This notion is corresponding to borderless / transnational education (see discussion of borderless / transnational education, section 2.6.1.5, Chapter 2).

Delivery abroad enables faculty and scholars to travel and deliver educational programmes in selected countries. This entry mode engages the service provider with the target student markets. This notion is consistent with teaching abroad (see discussion of staff mobility, section 2.6.1.2, Chapter 2). However, insufficient financial resource may put pressure on sending academics and researchers to continually teach or supervise students in a foreign market.

Commercial presence allows educational programmes to be delivered at a wholly-owned branch or satellite campus in an international location or offered with a joint venture partner in the host country, usually through a partner institution. This notion is corresponding to the overseas branch campus (see discussion of overseas branch campus, section 2.6.1.3, Chapter 2).

The second section of this model is the interrelationship of culture, learning / training styles and teaching / consumption methods. LaRosa, Joseph and Javalg’s (2009) discussion incorporates the works of two highly respected scholars: the anthropologist Geert
Hofstede’s ‘cultural dimensions’ (Hofsteds, 1983), and the organizational behaviour and adult learning expert David Kolb’s ‘experiential learning model’ (Kolb, 1999). Hofstede (1983) states that culture is learnt and derived from one’s social environment and that it shapes the way one thinks, feels, and acts, or the behaviours learnt throughout one’s life. LaRosa, Joseph and Javalg cite Hofstelde’s framework and suggest that institutions should make their teaching methods consistent with the local culture. Kolb’s (1999) experiential learning model implies that institutions should pay more attention to local learning styles. LaRosa, Joseph and Javalg’s framework combines Hofstede’s and Kolbe’s work and indicates that institutions must adapt their service delivery (or teaching methods) to suit local students’ learning (or consumption) styles in order to maximize final outcomes. This point is consistent with Honey and Mumford’s (1992) research that shows that the closer the match between preferred learning styles and the teaching methods applied, the more likely one is to learn. The interrelationship of learning and teaching highlights the importance of interaction between teaching (the home institution’s culture) and learning (the target country’s culture).

The last section of this framework is strategic consideration that emphasizes the ways to serve and manage HE internationalization in foreign markets. It presents strategic considerations in target markets, including product design and market entry strategies, managing collaborative relationships, maintaining educational and service quality.

However, LaRosa, Joseph and Javalg’s framework does not comprehensively address the modes of entry for HE internationalization. First, besides the four listed market entry modes, other available options, such as franchise, alliance, validation, articulation, top-up, credit transfer and advanced standing, are not discussed. Second, LaRosa, Joseph and Javalg confuse the notions of the mode of entry and programme delivery method (called ‘international market entry / delivery choice’). They are interrelated, but mode of entry and programme delivery method have different meanings. For example, ‘commercial presence’ is a circumstance of a satellite campus, rather than a market entry strategy. The relevant entry strategy (mode of entry) to achieve the ‘commercial presence’ is the greenfield (see discussion of hierarchical mode of entry, section 2.2.3). Another example is ‘delivery
abroad', which is a programme delivery method similar to ‘flying faculty’ or ‘home staff teaching abroad’, but it cannot be used as a mode of entry because it is not a market entry strategy. ‘Flying’ academics teaching abroad is an operational activity, which does not mean that the home institution has strategically entered a foreign market. However, LaRosa, Joseph and Javalg join the two notions and deliver a vague message to institutions in terms of international market expansion. Third, the middle section of this framework emphasizes interrelationships of cultural dimensions, such as the interaction between teaching and learning. It implies that HE internationalization is an external, environment-driven matter. However, environment may not primarily impact the development of HE internationalization because they are the factors faced by most universities (for example, economy, competition, government policy and level of technology). The success of HE internationalization may be determined by some internal issues, such as staff attitude, willingness to participate, communication, understanding, cooperation (see Q 6.1, Chapter 4). Finally, the strategic concerns of internationalization in the last section of LaRosa, Joseph and Javalg’s framework, which include marketing mix, product design and managing collaboration, are too common and too broad. These concerns are not specific to HE internationalization, but applicable to any field of international marketing management.

2.6.2.2 ‘Three waves’ model of HE internationalization

Mazzarol, Soutar and Seng (2003) categorize the development of HE internationalization into the ‘three waves’ model based on the home university’s level of international involvement.

The first wave involves students travelling to a host nation to study at a chosen institution. This was a common way throughout much of last century and remains so today. It is reflected primarily in the university’s strategy of recruiting international students. In 2002, a U.K. university survey showed that 73% of U.K. universities reported that their institutional mission included an international strategy (CVCP 2002). This survey found that, for these strategies, the main priority over an eight-year period was the recruitment of international students. Internationalization is included as one of the eight key corporate
strategies\textsuperscript{26} (2009-2014) of the case study university. Five main overseas regions are targeted in the case study university's recent marketing strategy\textsuperscript{27} (February 2010, p. 2): China, Hong Kong / Macau, India (North), Kuwait / Middle East and Nigeria / Ghana. The Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA, 1999/2000) reported that in Great Britain, 23.4\% of the total income of universities came from overseas (non-European) full-time higher education tuition fees. This figure became 24.48\% in 2000/2001. Ayoubi and Massoud's (2007) research presented the internationalization statistics of 117 U.K. universities, within which the case study university is listed under number 26, with 1.8\% of overseas (non-European) students, 5.22\% of overseas income to the total income and 0.3\% of market share of overseas first-year students.

The second wave involves institutions moving into foreign markets through an alliance or coalition and by establishing a presence in international markets through ‘twinning’ programmes (Smart, 1988). This process became common and successful in South East Asia in the 1990s, with many privately owned colleges providing an outlet for students to study for a foreign degree in their home country (Prystay, 1996). Education in Malaysia is a typical example. By 2000, there were around 120 private colleges offering ‘twinning’ programmes (also called ‘double degrees’) and 30 with ‘3+0’ programmes (Ministry of Education Malaysia, 2001). This model not only enhances international collaboration but also makes Malaysian institutions more attractive to students from China, Indonesia, Iran, India, Yemen, Philippine, Africa and Middle East. The unique selling point of Malaysian institutions is that students study in Malaysia and graduate with U.K. qualifications. It sounds good in terms of economy (saving living cost and tuition fee). The researcher is a beneficiary of the ‘twinning’ programme, having graduated with the University of [X]'s qualification from [N] College, Malaysia. Her own experience not only illustrates the

\textsuperscript{26} "Eight Core Strategies underpin the Corporate Plan: Academic development, Learning, teaching and assessment, Student experience, Target markets & progression, Employer engagement, Internationalization and Research." (source: www.qaa.co.uk. QAA University of [X] audit report, November, 2009, p. 6).

\textsuperscript{27} Central Marketing Strategy for International Recruitment (23\textsuperscript{rd} February, 2010), University of [X], Marketing Department, (source: www.[---].ac.uk/marketing).
‘second wave’ but also provides a witness standpoint to better understand the development of HE internationalization.

However, the second wave can place significant pressure on an institution’s internal resources, particularly in terms of academic staff. Mazzarol, Hosie and Jacobs (1998) state that resource pressure impacts not only on the faculty of home universities, but also on the overseas partner institutions. Relational friction may occur during the collaboration if the goals of the home institution and overseas partner are different (Hosie and Mazzarol, 1999). Another issue is the challenge of quality control for home universities. Home institutions must make sure that their overseas partners are responsible and able to deliver programmes of the same or equivalent academic standards. Therefore, programme moderation, validation and staff recruitment become vital. Nicholls (1987) suggests that overseas partners should provide high quality facilities and effective marketing support, and local teaching staff must have similar qualifications and skills as academic staff from the host institution. Course content and teaching materials must be of equivalent standards to those in the host institution.

The third wave is about opening overseas branch campuses. This involves substantially greater investment and risk and appears to be driven by local governments that wish to enhance the quality of their local education infrastructure (World Trade Organization, 1998). With regional locations that offer enhanced accessibility, these branch campuses have the potential to develop collaborative synergies to serve as launching pads for entry into some major markets, especially in developing countries (Mazzarol, Soutar, and Seng, 2003). A number of ‘third wave’ satellite campuses are emerging alongside the ‘first’ and ‘second’ waves in South East Asia, especially Malaysia and Singapore. Although local government offers strong support for these satellite campuses, they still need substantial time to fully develop and become financially viable and independent. Commercialization is the main motive for establishing overseas branch campuses, as participating institutions present themselves locally and directly compete with local institutions.
Mazzarol, Soutar, and Seng's 'three waves' framework is partially consistent with other scholars' views; for example, Nilsson (1999) and Knight (2003 and 2005) divide HE internationalization into two dimensions. The first dimension is internationalization at home, which is purely domestic and refers to the international and intercultural dimension of curriculum: teaching and research which helps students develop international and intercultural skills without leaving their home country. This view is corresponding to curriculum internationalization (see discussion of curriculum internationalization, section 2.5.2, Chapter 2). The second dimension is cross-border education, which refers to a situation where students, lecturers, researchers, programmes, institutions / providers, and course materials cross national jurisdictional borders (OECD, 2004). Three forms have been identified depending on who or what crosses the border (OECD, 2004). Firstly, a person can go abroad for the purpose of education (people mobility). This form is similar to the 'first wave', which is consistent with the previous discussion of student mobility (see discussion of student mobility, section 2.6.1.1), and staff mobility (see discussion of staff mobility, section 2.6.1.2). Next, an educational programme can go abroad (programme mobility). This form is similar to the 'second wave', which is consistent with academic collaboration (see discussion of academic collaboration, section 2.6.1.4). Finally, an institution or provider can go or invest abroad for educational purposes (institution mobility). This form is similar to the 'third wave', which is consistent with an overseas branch campus (see discussion of overseas branch campus, section 2.6.1.3).

Besides the 'three waves' notion, Mazzarol (1998) also presents the approach called information and communication technologies (ICT), or the 'bricks and mortar' institutions model (also called as E-learning or online distance learning). In this section, the researcher temporarily identifies E-learning as 'the fourth wave': 'E-wave'. E-wave can be included in the three waves simultaneously or work independently by targeting customers (students) in a foreign country. One of the first 'virtual university' models to be created was the Western Governors University in the United States. This organization was established by the governors of 17 Western state universities and is allied to such corporations as IBM, AT&T, Cisco, Microsoft and International Thomson (World Trade Organization, 1998). Large international organizations, such as Toyota, Motorola, Dell, CityBank have also
established virtual institutions that deliver online programmes. Many Open Universities (such as Open Universities United Kingdom, Open Universities Australia, Open Universities in India, National Open University of Nigeria and Arab Open University) offer programmes to be carried around the world into all the markets in which corporate partners are operating. The delivery of specialized tailored courses to individual corporate clients is another ongoing trend (Nicholls, 1987). E-wave is becoming more common as education institutions seek to secure financially beneficial contracts with large corporate partners that can assist in opening new sustainable off-shore markets. However, online provision is likely to be as costly as conventional delivery (Ives and Jarvenpass, 1996), and there may be limitations as to how widely it can reach global markets (Chandersekaran, 1998). Some countries (such as China Mainland) do not recognize the standards of E-learning qualification as equivalent to those gained through a traditional on-campus study model (see discussion of recognition of foreign qualifications, section 2.7.4).

The limitation of Mazzarol, Soutar and Seng’s ‘three waves’ model is the lack of detailed empirical implementation. For example, the ‘first wave’ emphasizes international student recruitment, but the particular channels to achieve a good recruitment (such as agents, partners, education fair or online direct recruitment) are not discussed. The ‘first wave’ highlights international recruitment as the direction and focus in the early stage of HE internationalization but does not indicate the particular ways to achieve that focus; thus, it lacks empirical implementation. The ‘second wave’ contemplates academic collaborations, but does not examine the entry modes (for example, franchise, alliance, validation or articulation), through which to enter a foreign market. The ‘third wave’ concentrates on establishing overseas branch campus, but it may not be the suitable stage for most institutions (see discussion of Q 5.1, Chapter 4) because there is insufficient evidence, especially financial statistics, to prove that a satellite campus is the right move. Professor Shattock of London’s Institute of Education carried out a study of the University of Nottingham’s campuses in China and Malaysia, and undertook an audit of the Australian Monash University’s campuses in Malaysia and South Africa. “The Nottingham campuses were not breaking even” he says, “that was also true of Monash, both in Malaysia and South Africa” (cited in Hodges, 2007, n.p). Currently, most overseas branch campuses are
still at the developing stage and rely heavily on the local government's financial support. What will happen if the foreign government withdraws the assistance? Furthermore, foreign governments may only support reputable universities, such as University of Nottingham and Curtin University of Technology, but what about other universities of middle or lower ranking? These universities present the majority of institutions in the United Kingdom but do not draw equivalent attention of local governments. And the 'third wave' is only emerging in South East Asia. The possibility of the 'third wave' in other regions, such as East Asia (China, Japan), South Asia (India, Pakistan), Europe and South America is still doubtful.

In short, the 'three waves' model presents only a facet of HE internationalization; other perspectives, such as mode of entry and programme delivery method are not discussed. Furthermore, although online distance learning plays an important role in HE internationalization, this is missed by Mazzarol, Soutar and Seng's discussion.

2.6.2.3 Trim's (2003) conceptual framework for auditing, evaluating and managing a partnership arrangement

Trim's (2003) conceptual framework is a stakeholder-based model of international education partnership management. Trim's model provides a professional marketing approach that argues that customers' expectations must be met. Trim suggests that this model can also be used to audit, evaluate and manage a partnership arrangement.

The stakeholder perspective is one of the main features, which is consistent with Bakir's (1993) view. Bakir identifies various client groups to be found in the education sector, including academic staff, students, administrators, governors, local authority personnel, government agency, politicians, chamber of commerce personnel, bankers, accountants, auditors, sponsors and various members of public (parents, siblings, shopkeepers and local business community and groups). Trim points out that customers are not homogeneous, hence educational provision needs to be placed within the context of a stakeholder. This model focuses on partnership arrangements involving institutions of further and higher education for provision to a broad range of audiences. It suggests that senior management
of the home university needs to have an understanding of who the stakeholders are and what they expect.

The second feature of this model is income generation. This model facilitates the link between academia, commerce and industry. The aim is to enable educational institutions to gain additional revenue from the exploitation of marketable ideas that are converted into commercial products and services. It is essential that within the framework of a partnership arrangement there is a structure in place to allow senior academics and administrators to ensure that the partnership is maintained and developed. The department of ‘centre of entrepreneurship’ plays a key role in this model and directly markets teaching, research and consultancy with overseas academics or industrial partners. This department focuses on new methods of income generation and the integration of the strategic planning framework of the partner institutions. Although the centre of entrepreneurship can promote research and consultancy services of the partner institutions to public and non-public organizations, the main job of this centre is to implement strategic plans regarding fund raising and to bring in outside expertise to help turn ideas originating from student projects and research projects into marketable products and services.

However, Trim’s model lacks empirical implementation. Firstly, the ‘centre of entrepreneurship’ directly controls the international commitments. Associated teaching, research and consultancy become supporting activities in order to create a new product, technology and service for the partnership. It is actually a creative activity, which is similar to Ansoff’s (1988) matrix of ‘product development’, where new products are developed in existing markets. One objective of education is to disseminate knowledge rather than keep developing new curriculum to meet foreign demands. Continuously developing new programmes may diversify the range of curriculum, which can result in less consistent curriculum in different markets. Consequently, the standards and quality of programmes are difficult to evaluate and maintain. Curriculum cannot be randomly re-validated or re-designed; it should be amended to meet certain academic standards. Thus most institutions usually start with their existing programmes and look for other compatible ones in the partners’ curriculums.
Next, the range of stakeholders in this framework is too wide. It is difficult for an institution to satisfy each stakeholder's expectation in such a broad group. This weakness reduces the credibility of empirical implementation of Trim's model.

Finally, Trim's model only focuses on international partnership, which presents an aspect of the full picture of HE internationalization. Other elements, such as mode of entry, programme delivery methods, international recruitment, and overseas branch campuses are left out. Furthermore, Trim treats education as a commercial product driven primarily by international market demand. This model leads institutions in a dangerous direction because "the commercialization and commoditization of education has become a complicated issue" (Smout, 2003, p. 31). This direction is against the nature of education and can directly affect academic quality. Students are more likely to suffer negative consequences of this approach because commercialization may dilute the quality of education service provision. From the students' points of view, the expected value for money may be difficult to maintain.

2.6.2.4 Summary

This section discusses five forms of HE internationalization that can be considered as the mode of entry in HE internationalization. However, each form only explains a facet of internationalization circumstance. There is lack of systematical explanation and in-depth analysis in terms of HE international market expansion. Three relevant frameworks intend to integrate HE internationalization into a systematic context, but may not fully address the internationalization process in the case study because HE internationalization rarely follows an ideal route, and there are many challenges and risks involved. The next section addresses the related issues of HE internationalization.
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2.7 Challenges and risks of HE internationalization

This section discusses the challenges and risks of HE internationalization. Compared to the factors (obstacles) of strategy implementation (see previous section 2.3), there are less studies of challenges of HE internationalization, although internationalization has become a key strategic element for universities around the world (Ayoubi and Massoud, 2007). Little literature discusses the implementation issues of HE internationalization at individual institution. Few analyses investigate the challenges and risks of HE internationalization. Previous studies identify ten key challenges of HE internationalization. The following section discusses each challenge individually.

2.7.1 Insufficient financial resource

According to Van Damme (2001), many institutions around the world face the lack of adequate financial resources for major international initiatives. Even if some institutions look at internationalization as a potential source of additional funding in the emerging global educational marketplace, many are confronted with limited resources to develop ambitious projects. The overall governmental funding of higher education is declining relatively. For example, recently educational funding cut by the U.K. government affects most British universities. On the one hand, it reduces the total funding received, thus universities have to look for alternative income streams, such as internationalization; on the other hand, in such a tight financial situation, how much money will be invested in internationalization by universities is questioned. Other examples of reduced funding include the U.S. Fulbright Programme and the most established mobility programmes, such as ERASMUS / SOCRATES: facing the phenomenon of student number imbalance in receiving and sending students, financial considerations impede the ERASMUS / SOCRATES programmes.

2.7.2 External issues: governmental policy and international competition

At the level of national policy making, significant differences exist between countries in the elaboration of international policies. Countries such as Australia, United Kingdom, New Zealand and the Netherlands have already been mentioned as formulating ambitious policies regarding internationalization in higher education. However, the most famous
destination of international students and scholars, the United States of America, is criticized for the absence of clear international policies being indifferent and having an 'insular attitude' (Altbach and McGill Peterson, 1998). The unbalance of student and staff mobility in the U.S. is striking with low figures of students going abroad to study and low levels of staff mobility. Following 1998 Paris Conference, GATE has been asked by the World Trade Organization to coordinate a survey on governmental restrictions related to the transnational trade in higher educational service. The result highlights the following categories of governmental restrictions: 28 national legislation and higher education policy; qualification authorities and policy; customs; visas; telecommunication laws; and intellectual property rights.

In addition, competition through league tables and by international reputation can put more pressure on institutions in terms of HE internationalization. Intense competition challenges universities that are in the middle or lower in the league table (Maringe, 2009). Competition highlights the need for greater differentiation in the position of universities in respect to the strategy of marketing target and positioning.

2.7.3 Quality assurance
Maintaining higher academic quality is a major challenge for both home universities and overseas partners. Institutions' marketing initiative in recruitment of foreign students is seen as an investment in order to generate additional income to compensate for declining

---

28 (i) National legislation and higher education policy (for example, laws limiting degrees to be conferred only by or through national universities; policies or laws discriminating against private / non-governmental institutions of higher education; differing approval or quality assurance processes for national and foreign educational provides), (ii) Qualifications authorities and policy (for examples, policies which do not fully recognize foreign education credentials whether offered inside or outside national borders); (iii) Customs (for example, customs restriction on certain types of cross border educational materials), (iv) Visas (for example, visa difficulties for students or administrative staff), (v) Telecommunication laws (for example, restrictive use of national satellites or receiving dishes), (vi) Intellectual property rights (countries with no national policy for or disregard for international agreements concerning intellectual property rights). (source: Sidhu, R. (2007) GATE and the new developmentalism: governing transnational education, Comparative Education Review, 51(2), pp. 214.)
governmental funding. These activities and initiatives have caused a number of U.K. institutions to face quality problems and resulted in criticism from students and staff (Bruch and Barty, 1998). This, together with a more general and increasingly comprehensive tendency of quality assurance in higher education, has given way to a concern over the quality of internationalization processes and policies (Van Der Wende, 2002). The most common approach is the establishment of a 'code of practice' or 'code of conduct'. In the United Kingdom, the Higher Education Quality Council (HEQC) produced such an instrument, and the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) has developed it further (Bruch and Barty, 1998). Another example is the Netherlands, where in 1994 the Inspectorate for Higher Education reviewed the quality of the internationalization policies of institutions in higher education (Van Overbeek, 1997). A number of organizations and associations try to implement and monitor academic quality in their member institutions, such as the Education Counselling Service (ECS) of the British Council or UKCISA (United Kingdom Council for International Student Affairs). Professional organizations and international associations in specific professional areas also implement various forms of quality control in the fields of education and training. For example, business schools and institutions in the field of engineering have well-established international exchange and collaboration programmes, the quality of which is monitored by professional associations in the field. However, most of these initiatives are dispersed and lack coordination or interdisciplinary integration. They are usually limited to specific regions, such as within the United Kingdom or European Union.

The quality assessment of internationalization policies and practices should not remain an isolated exercise, but has to be integrated in the overall quality assurance mechanism of institution and countries. Although QAA establishes an international version, which mainly monitors the quality of academic collaboration and partnerships between U.K. universities and overseas partners, many aspects of off-campus programme delivery are not fully evaluated because QAA's audit is primarily based on document examination (such as annual report, meeting record, internal / external moderation results) prepared by the home institutions. Partner examinations and site visits may not fully address certain implemental issues in partner's daily teaching process.
2.7.4 Recognition of foreign qualifications

Recognizing a foreign qualification is another critical obstacle to HE internationalization. Students obtaining a degree or a diploma in a foreign country want to have their qualifications validated on the labour market in the country where they want to live and work. This is an old and complicated problem in international relations in higher education (Van Damme, 2001). The challenges of qualification recognition include recognizing obtained qualifications by another country, especially home country; recognizing obtained qualification by employers; and recognizing qualifications gained through online distance learning and part time study (ibid). A number of international organizations have taken several initiatives in order to solve this issue; these include as the elaboration of declarations, conventions and agreements between member states, and the establishment of information centres. The most impressive development regarding qualification recognition has taken place in the European region (for example, the 'convention on the recognition of qualifications concerning higher education in the European region' adopted in Lisbon in April 1997, cited in Van Damme, 2001). National information centres facilitate recognition procedures at national levels. From the European Union, a separate network of centres, the National Academic Recognition Information Centres (NARIC), was set up. Since 1987, it has been closely related to the ERASMUS programme (Hilderbrand, 1996). However, the European model of degree recognition has not been exemplary for the rest of the world. Most countries, including the U.S., still apply detailed and complicated procedures based on equivalence tests and refuse automatic recognition of foreign degrees. These procedures encompass a detailed analysis of course and curriculum structure, contents, and examination systems.

In addition, many developing countries do not automatically recognize foreign qualification, either. For example, the Chinese government only recognizes the qualifications gained from foreign public universities that have been validated by the Ministry of Education of China. In other words, any other institution that is not validated by the Ministry of Education of China will be eliminated from official recognition. Furthermore, the Chinese government and most Chinese domestic employers do not
recognize qualifications gained through part-time study or online distance learning as being of the same standard as those gained through traditional full-time study. They consider part-time or online distance qualifications a kind of complementary category that is not qualified as the traditional on-campus standard. Under this circumstance, studying abroad (student mobility) is the only way for Chinese students to gain recognized foreign qualification; this is one reason why China has become the biggest student 'exporting' country. But this type of regulation deprives many poor or adult students of studying online or part-time. In addition, some jobs may require candidates to hold recognized qualification from international professional associations or organizations. For example, a qualification of ACCA or CIMA may become a prerequisite for certain senior accounting positions.

2.7.5 Recognition of credits and length of study abroad
Van Damme (2001) questions recognition of credit and accreditation. He states that the unacquaintedness of national legislation can cause serious problems, resulting in student's previous qualifications or credits are not recognized and advanced standing students need to study longer to gain more credits. Van Damme states that the structural and educational difference between higher education systems in different countries are both an impelling force towards mobility and cooperation and a real barrier against its further development. The lack of transparency and 'readability' of higher education regulations at national, institutional and even faculty levels creates all kinds of problems, resulting in a widespread uncertainty among students about the recognition of a credit or the study period at the home university. For example, the recognition rate for ERASMUS students was 75% and almost half the mobile students experienced prolongation of their studies (Teichler, 1996; Teichler and Maiworm, 1996). A Dutch study for 1992-1995 also revealed that 41% of the study period abroad resulted in delayed completion of study (Van Der Wende, 1996). A longer time abroad means extra cost of living and transportation. Students who work may not be able to take off long periods of study due to scheduling restrictions. Non-recognition of study periods abroad causes waste of time for students, such as extending the overall duration of study and undertaking extra study load and examinations.
Europe is the credit transfer leader. Within the ERASMUS / SOCRATES programmes, the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS)\(^{29}\) is an institutional framework for credit recognition and transfer for students studying abroad in the ERASMUS / SOCRATES programmes. With ECTS, the participating institutions agree to recognize the components of study automatically and thus facilitate the transferability of credits without concerns for contents and quality (Van Damme, 2001). However, ECTS has always been confronted with hesitation by some institutions who are against full and automatic recognition and credit conversion, although ECTS holds a higher recognition level than ERASMUS, whose procedures for credit recognition are much slower (ibid). The weakness of ECTS explains the reason why some institutions refuse to participate in the scheme. It is constructed on a maximalist reading of the concept of recognition by asking prior recognition of foreign credits by the home institution, without any prior check of contents, teaching methods, workload, student assessment procedures and academic quality. Steiner (1996) states that the ECTS approach relies on a great deal of optimistic trust and confidence. ECTS has chosen to bypass crucial questions of content comparability, education culture and quality and is therefore labeled ‘surface adjustment’ rather than a mechanism of credit transfer.

Another important instrument is called ‘transcripts of records’ (Van Damme, 2001). This document lists the courses and the study results of a mobile student in the host university, enabling transfer of credits to the home university. But this instrument is still based on a prior agreement between the host and home institutions. While a ‘conversion table of national grading scales’ is developed aiming to produce comparable and transferable study results, the transferability of the instrument is still limited by a mutual agreement. Although both ECTS and ‘transcripts of records’ are more advanced (compared to other

\(^{29}\) ECTS was fully integrated in ERASMUS / SOCRATES programmes from 1996 onwards. ECTS is built on clear ‘learning agreements’ between the home and host universities on the study programmes of mobile students. In order to enhance the transparency of study programmes and curriculum in the participating universities, the institutions have to transform their curriculum into a general system of study-points or credits. The number of study-points allocated to a certain course fixed its weight in the overall curriculum. One year of full-time study has a maximum of 60 study-points. In this system, courses and study periods become quantifiable and therefore easily transferable. An extensive ‘information package’ describes the curriculum, course and study-points, but also provides more informal information concerning the educational culture, the evaluation procedures of a certain institution. (source: Van Damme, D. (2001) Quality issues in the internationalization of higher education, Higher Education, 41(4), pp. 434.)
schemes, such as NORDPLUS or UMAP), some counties (such as U.S., Japan, China, Israel) still refuse to recognize academic study in the institutions or countries beyond their administrative supervision. Some of them have a rather protectionist attitude towards foreign study in order to safeguard their own degrees, diplomas, education system and culture. In mobility programmes where study programmes are mutually agreed between sending and receiving institutions, there is no problem regarding credit recognition or period of study. However, in a wider global context, these integrated exchange and mobility programmes remain rather exceptional.

2.7.6 Gap of management of HE international strategy

In a study of the development of marketing within higher education, Smith, Scott and Lynch (1995, p. 27) have found “a temptation to align marketing endeavour into the corporate strategy primarily relate to chief executives” and Maringe’s (2009) study of six U.K. universities indicates that there is a gap in management of HE internationalization, with only one of six universities having a stand-alone internationalization document that includes a clear variety of activities ranging from curriculum, student recruitment to staff recruitment, staff professionalization and funding, widening participation and cross-border activities as the key elements of its strategy for the next five years. The remaining universities only have internationalization as a key component of the overall institutional strategic plan over a period of time.

Maringe further points out that the institutional leadership in terms of internationalization shows certain patterns among pre-1992 and post-1994 institutions. International portfolios are under the remit of senior academics, such as deans or Pro Vice Chancellors in pre-1992 universities, whereas the responsibility frequently rests with senior non-academics of the rank of directors in the post-1994 institutions.

2.7.7 Challenges of managing diversity

Student and staff diversity has increased over the years on U.K. university campuses (Maringe, 2009). The challenges of language, social and cultural perspectives in terms of
internationalization are significant (Maringe, Lumby and Morrison, 2007). Management diversity has become a key challenge brought about by HE internationalization.

2.7.8 Ongoing staff development and training
With the changing demographics comes the need for ongoing staff development and training in order to orientate and re-orientate teachers and service providers to emerging needs of untapped societies (Killick, 2006; De Vita and Case, 2003).

2.7.9 Lack of focus on the curriculums
The lack of focus on curriculum internationalization is emerging as an issue that has been given less attention by university staff (Maringe, 2009). Commercialization is becoming one of the main drivers of HE internationalization (Alexander and Rizvi, 1993; Dobson, 1998; Starck, 2000; Matthews, 2002; Marginson, 2003). Beyer and Liston (1996) state that the curriculum is the centrepiece of university activity. They argue that with the lack of focus on the curriculum, consequent initiatives (for example, internationalization, marketing and establishing overseas branch campuses) are operating as addendum activities with little potential for becoming a home grown philosophy as long as they are not framed within the curriculum traditions. Universities should focus more on their core purpose to provide teaching and research on the original site (Shattock cited in Hodges, 2007).

2.7.10 Neglect of the local at the eclipse of the global
The neglect of the local at the eclipse of the global is reflected as the local needs and requirement are overshadowed by the preoccupation with the issues in internationalization (Maringe, 2009). A typical example is home students feeling left out of the university’s focus on decisions.

2.7.11 Summary
Most challenges discussed above present the surface problems of HE internationalization only, and overlook some fundamental implementation issues in relation to internationalization within an institution, such as communication, resistance to change,
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student support, operational conflicts, organizational culture, cooperation and coordination, and motivation and incentives. Besides the 'insufficient financial resources' (see section 2.7.1) and 'external issues' (see section 2.7.2), most problems discussed in the literature are not directly related to the circumstance observed at the case study university. In contrast, most challenges identified in the relevant literature are more likely to occur when the institution's international development achieves a large scale whereby a large number of international students are recruited. For example, if the number of international students in a university occupies a major proportion of the overall number of student, then problems of 'neglect of the local at the eclipse of the global' (see section 2.7.10) and 'managing diversities' (see section 2.7.7) are likely to happen. Thus, these challenges and risks do not properly fit the institutions whose international development is at an early stage, when most aforementioned problems and risks are considered less of a challenge.

2.8 Conclusion

The two sections of the literature review have examined the body of literature on commercial internationalization (section 2.1-2.4) and HE internationalization (section 2.5-2.7). Since commercial internationalization has a longer history and stronger background than HE internationalization, this research will use the literature on commercial internationalization to examine HE internationalization. The literature on commercial internationalization and HE internationalization shows a partial overlap in terms of international development, market entry strategy, and strategy implementation. The similar themes within one area (either commercial internationalization or HE internationalization) are correlated and compared to the related sections of the other area, such as theories of international approach (2.1) versus internationalization of HE (2.5); mode of entry (2.2) versus models or forms of HE internationalization (2.6); strategy implementation and obstacles (2.3) versus challenges and risks of HE internationalization (2.7).

Six theories of international approaches from commercial or manufacturing background have been considered: the Uppsala school approach, TCA, OLI, agency approach,
industrial network approach, and resource-based approach (see section 2.1). However, not every internationalization approach is applicable to HE internationalization.

The Uppsala school approach implies that organizations increase their international involvement in small incremental steps due to differences in culture, language, education, and business practices. However, this approach has been criticized as too deterministic, so the organizations could be considered to have no strategic choices with this approach. Speed of market entry is another weakness as today many organizations’ international development simply does not follow a trial and error procedure. Universities cannot require overseas and partners to wait until they have gained sufficient knowledge and experience. Therefore, the Uppsala school approach is not suitable for HE internationalization.

Transactional cost analysis (TCA) is a yardstick to measure cost prior to selecting internal or external expansions. It holds up well in HE internationalization in terms of international recruitment (through agents, partners or wholly owned satellite campus abroad). Due to the concern of risk, cost and uncertainty, most U.K. universities prefer external expansion rather than establishing a hierarchical foreign branch. Although cost measurement is the foundation of this approach, TCA was criticized as too narrow an assumption of human contribution, opportunities and an equally narrow interpretation of economic objectives.

The OLI approach (ownership, location, internalization) is initially identified for goods manufacturing in terms of the extent, form and pattern of international production. OLI encourages organizations to expand internationally through own subsidiaries. In relation to HE internationalization, although some reputable universities have their own overseas branch campuses, the main drawbacks of OLI, such as higher investment and risk, would stop most universities considering this approach.

The agency approach is based on the principle of a contract where parent companies delegate their own functions or assets to agents. In HE internationalization, universities delegate certain authority to agents and allow them to operate on the universities’ behalf.
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This approach enhances international student mobility. The main weakness lies in the information asymmetry, in which agents become intermediates in an international business. Their capabilities and characteristics can lead to lower loyalty because they might put more effort into an organization's competitors in order to gain higher commission. However, this drawback is not obvious in HE internationalization because agents do not access universities' core competence (for example, syllabus and curriculum), nor are they interested in teaching.

The industrial network approach views an international organization in relation to other organizations in the marketplace; hence an organization is not seen as an isolated actor but as a network member. Thus, the associated weakness is that each member focuses too much on maintaining existing networks and relationships rather than the characteristics of individuals. And if one member withdraws or changes its status, the entire network needs to be rearranged as a consequence. Although academic collaboration seems to build up an academic network, the institutions involved do not need collaborations to continue their institutional functions. Thus, the industrial network approach is eliminated from the analysis of HE internationalization.

The resource-based approach aims to develop dynamic capabilities and views the organization as a source of competitive advantage. This approach is reflected well in HE internationalization, especially in student recruitment and academic collaboration, as it recognizes the importance of intangible knowledge-based resource in providing a competitive advantage, because it addresses not only the ownership of resource, but also the dynamic ability for organizational learning required to develop new resource. However, the main drawback of this approach is that the resource is changeable and not always reliable, and possession of a unique resource does not guarantee a core competence.

In short, these international approaches are dependent to some extent on the existence of markets to inform internationalization decisions. Although they are derived from commercial internationalization, analysis shows that four approaches - TCA, agency approach, OLI and resource-based approach - are transferable to HE internationalization.
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These compatible approaches indicate diversity of opinion on the internationalization process in institutions and provide different emphases in the areas of market entry strategy and mode of entry selection.

Mode of entry is one of the most critical decisions in international marketing, as it sets the channel structure and the level of control of an organization in international markets. Literature discusses three groups of existing modes of entry in commercial internationalization (see section 2.2). Export mode (direct and indirect) provides low risk, low control and high flexibility; intermediate mode (licensing, alliance, joint venture, contract manufacturing, management contracting and franchise) indicates shared risk and control and low flexibility; finally, hierarchical entry (acquisition and greenfield) provides high control and high risk with lower flexibility. Unlike commercial internationalization, HE internationalization can adopt more than one mode of entry simultaneously and one partnership can also involve multiple modes of entry. Four entry strategies from commercial background are compatible with HE internationalization, including export, alliance, franchise and greenfield. E-learning (online and distance learning) as a widely adopted channel in HE internationalization should be added as a formal entry strategy.

In terms of strategy implementation, common key implementation factors were identified (see section 2.3). However, in literature, there is no discussion of relationships among these factors nor is there an explanation of particular forms of these factors within an institutional context in terms of HE internationalization. Organizations may struggle to cope with each factor individually at every level in a hierarchical organizational structure. In addition, although frameworks focus on the influence between context and process, some industries (for example, accounting) and non-profit public sectors (such as education, national health care and local government authorities) go beyond the preview criteria as they move vertically into the finer aspects of strategy implementation. The literature in relation to the issues raised in this research includes resources, communication, operational process, motivation and incentives, coordination and cooperation, organizational culture and resistance to change. Although previous discussions have addressed these critical factors (see section 2.3.3), they may still be revealed as issues in the case study due to
weak internal integration among the key departments. Thus, a set of highlighted factors or comprehensive implementation framework cannot explain the challenges arising in higher education or particular aspects of strategy implementation. The issues of HE internationalization may reveal their own unique forms through an education-specific interpretation within an institutional context.

Selecting right target countries for foreign operations is an important decision that has a major impact on internationalization. Many external key factors were identified, including economy, culture and languages, governmental regulations and policy, competition, transactional costs, risk, opportunity and market (see section 2.4). However, most factors have focused on particular case studies or commercial surveys, rather than non-profit organizations, where the impact of external environment may not be as obvious as in commercial internationalization.

The forms of HE internationalization are represented by education-specific modes of entry for institutions' international market expansion. Universities use traditional (face-to-face) and virtual (borderless / transnational) modes to deliver programmes to students in other countries through twinning, franchising, articulation, collaboration and joint or double degree arrangements. Some institutions also seek to establish a physical presence through overseas branch campuses.

The best known form of HE internationalization is the increasing mobility of students studying abroad, including regional student exchange. Student mobility also enhances the development of staff mobility, which consists of staff exchange and staff teaching abroad. Some universities tend to adopt a more market-oriented, entrepreneurial approach to recruit international students and establish satellite branch campuses in foreign countries. Based on a mutual institutional recognition, academic collaboration has also developed rapidly since the 1990s. Through E-learning, the delivery of programmes of the home institution is technologically supported and geographically launched with the receiver institution situated abroad. However, unlike the mode of entry (see section 2.2), the forms of HE internationalization are less systematically analyzed as most studies address or describe
them only as fragmented circumstances of HE internationalization. No literature properly correlates these forms of HE internationalization with the research in similar areas of commercial internationalization, such as international approach and mode of entry. The existing literature overlooks the interrelationship between commercial internationalization and HE internationalization.

Besides the above forms of HE internationalization, three educational frameworks include LaRosa, Joseph and Javalg’s (2009) model for servicing international education market, Mazzarol, Soutar and Seng’s (2003) ‘three waves’ model of HE internationalization, and Trim’s (2003) conceptual framework for auditing, evaluating and managing a partnership arrangement (see section 2.6.2). These frameworks intend to integrate HE internationalization systematically through the focus on the partner relationship, the influence between context and process, but may not comprehensively address the internationalization process examined in the case study.

Compared to the critical factors of strategy implementation with commercial organizations, a small number of issues of HE internationalization have been identified in previous research: insufficient financial and human resources challenge international initiatives for many institutions. The impact of external environment on HE internationalization stems from governmental policy, international competition, health and safety situation, and volatile international markets. Quality assurance in higher education has given way to a concern over commercialization. Maintaining higher standards of quality puts more pressure on both home universities and overseas partners. HE internationalization does not only affect institutions, but students as well: for example, the lack of transparency and ‘readability’ of higher education regulations at the national, institutional and faculty levels results in a widespread uncertainty in terms of recognition of credits and length of study abroad for international students. Although many initiatives (such as ERASMUS and NARIC) have attempted to address this issue, the European model of recognition of qualification has not been standardized worldwide. A diminished focus on the curriculum internationalization is emerging as an issue that has been given less attention by universities. With the lack of focus on the curriculum, consequent international initiatives
are operating as addendum activities that do not influence the culture of the home institution. Although these challenges and risks of HE internationalization are deemed valid, different concerns may emerge when evaluation is undertaken from an institution’s internal perspective.

To a certain degree, commercial internationalization and HE internationalization overlap. It has been determined that four commercial international approaches (TCA, agency, resource-based and OLI), and three modes of entry (export, franchise and alliance) are compatible with HE internationalization. Most obstacles to strategy implementation derived from commercial organizations are also applicable and transferrable to HE internationalization. Since education is primarily knowledge-based and requires high level of professional skills, there is no perfect match between commercial internationalization and HE internationalization, but the two are still interrelated. However, no literature properly correlates HE internationalization with the research in similar areas of commercial internationalization in terms of market entry strategy and programme delivery. In short, the existing literature overlooks the interrelationship between them. A knowledge gap emerges, in which related literature on commercialization (see section 2.1-2.4) cannot fully explain (or apply to) HE internationalization. On the other hand, HE internationalization lacks its own specific theoretical foundation, since the small amount of literature addressing the related circumstance in terms of entry strategies, models, and challenges of HE internationalization, is fragmented (see section 2.5-2.7). Therefore, an education-specific market entry framework is needed to guide universities’ international market expansion.
Chapter Three Methodology

3.0 Overview
This chapter discusses research methodologies adopted in this research, concentrating on three sections: research design, research process, and data collection and analysis. Hussey (1997) explains the relationship among these three sections as follows: the research design is the overall approach to research process, from the theoretical underpinning to the collection and analysis of the data. Research methodology relates to how the researcher constructs knowledge about the social world, either through a hypothetical-deductive model of knowledge production or by developing some other models for this purpose. Research methodology involves actual research strategies, such as data collection and analysis.

This research adopts the interpretivist philosophy and inductive approach, with the focus on a single institution. Five research strategies are selected: including participant observation, ethnography, theoretical or descriptive framework, case study, and triangulation. The total of 20 interviewees from three key departments (Corporate, Department 2 and Faculty) participate in semi-structured interviews. Other types of data collection (such as observation and secondary documentary data) contribute to triangulation across the primary data. The answers from each group are used for the comparative analysis. An overlap pattern structure is defined, indicating the level of the university’s internal integration. Data analysis strategies consist of content analysis, critical discourse analysis (CDA), colour coding, and categorization of meaning.

3.1 Research Design
Research design is affected by both ontology and epistemology. This research adopts interpretivist philosophy and inductive approach. With a qualitative paradigm, the researcher seeks to understand the internationalization of higher education (HE) in a context-specific setting.
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3.1.1 Research philosophy
Research philosophy can be defined as a way of thinking on the development of knowledge. Saunders, Lewis and Adrian, (2009) identify three types of research philosophy: positivism, interpretivism and realism. Based on the nature of reality (ontology), the researcher proposes interpretivist philosophy as opposed to quantitative philosophies (such as positivism and realism).

Interpretivism
Interpretivism is broadly defined as any kind of research that produces findings not arrived at by means of statistical procedures or other means of quantification (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). It explores the richness, depth, and complexity of a phenomenon. An interpretivist is largely concerned with words and meaning arising in social context. Interpretivists argue that the social world is understood (interpreted) by different people in different situations in different ways. Logically, nothing can ever be wholly true and nothing can ever be wholly false. Fryer (1991) states that qualitative researchers are characteristically concerned with attempting to accurately decode and interpret the precise meaning of phenomena occurring in their normal social contexts and are typically preoccupied with complexity, authenticity, contextualization, shared subjectivity of the researcher and the minimization of illusion. The weakness of the interpretivist philosophy is that the social context may change because the social world is seen to be produced and reproduced on a daily basis by people, thus something that holds true here and now may not necessarily be true in the future or in another society. Therefore, the main drawback of the interpretivist philosophy is the lack of generalizability (see discussion of generalizability, section 3.4.3). However, this drawback does not affect the validity of this research because this research aims to establish a theory rather than seek external validity through the study of a large segment of the population.
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Interpretivist philosophy is adopted in this research. The reasons are listed as follows: firstly, this research intends to define a dynamic framework of HE internationalization. Secondly, the researcher intends to gain insights through the discovery of meaning by interpreting the interviewees' subjective understanding of HE internationalization. The framework itself neither has 'external features' (external validity), nor exists independently from the researcher's interpretation. Thirdly, this framework cannot be produced through measurement or empirical population study. Finally, there is no single objective reality within interpretivism, but a multiple constructive reality that involves the researcher's fundamental beliefs. These beliefs relate to the nature of the framework and the socially constructed relationship to the researcher and other parties involved (such as the three different interview groups). The nature of reality (ontology, as discussed later, see section 3.1.2) leads this research into the interpretive domain.

Positivism
Positivists look at reality objectively; they generally assume that reality can be described by measurable properties which are independent of the observer. According to McClelland (1999), positivism claims that valid knowledge can only be determined through a direct observation of phenomena. A positivist aims to construct general laws, or theories, which express relationships between phenomena. Observation and experiment will then show whether the phenomena do or do not fit the theory.

Positivists argue that valid knowledge can only be produced on the basis of direct observation that involves the ability to measure and record something. This means that only the observed things can be accepted as empirical evidence; for example, through people's senses (sight, smell, touch, taste and hearing). This evidence exists independently, out of the researcher's reach. Other things cannot be seen; for example, people's perception, interpretation and thoughts will not be considered empirical evidence in the positivist philosophy.
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Positivism assumes the existence of objectivity in observation. The phenomenon under observation can be measured using structured / standardized instruments (Orlikowski, and Baroudi, 1991); while, with interpretivism, the researcher looks for meaning in the social context, and does not assume the existence of any fixed relationship within the circumstance (ibid). In other words, interpretivism is subjective and depends on the observer’s interpretation; positivism tends more towards objectivity and depends on measurement.

The main objective of this research is to establish a framework rather than testing assumptions. The research reality dynamic framework does not exist independently from the researcher’s interpretation and the process of framework construction is characterized by qualitative data analysis rather than quantitative population study. Therefore, positivism is deemed unsuitable for the present project.

Realism
Another research philosophy is realism, which normally resides in science research. Hare and Logachev (1999) state that according to realism, the reality exists independently of the researcher’s mind. Realism refers to abstract concepts that are born of people’s minds but exist independently; therefore it tends towards literal truth and pragmatism (Bhaskar, 1978). Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill’s (2009) research process ‘onion’ shows that realism is in the middle position between positivism and interpretivism. On one hand, like positivism, realism accepts that social structures have some form of independent existence which is experienced as ‘external’ to the actors; on the other hand, like interpretivism, realism accepts that what the actors believe to be real will have important consequences for the actors’ behaviour. As Lee, Liebenau and Degross (1997) argue, those things we believe to be real are experienced by us as real. Kilminster (1993, p. 43) state that “the basic drift of realism is that the social and natural realism are real, exist independently of us and have a structure of their own, which sciences attempt to describe and explain. Unlike the positivists … the realists claim that what we directly observe in
both nature and in society is generated by hidden mechanisms which we cannot observe, but which scientists infer from observations and theoretical work. This view is opposed to forms of interpretivism which state that scientific theories are simply constructions or fictions. Therefore, the characteristics of realism can be summarized as the view of reality as existing independently but needing people’s ability to understand and perceive it. However, this characteristic does not fit this research because the dynamic framework (research reality) does not exist objectively, or separately from the researcher’s interpretation. The role of the researcher is to define something new rather than discover something that already exists. Thus realism is not deemed appropriate for this research.

3.1.2 Ontology
Ontology is the nature of reality, something immutable, an undiscovered truth. Sometimes something is socially constructed, and this human product results in conflicting multiple realities which can be changed over time. Ontology refers to questioning the existence of a ‘real’ world that is independent of our knowledge; it is a theory of being (Marsh and Stoker, 2002). In short, ontology is about what we believe exists. In this research, ontology refers to the nature of the dynamic framework (research finding): is it a single reality which exists objectively from the researcher’s perception? Or are there multiple views of reality within which relationships are socially constructed and which rely on the subjective interpretation by the researcher? This research belongs to the latter. The dynamic framework does not exist independently from the researcher’s interpretation. Thus the ontological approach tends towards constructivism (discussed later), which is consistent with the interpretivist philosophy.

There are two main ontological approaches: objectivism and constructivism. According to Bryman (2003, p. 16), “objectivism is an ontological position that implies that social phenomena confronts us as external facts that are beyond our reach of influence” that is corresponding with positivist philosophy. In other words, all social phenomena and categories exist beyond the control, influence and actions of the researcher. On the other
hand, "constructivism asserts that social phenomena and their meaning are continually being accomplished by their social actors. It implies that social phenomena and categories are not only produced through social interaction but that they are in a constant state of revision" (Bryman, 2001, p. 18). With the constructionist approach, there is no objective reality but rather constructions of it.

This research is tending towards constructivism. The researcher immerses herself in the project and becomes part of the research. The market entry dynamic framework reflects the researcher's individual informed view in terms of HE internationalization. This framework is created from the researcher's own informed perception of HE internationalization and consequent actions. The research findings are continuously revised and evaluated based on her subjective perceptions of the topic. The dynamic framework is something that is created and re-created through the whole research process. Since the nature of reality (ontology) is more constructive and depends on the researcher's subjective interpretation, the next question is how to construct and view that reality. This question leads the discussion of the epistemology (nature of knowledge).

3.1.3 Epistemology
Bryman and Bell (2008) define epistemology as a theory of knowledge, used to describe a stance (for example, positivist or interpretivist). Derose, Maler and Orchard (1999) identify epistemology as a branch of philosophy concerned with the nature and scope of knowledge. Epistemology primarily addresses human world view, such as the definition of knowledge and how it is gained, and refers to the question of how to know the world. It looks at the relationship between the inquirer and what can be known by direct observation of the external world to uncover knowledge or when the observer and the subject of inquiry must interact to create knowledge. In short, epistemology is the technical term of the theory of knowledge; it refers to how we see the world (Marsh and Stoker, 2002). There are two main epistemological strands: positivism and interpretivism. The difference between positivism and interpretivism is the way they approach
knowledge. In the positivist strand, the role of the research is primarily to test theories or create laws. The interpretivist strand, on the other hand, sustains that social phenomena do not exist independently of actors' interpretation of them; rather it is this interpretation, or the meaning of social phenomena, which affects social reality. In other words, epistemology refers to what proof the researcher will accept about what constitutes valid knowledge. The level of proof relates to what the researcher believes exists and how it is possible to study it reliably: does the researcher accept things on trust, through faith or empirical observation / evidence (positivist), or through interpretation and her personal experience (interpretivist)?

In this research, the nature of knowledge is interpretive. As an interpreter, the researcher is going to create a brand new dynamic framework that does not exist independently from her interpretation. The interpretive epistemology is consistent with the interpretivist philosophy that determines the choice of a research approach.

3.1.4 Research approach

Research approach is the way to gain knowledge, which describes how the researcher can go about the task of producing reliable and valid knowledge. Research approach can be inductive or deductive. The inductive approach moves from specific observations to broader generalizations and theories, what is known as a 'bottom up' approach (see figure 3.1). The inductive approach begins with specific observations and measures to detect patterns and regularities, formulates some tentative hypotheses that can be explored, and finally develops some general conclusions or theories (Manna, Ness and Vuillemin, 2006). The inductive approach, by its nature, is more open-ended and exploratory.
The inductive approach fits this research and complements the principles of interpretivism. According to Hyde (2000), inductive approach, which is a theory-building process, starts with specific observations about the phenomenon under investigation. Gummesson (2000) states that inductive approach begins with specific observations of an individual case. Based on the accumulation of observation, a new general idea may be discovered. The inductive approach is similar to the job of detectives, who gather evidence and information from the scene of the crime (observed circumstance) and identify the murderer (theory).

The main weakness of inductive approach is that it is not qualified to form a general conclusion for any given case because inductive research is not based on a quantitative population study. However, this weakness does not affect this research because the purpose of this research is to establish a dynamic framework rather than generalize it. The research findings can be seen as a starting point rather than an end. The generalizability of the dynamic framework will be tested in further research (see discussion of further research, Chapter 6, section 6.4). The researcher views the knowledge-gaining process as a theory-building journey. Her previous overseas study experience and current status (the representative of S1 Academy, China) enable her to
conduct a participant observation. The researcher is directly involved in the establishment of a progression agreement between the case study university and S1 Academy, China. This gives the researcher an opportunity to witness first-hand internationalization at the case study university.

McClelland (1999) states that the deductive approach is a method of inquiry in which a theory is verified or refuted by empirically testing hypotheses deduced from it; this is also known as hypothetical-deductive method. Gummesson (2000) holds a similar view that the deductive approach begins with general ideas (such as theory, laws, principles), from which a specific hypothesis is formed, which can be tested in order to support the general ideas. If the hypothesis is supported, then the initial idea is deemed to be correct. In contrast with the 'theory building' feature, the deductive approach works from the general to the specific; it is also known as the 'top-down' approach (see figure 3.2).
2006). The weakness of the deductive approach is the lack of deep investigation of the circumstance: the deductive approach can only test an assumption rather than establish a theory, and it only addresses the questions of ‘what’ and ‘how’, rather than ‘why’. The deductive approach is a typical method to test a theory. It is consistent with the principle of the positivist philosophy. However, this research aims to establish a dynamic framework rather than test or confirm a hypotheses; therefore deductive approach is eliminated from the research design selection.

The above section discusses ontology, epistemology and research approach. Hughes (cited in Taylor and Bogdan, 1984, p. 28) sees the relationship among them as follows: “every tool or procedure (research approach / design) is inextricably embedded in commitments to particular versions of the world (ontology) and to knowing that world (epistemology)”. Ontology is the nature of reality that can be understood or studied through either an objective way (positivist) or a constructive way (interpretivist). In other words, ontology has impact on how the researcher views the nature of knowledge, or epistemology. This will have further impact on how to gain that kind of knowledge, which is the research approach. Thus research reality determines and is determined by the research philosophy (epistemology) and research approach.

3.2 Research process
Research process explains how the researcher undertakes this research in field. The three stages of research process are research strategy, research planning, and data collection.

3.2.1 Research strategy
The research strategy is a general guidance to answer research questions. It contains clear objectives, specifies the resources from which the researcher intends to collect data, arrange the schedules and locations of interviews, address financial and ethical issues of the research. The choice of strategy is determined by the interpretivist philosophy and
inductive research approach. It also reflects the reason why a particular strategy is adopted. Five research strategies are adopted for this study: observation, ethnography, theoretical / descriptive framework, case study and triangulation.

3.2.1.1 Observation

According to Lee, Liebenau and Degross (1997), there are two general types of observations: direct observation and participant observation. The main distinction between these is that the former does not involve the researcher’s interaction with the informants, and the latter requires the researcher to take part in the culture or context in which s/he is working. Participant observation is a common method used in marketing, organizational behaviour studies, human resource studies and psychology research. It is similar to ethnography because it involves immersion in the field of study. In the present study, the involvement of international activities with SI Academy, China and current student status enable the researcher to play the role of participant observer.

Gill and Johnson (1997, p. 113) identify participant observation as the process whereby “the researcher attempts to participate fully in the lives and activities of subjects and thus becomes a member of their group, organization or community. This enables the researcher to share their experiences by not merely observing what is happening but also feeling it”. The researcher used to be an undergraduate student at [N] College, Malaysia (1999-2003). During that time, the case study university collaborated with the [N] College and ran a ‘3+0’ programme (BSc in Business Information System) in Malaysia. The researcher completed the undergraduate programme in Malaysia, graduated with the case study university’s qualification, and came to the United Kingdom for Masters study. As a beneficiary of an academic collaboration, the researcher’s own study experience helps her better understand HE internationalization. Being a student at the case study university reduces the barrier of data access to a certain extent. Furthermore, in early 2010, on behalf of SI Academy, China the researcher was directly involved in establishing a partnership between the SI Academy, and the case study university. This
field experience and involvement led to a more natural data collection, which enhances validity of this project.

Gill and Johnson (1997) develop a fourfold categorization of the roles of the participant observer (see figure 3.3): complete participant, complete observer, observer as participant, and participant as observer. In this research, both participant as observer and complete participant are adopted.

As a representative of the S1 Academy, China, the researcher is directly involved in the collaboration between the S1 Academy and the case study university. The relevant departments (under Department 2) include International Office and Admissions. When dealing with the International Office, the researcher's identity is revealed as the representative of S1 Academy. Thus the role of researcher is categorized as participant as observer. However, after a key person's unexpected resignation, no one followed up the progression, thus the progression arrangement between the S1 Academy and the case
study university was handed over to the Admissions. The researcher's identity (S1 Academy representative) was concealed during the interaction with the Admissions. The researcher did not purposely conceal her identity, but during the process of establishing the partnership, the researcher was not given an opportunity to formally discuss the potential collaboration with the Admissions staff. Thus the role of participant observation switches from participant as observer to complete participant.

Clough and Nutbrown (2002, p. 46, cited in Cope, 2009) state that “observation raises a perfectly valid point about the way researcher observes: what are they looking for? Are they looking critically; looking openly; looking know-why; looking for evidence; looking to be persuaded or looking for information”. Considering these questions reflects the researcher’s own observation roles. Besides research, the researcher’s main task is to build up collaboration between S1 Academy, China and the case study university. Thus the researcher is looking for related information and is interested in how to establish this partnership. When the observation role switches to complete participant, another research theme (see theme no.5, Chapter 1, section 1.2; and Chapter 4, section 4.2) is emerging – the issues and problems of HE internationalization. At that stage, besides ‘what’ and ‘how’, the researcher is also interested in ‘why’ – why is the process difficult? What are the challenges of HE internationalization? And why do these challenges occur? A new research theme is derived from a combination of both observed data and individual perception. This theme contributes directly to the implementation issues of HE internationalization.

Furthermore, compared to other data collection, observed data tends to be more reliable. Chan (2009) defines validity as the best available approximation to the truth of a given proposition, inference, or conclusion. Observational research findings are considered strong in validity because individuals may not know that they are being observed and, consequently, they are unlikely to change their actions in order to show the researcher their reactions or make up information. Cook and Campbell (1979) have pointed out that
subjects or respondents tend to report either what they believe the researcher expects to see or what reflects positively on their own abilities, knowledge, beliefs, or opinions. Since the researcher’s identity is not revealed to the Admissions, the observed data in terms of reaction of the Admissions department is more accurate (see Q 6.1, observed data collection, Chapter 4).

3.2.1.2 Ethnography

Patton (1990) states that the term ethnography refers to folk (ethno) description (graphy). In this research, the appropriate research strategy would be an ethnographic study of research themes within the institutional context, including academic collaboration, international recruitment, programme delivery, challenges and issues at the case study university. Three interview groups are involved: Corporate: the decision making team mainly responsible for corporate strategy making; Department 2, mainly responsible for international initiatives, student recruitment and academic collaboration; and Faculties, or the academic teaching team responsible for strategy implementation. Throughout the course of research, the researcher has studied the perception of the process of internationalization in the three groups and also interpreted each group’s culture. A total of six themes have been identified (see Chapter 1, section 1.2; and Chapter 4, section 4.2). This research aims to evaluate and investigate the international circumstances in respect to these six themes.

Ethnography enables the researcher to gain rich insights into the circumstance of HE internationalization at the case study university. Saunders, Lewis and Thonhill (2009) state that the purpose of ethnography is to interpret the social world the research subjects inhabit in the way they interpret it. The ethnographer’s method is to live among the people involved in the study and record their way of life frequently using modern media, such as digital audio / visual recording. The main characteristic of ethnography is to immerse into the lives of the subjects: “all ethnographic works involve case study” (Brewer, 2000, p. 76). Frequently, research designs are unstructured or semi-structured,
using observation, field note and modern media to record events. In this research, all the interviews were audio recorded and transcribed into text. The collected data was then saved to be used for later analysis. Ethnography is not only a data collection method but a “style of research” (Brewer, 2000, p. 11), where the researcher’s main priority is to understand social activities and meaning in a given social setting. Recognizing this in research methodology leads the researcher to interpret the meaning derived from both denotation and connotation of the signs / discourse (see discussion of denotation and connotation, section 3.3.3.2.2).

Ethnography should provide the “deep understanding of the actors, interactions, sentiments and behaviours” needed for case study research (Woodside and Wilson, 2003, p. 506, cited in Cope, 2009), but are these insights simply of value in themselves, or are they valuable because they are useful for other purposes (Hammersley and Atkinson, 1996)? The question is how the researcher or anyone else can know if they are given a true account of interactions, sentiments or behaviours – particularly in qualitative research where the researcher interprets the meaning based on her own reality of the circumstance. The interpretation is real to the researcher; it is ‘born’ from her own perception, but how about other people? Is this research finding valuable to others? A validity issue is emerging here. Qualitative research is measured by transferability and applicability. The researcher believes that research findings can be transferred and applied to similar circumstances in other universities (see discussion of validity, section 3.4.2). The explanation is as follows: research findings are directly derived from data collection and analysis. The three interviewee groups are interrelated, and some common values exist among them. The overlapping content in the dynamic framework also proves that at a certain point, there is a degree of shared views. The mismatching points contribute to group-specific views (see Chapter 4). Thus research findings hold validity for both interviewees and groups interviewed. However, for other people (besides the interviewees and the researcher) or other universities, the research findings are valuable only as a conceptual framework. This framework can be tested in further research.
through quantitative study (see discussion of further research, Chapter 6, section 6.4). If the result shows a strong generalizability, then it is safe to say that the researcher has given an externally valid interpretation of HE internationalization.

### 3.2.1.3 Theoretical or descriptive framework

Yin (1994) suggests that, where researchers have made use of existing theories to formulate research question and objectives, research may also use theoretical propositions to help them do this as a means to devise a framework to help organize and direct data analysis. This research intends to use theories of commercial internationalization to interpret HE internationalization. Thus the researcher starts this research by examining literature in the areas of both business and education. The existing literature provides an overall understanding about what has been done in similar areas.

Many scholars discuss commercial internationalization in different aspects. Compared to HE internationalization, commercial internationalization has a stronger and richer theoretical basis. In HE internationalization, most authors conduct deductive research among numerous institutions, looking for the proportion of overseas students, percentage of overseas income (to the total income), market share of overseas first year students, institutions’ mission and internationalization strategies. However, fewer qualitative research studies are conducted in terms of market entry, challenges and issues of HE internationalization. Three frameworks have been proposed in terms of evaluating and managing HE internationalization: LaRosa, Josephe and Javalg’s (2009) model for servicing international education market (see Chapter 2, section 2.6.2.1), Mazzarol, Soutar and Seng’s (2003) ‘three waves’ model (see Chapter 2, section 2.6.2.2) and Trim’s (2003) framework for audit, evaluating and managing a partnership arrangement (see Chapter 2, section 2.6.2.3). These frameworks may not fully explain the international circumstance at the case study university, and if so, any potential mismatch between the observation and literature could indicate and guide the direction of this research. Miles and Huberman (1994), Robson (2002) and Yin (1994) state that in order to devise a
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theoretical or descriptive framework, the researcher needs to identify the main variables, components, themes and issues in the research project and the predicted or presumed relationships between them. Commencing research from a theoretical perspective, the researcher reviews the existing body of knowledge, realizes the gap between literature and observation and finally defines the research direction.

However there is a debate about this strategy as applied to qualitative analysis (Bryman, 1988). Bryman (1988, p. 81) sums up the argument against it as follows: “the prior specification of a theory tends to be disfavored because of the possibility of introducing a premature closure on the issues to be investigated, as well as the possibility of the theoretical constructs departing excessively from the view of participants in a social setting”. However, the researcher does not agree with Bryman’s view because there might be some mismatch between the literature and observed circumstances. New themes keep emerging (such as theme no.5, Chapter 1, section 1.2). Actually, instead of a ‘disfavoured’ impact, the researcher sees the ‘disfavoured’ impact as a ‘favoured’ indicator that highlights a gap in literature and guides the research direction.

3.2.1.4 Case study

Robson (2002) defines case study as a strategy for doing research which involves an empirical investigation of a particular contemporary phenomenon within its real life context using multiple sources of evidence. This strategy will help gain a rich understanding of the context of this research (Morris and Wood, 1991). For Yin (1994), case study research should commence with a statement of propositions - answers to the questions of ‘how’ and ‘why’ to be tested with the data gathered. A case study fosters a holistic understanding of the organizational process by paying attention to a number of trends combining and reinforcing each other to create particular impacts (Ragin, 1987 and Yin, 1994). The naturalistic approach to case study enables the researcher to present the points of view of the social actors (interviewees) involved, and to link these perceptions in an academic unit (such as the case study university). A case study provides
an in-depth look into phenomena that might be missed when using a quantitative strategy (for example, questionnaires) that covers a large number of universities but disregards the particular context in which they operate. The case study enables the researcher to immerse herself into the research process. In other words, the researcher has become part of this project; therefore, it is more likely for the researcher to interpret different internal subjective views within the context of the case study university naturally, rather than focusing on the surface circumstance with many case studies involved.

Stenhouse (1985) defines the case-study methodology as involving the collection and recording of data about a case or cases and the preparation of a report or the presentation of the case. A post-1992 university is chosen as a case study to critically evaluate HE internationalization in terms of international recruitment and academic collaboration. In order to gain rich information about HE internationalization, data collection in the case study includes interviews, observation and secondary data.

3.2.1.5 Triangulation

The idea of triangulation is derived from the navigation techniques using several location markers in order to pinpoint a single objective. According to Cohen and Manion (1992), in social sciences triangulation attempts to map out, or explain more fully, the richness and complexity of human behavior by studying it from more than one standpoint. Triangulation is typically a strategy for improving the validity and reliability of research or evaluation of findings. Mathision (1988, p. 15) elaborates this by saying that “[t]riangulation has raised an important methodological issue in naturalistic and qualitative approaches to evaluation (in order to) control bias and establishing valid propositions because traditional scientific techniques are incompatible with this alternate epistemology.”

Patton (2002, p. 247) advocates the use of triangulation by stating that “triangulation strengthens a study by combining methods. This can mean using several kinds of
methods or data, including using both quantitative and qualitative approaches”. However, the idea of combining approaches has been challenged by Barbour (1998). She argues that while mixing paradigms is possible, mixing approaches within one paradigm, such as qualitative research, is problematic since each approach within the qualitative paradigm has its own assumption in ‘terms of theoretical frameworks we bring to bear on our research’ (p. 353). Even though triangulation is used in a quantitative paradigm for confirmation and generalization of research, Barbour does not disregard the notion of triangulation in qualitative paradigm but states the need to define triangulation from a qualitative research’s perspective in each paradigm. For example, in using triangulation of several data sources in quantitative research, any exception may lead to the hypothesis being refuted whereas exceptions in qualitative research may lead to further evaluation and adjustment of the theories. In this research, data are triangulated from three sources: i) primary data (for example, interview audio records, transcripts and video clips); ii) observation data (for example, the case of S1 Academy, China, related emails and the researcher’s own overseas study experience); and iii) documentary data (for example, websites, publishing documents, journals and reports).

Triangulation provides a more detailed and balanced picture of the situation and further contributes to the validity and reliability of the research. Through triangulation, the researcher keeps evaluating, refining and modifying the research in terms of themes, interpretation and analysis. It also increases the accuracy of data analysis.

3.2.2 Research planning

Research planning provides an outline for sample selection (for example, the choice of the organization and interviewees) and background data collection at the organization in the case study, including history, background, publishing materials and websites.
3.2.2.1 Sample collection

According to Bryman and Bell (2008), in seeking to justify the sample selection, researchers need to refer to the relevance and context of the study (for example, close attention should be paid to the objectives of the study). Unlike quantitative research, there are no clear or specific methods, rules and protocols to follow. Thus the choice of a case study and interviewees needs to be carefully considered in order to ensure that a qualified outcome is achieved.

3.2.2.1.1 Choice of the case study

The researcher chooses a post-1992 university as a case study based on the following reasons: firstly, most U.K. universities (including the case study university) do not have overseas branch campuses. The case study university is part of a large group of institutions who conduct HE internationalization without overseas branch campuses. So research findings may be transferable or applicable to similar cases within this group. Secondly, this is a qualitative research focusing on 'why' and 'how' instead of only 'what'. Thus, this research does not target a quantitative population study, but uses a particularizable case. Thirdly, as a beneficiary, the researcher's own overseas study experience provides an opportunity to witness the process of HE internationalization, especially from a customer's (student's) point of view. Fourthly, the case study selection is primarily based on data availability and accessibility. As a student of the case study university, the researcher is familiar with the university. This increases the researcher's chances of accessing data. Compared to other organizations (such as other universities), the researcher's interview requests are more likely to be accepted by the staff at the same university. Furthermore, because interview questions include some sensitive issues, such as Q 6.1 'During the process of internationalization, what are the challenges you face?' and Q 7.2 'Why do you think the level of internationalization in each faculty is different?', a randomly selected case study may result in less valuable data collected, which would lead to inaccurate research findings. This concern arises from interviewees refusing to answer certain questions. For example, in this research, one corporate interviewee
declined to answer some questions, which resulted in primary data not being available for certain questions. Consequently, if more universities are involved, more interviewees may refuse to answer questions. It can lead to less primary data collected, which further affects research validity.

Once the sample organization is confirmed, the next question is how big is the sample size? That specifically relates to the number of interviewees. Who should be involved, and why? When selecting targets for interviews, a purposive sampling approach was adopted to identify the interviewees. Purposive sampling approach is one of the most common sampling research strategies (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000). With this approach, interviewees/respondents participate in research according to the preselected criteria that is relevant to particular research themes (ibid). This method is particularly effective and appropriate for this type of qualitative research (Punch, 1998). By using this sampling method, the questions are addressed to the persons with designation and responsibility for the university's international activities. The selected interviewees are knowledgeable and able to provide sufficient information. Since all interviewees are the key persons from the three interrelated groups (the Corporate, Department 2 and Faculty) and their daily work is directly related to internationalization, their participation makes data collection rich and natural.

However, due to job scope and responsibilities, it was impossible for each interviewee to know well all the international initiatives and activities at the case study university; therefore focus group interviews were conducted (Cohen and Manion, 1992). The focus group allows the researcher to examine the ways in which interviewees participate in the implementation of the international strategy in conjunction with one another, and construe the general topics in which the researcher is interested. According to Hutt (1979) and Fern (2001), in management and business, the focus group technique is seen as a way of helping individuals to define problems and solutions. This technique enables the researcher to develop a better understanding of why people feel the way they do. For
example, why does the faculty group consider work overload and tight schedule major operational issues? Why does Department 2 perceive that there is a strong resistance of cooperation in terms of HE internationalization at faculty level? Answers to these and other similar questions will guide the researcher’s interpretation of both denotative and connotative meaning of the data collected in interviews.

3.2.2.1.2 Research preparation

Research preparation in the early stage of this project is briefly listed as follows. Firstly, the researcher checks the organizational structure and identifies three key departments (groups). Secondly, the potential interviewees within each department are listed. Thirdly, the researcher gathers their contact details including position, e-mail, telephone number and office venue. Then, the researcher prepares a cover letter (see Appendix 13) to introduce the research title, objectives, purpose, and to explain how their participation can contribute to this research. Finally, the researcher emails this cover letter and interview questions to the interviewees. Due to ethical issues, no names, initials or job positions will appear in this research. Interviewees are separated into three groups and each interviewee is presented as ‘Interviewee no.1’, ‘Interviewee no.2’, ‘Interviewee no.3’ (see Appendix 16).

Guest, Bunce and Johnson, (2006, p. 67) state that the researcher proceeds with a set of semi-structured themes or research questions, and conducts interviews and observations until a point is reached where it may be augured that “no new information is being revealed, and similar finding are being confirmed.” But how can the researcher know when she should stop collecting data? How can she know that there are no more new insights from ongoing interviews? This further poses the question of ‘how many interviews are enough?’ Other scholars examine a number of qualitative studies and draw some general guidelines, suggesting, for example, samples of five to 25 interviewees for phenomenological studies and 20 to 30 interviewees for grounded theory studies. At the initial stage, the researcher did not know how many interviews could be conducted. In
order to gain rich information, the researcher contacted as many potential interviewees as possible. The total of 40 interview requests were sent out; of these, 27 potential interviewees replied; 22 out of 27 agreed to participate and finally 20 interviews were conducted. The total of nine interviewees represent the corporate group; six interviewees are from Department 2; the Faculty group has five representatives. Some interviewees were available to participate immediately and some interviews were arranged three-four months later. Thus the period of data collection lasted four months. Two interviewees were interviewed twice due to schedule arrangements, thus the total of 22 interview audio records were saved. All records were transcribed and categorized into three groups (Corporate, Department 2 and Faculty). The answers from each group will be used in comparative analysis (see Chapter 4, Case study), which consists of common points (agreed by all three groups), partially shared points (agreed by two groups), and group-specific points (agreed by single group).

3.2.2.2 Gathering background data
Before primary data collection, gathering background data is a necessary part of preparation to trace the history, background and context of the case study university, job scope of individual interviewees, and units (departments) to be researched. This stops the researcher from seeking information that is already published or generally available, and provides an overall understanding of the case study university, adding greater credibility to the research. The main body of gathered data is presented as documentary data, including existing overseas partnerships (see Appendix 2), core value and underpinning behaviour (See Appendix 3), central marketing strategy 2010 (see Appendix 4), international recruitment strategy, QAA audit report of the case study university (2009), quality assurance collaboration handbook, and ISB international student barometer 2010 (see Appendix 10).
3.2.3 Data collection

In this research, interview and observation are the main sources of data collection. Data is collected from the following three sources. The first source of data collection is documentary data, such as the university website, published accounts, global newsletters, annual reports, marketing presentation, QAA collaboration report, list of overseas partners. The second source of data collection is through observation, which is not only a common research strategy, but also one of the most important methods of data collection (Ackroyd and Hughes, 1992). The observed content consists of the researcher's own study experience, involvement in the case of SI Academy, China, related emails and student enquires. The last source is primary data, including audio records, transcripts texts and related semiotic context during interviews (such as body language, facial expression, volume of speech, and vocal tone). A semi-structured interview approach is adopted. Research findings are based on the analysis of these data sources (see Chapter 4, Case study).

3.2.3.1 Semi-structured interview

An interview offers an opportunity to understand the reasons for the decision that respondents have taken, their attitudes and options (Blumberg, Cooper and Schindler, 2005). Interviews are a particularly important source of data collection. They may be highly formalized and structured, using standardized questionnaires for each research participant, or held as informal and unstructured conversations (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, 2009). Interviews in qualitative research fall between completely structured and unstructured (Burgess, 1984). Semi-structured interview is chosen as opposed to formal structured interviews as these are considered ‘artificial’ (Hammersley, 1992, p. 163), and unstructured interviews are possibly too aimless (Robson, 2002). Semi-structured interviews are appropriate for this research as this approach has flexibility (Denscombe, 2003, p. 167) and adaptability (Bryman and Bell, 2003, p. 135). It plays the dominant role in primary data collection by providing an opportunity to seek answers and reasons within the context (Healey and Rawlinson, 1994). Furthermore, the choice of
semi-structured interviews also corresponds to the interpretive epistemology and is strongly justified by the purpose of this research because this research aims to define a new framework derived from the researcher's interpretation of the denotation and connotation of discourse (as discussed later, see section 3.3.3.2.2). Unstructured interviews may result in divergent data collection where new theory is unlikely to be defined; and formal structured 'artificial' ways may result only 'surface' data are collected. The validity of the data collected is hard to maintain. Furthermore, it will be difficult for the researcher to gain rich insights through the discovering of meaning by interpreting respondents' subjective view.

Although the researcher has adopted a semi-structured interview approach, some new themes that the researcher has not previously considered emerged during interviews. If an area not considered previously is deemed significant it will be added into this research by revising research themes and interview questions. If the new area is unrelated to the research topic, the researcher has to politely direct the conversation back on track due to time constraints.

The interview questions were pilot tested twice by two interviewees (one is from the faculty group; the other is from Department 2) for ambiguity and clarity. As a result, changes were made to several questions. The pilot interview feedback was that the interviewees were not well placed to answer the interview questions, due to the difference in their jobs responsibilities. Thus, the researcher decided to re-design interview questions and categorized interviewees into three focus groups (Corporate, Department 2 and Faculty) based on their job scope, responsibilities and positions. After the second pilot test, the finalized interview questions attached to the cover letter (see Appendix 13) were sent to the interviewees in advance. A copy of the relevant interview transcript was later sent to each interviewee for checking. The researcher also sought interviewees' permissions to directly cite their response (see Appendix 16). Most interviewees agreed
to have their answers cited directly; for those who hesitated or declined, indirect citing was adopted.

In order to collect accurate data, focus group interviews (Cohen and Manion, 1992; Spindler, 1992) were conducted (see discussion of research planning: sampling selection section 3.2.2.1). This enabled the researcher to deliberately combine the reaction of different groups and form a rich full picture of internationalization at the case study university. Another advantage of the focus group interviews is the opportunity to compare different responses among the groups. The comparison was arranged into three categories: common points, partially shared points and group-specific points (see Chapter 4, Case study). Each interview was conducted according to the traditional one-to-one model.

Based on the nature of the question, interview questions were also separated into three different groups (see Chapter 4, section 4.3). Firstly, informative questions address objective facts and the typical question word is ‘what’; next, analytical questions expect the interviewees to analyze certain phenomena and discuss the associated reasons for certain circumstances or demonstrate a particular process; the typical question words are ‘why’ and ‘how’; and finally, evaluative questions are designed to investigate the interviewees’ subjective views. Interviewees are requested to evaluate or comment on certain circumstances that may or may not correspond to their own points of view.

Cooper and Branthwaite (1997) suggest that paying attention to questions and approaches may be useful, such as recognizing that different questions present different degrees of difficulty, and that the researcher can therefore devise strategies to better cope in the interview setting. In this research, labelling interview questions (for example, informative, analytical and evaluative) presents an incremental level of cognitive involvement. The interviewees may feel that evaluative questions are more difficult to answer compared to informative questions. For example, the informative questions, such as ‘International
strategy and understanding’ (theme 1; see Q 1.1 - Q 1.4), ‘Recruitment strategy’ (theme 2; see Q 2.1 - Q 2.2), ‘Different ways of collaboration’ (theme 3A; see Q 3.1 - Q 3.4), and ‘Programme delivery’ (theme 3B; see Q 4.1) are asked early in the interview, while evaluative questions, such as ‘issues and challenges’ (theme 5; see Q 6.1 - Q 6.3), and ‘internationalization of faculty’ (theme 6; see Q 7.1 - Q 7.3) appear at the end of the interview. This incremental arrangement enables the researcher to develop trust with interviewees and creates a more comfortable conversation environment.

The length of interviews varied. The longest interview lasted 96 minutes, while the shortest one took 37 minutes. The average length of interview was 56 minutes. All interviews were conducted in English. Table 3.1 presents an example of the interview plan for every individual respondent.

Table 3.1 Example of interview plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview plan: Study of HE internationalization in University of [X]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School/faculty</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Venue</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Present</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transcript</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Themes** | Theme 1: Internationalization strategy and understanding  
Theme 2: International recruitment strategy  
Theme 3: Academic collaboration (3A), and Programme delivery methods (3B)  
Theme 4: Overseas branch campus  
Theme 5: Issues and challenges of HE internationalization  
Theme 6: Internationalization of faculties |
| **Remarks** | |
3.3 Data presentation and analysis

Once a particular strategy has been confirmed, the next step is to determine how to demonstrate the robustness and rigidity of the chosen process. The process of data presentation and analysis includes four stages: recording and transcribing, data summary and reduction, data analysis, and drawing conclusions and constructing solutions.

3.3.1 Recording and transcribing

All interviews were audio recorded. However, the presence of recording equipment may distract the interviewees; thus the researcher used unobtrusive modern technology and a professional dictaphone to record interviews. Audio recording saves time by freeing the researcher from note taking, so that both respondents and the researcher are able to focus and concentrate on the interview. Another advantage of audio recording is that all the transcripts can be saved for further analysis. The researcher gives each interviewee a copy of their own interview transcripts for checking because correct transcription is a prerequisite for data analysis. A transcript sample is presented in Appendix 11. All audio recordings are saved in digital format as references. Table 3.2 contains an example of an interview transcript.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Questions / Response</th>
<th>Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme I</td>
<td>Internationalization strategy and understanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>What is internationalization strategy of the University of [X]? And what do you understand by ‘internationalization of higher education’?</td>
<td>Q 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewee no. 1</td>
<td>&quot;...It has three strands to it, which are the recruitment of international students, primarily to study here but it could be elsewhere; the development of collaborations with organisations, particularly higher education organisations, which will involve us working together in a number of different ways but, again, is likely to lead to cohorts of international students studying our programmes, either here or in the partner institution; and, thirdly, is internationalizing the curriculum, so to bring an appropriate international and globalised flavour to the curriculum of every programme in the</td>
<td>Q 1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER THREE
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3.3.2 Data summary and reduction

Data summary and reduction shape the mass transcript presentation and stress similarities and differences of the key themes. This is the first step in analyzing qualitative data. Data reduction is a process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting and transforming qualitative data by identifying and organizing data into clear categories or patterns. The original interview transcript is a total of 329 pages long, containing 22 interview records. The process of selecting and identifying the volume of data into patterns depends largely on the researcher’s informed subjective perception of research themes and interview questions. The researcher’s interpretation determines which data is important and which category it should be put in. During data reduction, the researcher has to keep in mind the study objectives, research philosophy and strategy underpinning in order to make a correct selection. The data reduction procedure corresponds to content analysis (see discussion of content analysis, Chapter 3, section 3.3.3.1), and includes the following steps. The first step is to align each interviewee’s answer with a particular interview question. Secondly, key points derived from each answer are summarized. This summary will compress long statements into briefer statements in which the main sense of what has
been said or observed is rephrased in a few words (Kavale and Forness, 1996). These key points can be the same words that are repeated or different words with similar meaning (for example, curriculum, syllabus, courses and programmes). The keywords present the interviewee's main meaning. An example is listed below. The keywords are highlighted in transcripts and presented in bullet-points under each interviewee's response.

Q 1.1 What is internationalization strategy of the University of [X]? And what do you understand by 'internationalization of higher education'? Would this include

- A certain number or percentage of overseas students?
- Staff/student exchange?
- Joint research?
- Overseas market-targeted syllabus?
- Collaborated partnership?
- Overseas office?
- Overseas campus?

In other words, what standards should be used to assess the level of internationalization?

Interviewee no.1 (Corporate group):

"...It has three strands to it, which are the recruitment of international students, primarily to study here but it could be elsewhere; the development of collaborations with organisations, particularly higher education organisations, which will involve us working together in a number of different ways but, again, is likely to lead to cohorts of international students studying our programmes, either here or in the partner institution; and, thirdly, is internationalizing the curriculum, so to bring an appropriate international and globalised flavour to the curriculum of every programme in the institution..."

Key points:

- Recruitment of international students
- Development of collaborations
- Internationalizing curriculum
Interviewee no. 3 (Corporate group):
"... the [--] was trying to say that he wanted to have another attempt at increasing international student recruitment but also to internationalize the university which is a slightly wider thing than just recruiting international students. So the internationalization strategy of the university is about yes, recruiting international students but making the curriculum and the courses more ... more international, yeah. Doing things like encouraging staff to research internationally and to exchange, to go and work with international universities and for international university staff to swap and come and work with us."

Key points:
- Recruitment of international students
- Internationalizing curriculum
- Encouraging internationalization
- Exchange of staff

Interviewee no. 4 (Corporate group):
"... We are at the moment, our focus tends to be on trying to grow the number of international students, but what we need to also develop is the internationalization of the curriculum so that we move towards truly integrated internationalized approach which benefits home students or all students across the globe."

Key points:
- Recruitment of international students
- Internationalizing curriculum

Thirdly, at this stage, each respondent's answer (transcripts) has been rephrased into keywords. The researcher gathers these keywords under particular questions and combines them within each group. The overlapping points are counted once. In the above example, although 'international recruitment' is repeated in several answers, it is counted once within one interviewee group. This process is repeated with each interview question within different interview groups. Finally, each group's key summary is constructed. The last stage is to compare three group summaries based on each question and find out the
overlapping and mismatching points. Three categories are identified as follows (see Chapter 4, Case study): common points (agreed by all groups), partially shared points (agreed between two groups, such as Corporate-Department 2, Corporate-Faculty, Department 2-Faculty), and group-specific points (unique to a single group). At this stage, the reduced key points are separated into seven sub-groups: one group of common points, three groups of partially shared points, and three groups of group-specific points. At this stage, the data condensation is completed. The next step is data analysis.

3.3.3 Data analysis

There is no standardized procedure for analyzing qualitative data. With interpretivism, the research findings rely much more on the researcher’s own interpretation of the circumstance (such as HE internationalization). Qualitative data analysis requires the data to be presented in ways which enable others to interpret, analyze, evaluate and draw conclusions. Three data analysis strategies are adopted: content analysis, critical discourse analysis, and categorization (grouping) of meaning. Categorization of meaning is reflected in data reduction. Both content analysis and critical discourse analysis (CDA) are typical data analysis strategies for qualitative research.

3.3.3.1 Content analysis

Content analysis has been defined as a systematic, replicable technique for compressing text into content categories based on the explicit rules of coding (Berelson, 1952; Krippendorff, 1980 and Weber, 1990). Content analysis enables researchers to sift through large volume of data with relative ease in a systematic fashion (Stemler, 2001). It can be a useful technique to discover and identify the focus of individual, group, institutional, or social attention (Weber, 1990). Content analysis is one of the most common strategies in qualitative data analysis (Stemler, 2001). In simple terms, content analysis means doing a word-frequency count. The assumption made is that the words that are mentioned most often are the words that reflect the greatest concerns. Thus the repeated words or different words with similar meaning are accountable. Unlike critical
discourse analysis (see section 3.3.3.2), content analysis normally accepts the circumstance as what has been told. This strategy is reflected in the data reduction and comparison process. By reading the transcripts, the researcher manages to condense the meaning from long sentences or large paragraphs of conversation into several key words (see discussion of data summary and reduction, section 3.3.2).

However, content analysis cannot carry on further and deeper analysis, because it adopts a quantitative tool and works on surface 'raw' data, rather than the connotation, or underlying meaning (see discussion of denotation and connotation, section 3.3.3.2.2). Content analysis is useful for data reduction because it uses word frequency count to make inferences about the matters of importance. It adopts a quantitative method to analyze qualitative data. The analysis process is quite similar to data reduction where the researcher keeps reading content word by word and highlighting the key points simultaneously. Content analysis works similarly with some qualitative research software (such as UNDIST, HYPER Research), which identifies the whole sentence in which that words was used so that the researcher can see the word in context. The content (texts / transcripts) is the prerequisite for content analysis because content analysis works on denotation. This strategy may become invalid when no content is gained. However, with critical discourse analysis (CDA), the interpretation of the underlying connotation can deliver interpretations and conclusions even when there is no visible denotative meaning.

3.3.3.2 Critical discourse analysis (CDA)
Fairclough, Jessop and Sayer (2004) state that the term 'discourse' is used in various ways within the broad field of discourse analysis. Two particular stances can be summarized as follows: firstly, 'discourse' is in abstract sense a category which designates the broadly semiotic elements (as opposed to and in relation to other, non-semiotic, elements) of social life (language, but also visual semiotics, 'body language'). Secondly, discourse analysis is a general term that covers a wide variety of approaches to the analysis of language in its own right and is concerned with how and why language is used by individuals in specific social contexts (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, 2009).
CDA entails some form of detailed textual analysis (Halliday, 1978 and 1994). It specifically includes a combination of inter-discursive analysis of texts and linguistic and other forms of semiotic analysis. That combination is reflected within institutional semiotics. One of the broadest definition is given by Eco (1976, p. 7), who states that “semiotics is concerned with everything that can be taken as a sign”. Chandler (1998) argues that semiotics involves the study not only of what we refer to as ‘sign’ in everyday speech, but of anything which ‘stands for’ something else. Semiotics is often employed in the analysis of texts. The strategy of data analysis is mainly combined with discourse analysis and content analysis (for example, University Media Group, 1980; Leiss, Kline and Jhally, 1990; and McQuarrie and Mick, 1999). Discourse analysis emphasises how language in the form of oral and written text, constructs and reproduces the social world rather than being a means to reveal the social world as a phenomenon (Hardy, Lawrence and Phillips, 2006). The interpretative discourse analysis method is used in the case study to analyse documents and interview transcripts (Gee, 1992; Hammersley and Atkinson, 1996; Jupp and Norris, 1996) on a line-by-line basis (Strauss and Corbin, 1990); this allowed the use of the open coding method to identify a number of themes and to group the phenomena into separate categories (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). In this research, the data is analysed for common sub-themes within the main categories. This involved the process of carefully reading, re-reading and comparing the transcripts. Colour coding of the transcripts is used to identify the most frequently mentioned issues and to develop sub-themes and patterns within the categories. Gorman and Clayton (1997, p. 200) describe this as “bringing order, structure and meaning to the mass of collected data”. These themes were used to analyze the participants’ reactions during the process of interview and present a full picture of HE internationalization at the case study university.

This research adopts critical discourse analysis (CDA), which subsumes a variety of approaches towards the social analysis of discourse (Pêcheux, 1982; Fairclough and Wodak, 1997; Wodak and Meyer, 2001). Fairclough (2004) states that CDA can work when it achieves a high level of adequacy with respect to the realities it condenses –
insofar as it is capable of being used to represent / imagine realities at different levels of abstraction, in different areas of social life (economy, government, education, health, regional and social disparities), and on different scales (international, macro-regional (for example, EU), national, local). Thus a large amount of transcripts has enabled this research to adopt CDA; furthermore, rich data collection can also increase research validity.

Fairclough (2004) states that CDA constitutes both ‘genres’ and ‘style’. Genres are diverse ways of the researcher’s (inter)acting in the specifically semiotic aspects. Some examples of genres are: meetings in various types of organizations, political and other forms of interviews, news articles in the press, and book reviews. In this research, genres are mainly reflected as interviewing different persons from different groups. Style corresponds to different positions of social actors, for example, the style of business managers or political leaders. In this research, the style is reflected in the interviewees’ positions at the case study university. Basically, interviewees within the same group have similar style, which is different from other groups. Different styles from each key department may result in an overlap of similar and group-specific views, because although all interviewees belong to same organization, the context and culture of their own departments may vary.

According to Fairclough and Sayer (2004), CDA allows one to incorporate elements of context into the analysis of texts, to show the relationship between concrete occasional events and more durable social practices, to show innovation and change in texts. CDA has a mediating role in allowing one to connect detailed linguistic and semiotic features of texts with processes of social change on a broader scale. CDA is adopted within a semantic field (the institutional context). However, Chandler (1998) states that content analysis is a prominent rival to semiotics (discourse analysis) as a method of textual analysis. Content analysis involves a quantitative approach to the analysis of the manifest ‘content’ of texts, while semiotics (discourse analysis) seeks to analyze texts as structured
wholes by investigating latent, connotative meaning (see discussion of denotation and connotation, section 3.3.3.2.2). Semiotics (discourse analysis) is rarely quantitative and often involves a rejection of such approaches, because an item occurs frequently in a text does not make it significant. Text analysis is more concerned with the relation of text elements to each other.

The reasons why this research adopts a combination of content analysis and discourse analysis are listed below: firstly, the interview transcripts are the main body of the primary data. Text content can be considered denotative (see section 3.3.3.2.2). Transcript texts contain objective signifiers (see discussion of signifier and signified, section 3.3.3.2.1) that can be analyzed through content analysis. Secondly, both interview questions and answers are grouped into three categories: informative, analytical and evaluative. The informative content is more objective, and answers the question "what?", while the analytical and evaluative content is more subjective and thus suitable for semiotic (discourse) analysis, because these data reveal the interviewees' subjective views and contain the connotative meaning of reality in terms of internationalization at the case study university. Thirdly, the primary data are collected mainly through audio record interview. The associated transcripts are derived from audio recordings only. Thus, some contexts (semiotics) are not fully presented by the text (for example, interviewee's vocal tone, volume of speaking, body language and facial expression). These elements are a part of context (semiotics), but missed in transcripts. This results in fewer connotations gained.

3.3.3.2.1 Signifier and signified

Signs take the form of words, images, sounds, odours, flavours, acts or objects (Peirce, 1931, p. 58), but such things have no intrinsic meaning and become signs only when we invest them with meaning (Chandler, 1998). "The sign is the whole that results from the association of the signifier with the signified" (Saussure, 1983, p. 76). Saussure offers a
The ‘signifier’ is the verbal form which the sign takes. The ‘signifier’ is commonly interpreted as the material (or physical) form of the sign. It is something which can be seen, heard, touched, smelt or tasted. In this research, the audio records, the interview transcripts, the words, sentences and written letters all belong to ‘signifier’ or the verbal symbol of the signified. That is something objective and the meaning is commonly accepted. The ‘signified’ is the concept it represents. It is not to be identified directly with a referent but as a concept in the mind — not a thing but the notion of a thing. The ‘signified’ can be treated as a mental construct or an object, such as a tree (a concept of a woody perennial plant typically with a single stem or trunk growing to a considerable height and bearing lateral branches) or a cat (a concept of a domestic feline quadruped mammal with soft fur, a short snout, and retractile claws). The ‘signified’ is more subjective (to both researcher and readers) and often changeable depending on the associated semiotics (the context). For example, the same signifier (the word ‘tree’) can stand for different signifieds. If in a forest, ‘tree’ means a woody perennial plant, while in an Amway direct selling training seminar, ‘tree’ may mean the direct selling network that consists of distributors at various levels. The ‘signified’ relies on readers (based on their
particular semiotics), and whether they get the same perception as the research's interpret. Here, the researcher cannot guarantee that every reader perceives the same meaning as hers, but she endeavours to make sure that her perception is substantiated and justified and can therefore be accepted by them as valid. Since interview transcripts are the basis of primary data analysis, most data (including secondary data) are under the category of 'signifier'. However, 'signifier' is not completely objective. It contains the perspectives of denotation and connotation (Saussure, 1974). The connotative meaning contributes to the subjective interpretation of reality in this research.

3.3.3.2.2 Denotation and connotation
Denotation is described as the definitional, 'literal', 'obvious' or 'commonsense' meaning of a sign (Chandler, 1998). In the case of linguistic signs, the denotative meaning is what the dictionary provides. The denotation of a representational visual image is what all viewers from any culture and at any time would recognize the image as depicting (Panofsky, 1970a). On the other hand, connotation is used to refer to the social-cultural and 'personal' (ideological and emotional) associations of the sign (Wilden, 1987). These are typically related to the researcher's inter-subjective view, such as how the researcher views the circumstance, what position the researcher holds when she views it. The meaning of connotation can be influenced by her inter-subjective perception, experience, age, ethnicity and so on. This kind of sign is more 'polysemic', more open to interpretation than denotation. In 'The Photographic Message' (1961, cited in Barthes, 1977) and 'The Rhetoric of the Image' (1964, cited in Barthes, 1977), Barthes argues that in photography connotation can be distinguished analytically from denotation. Fiske (1982, p. 91) states that "denotation is what is photographed, connotation is how it is photographed", for example, shooting naturally or with the 'Black and White' effect. Thus, the photograph may appear to be a 'natural sign' or 'artificial sign'. Through CDA, this research does not only recognize what is shown by denotation, (for example, the written words or texts), but also interprets the underlying connotative meaning. The
connotative meaning is more subjective and relies on the researcher’s own interpretation of the circumstance (such as HE internationalization).

Although there is a significant difference between denotation and connotation, they work as two halves of a whole, and cannot be separated during data analysis. Voloshinov (1973) insists that no strict division can be made between denotation and connotation, because no sign is purely denotative (lacking connotation). According to Barthes (1974), connotation produces the illusion of denotation. Denotation can be seen as no more of a ‘natural’ meaning than connotation, but rather as a process of naturalization of circumstances. Such a process leads to the illusion that denotation is a purely literal and universal meaning, and indeed that these connotations, which seem most obvious to individual interpreters, are just as ‘natural’. In this project, the researcher reports the denotative meaning and interprets the connotations associated with it. The interpretation is derived from connotative evidence (three sources of data collection); the interpretation is subjective, but not a random, arbitrary or 100% personal perception, either.

Denotation involves a broader consensus. According to Chandler (1998), the depositional meaning of a sign would be broadly agreed upon by members of the same culture, whereas “nobody is ever taken to task because their connotations are incorrect” (Barnard, 1996, p. 83), so no inventory of connotative meanings generated by any sign could ever be complete. However, the problem is the stressing of the individual subjectivity of connotation, because within a culture or certain context, subjective responses are shared to some degree, while denotation always holds a common agreement. For example, there is a clear answer to the question whether the case study university has an overseas campus. This is a sign of denotation that achieves 100% agreement (see Q 5.1, Chapter 4). However, when the interviewer asks ‘why does not the University of [X] have an overseas campus?’ the answers are divergent. Most interviewees say that an overseas branch campus is too risky and expensive, while others respond with ‘no idea’. The answer to an ‘analytical’ question is an emerging individual perspective. Consequently,
the implication of interviewees' answers leave the researcher with the question "why do the interviewees have no idea?" The potential answers can be that they really do not know. they do not care about it, or that they know why, but purposely do not want to share this information because of ethical issues. These can be the interpretations of this answer.

With CDA, the researcher not only accepts what the data is saying, but also evaluates whether this data is credited as an accurate representation of reality. Even though data has no 'true' or 'false' quality, its interpretation does, and therefore it still can be analyzed in CDA because it contains a connotative meaning in that particular semiotics.

3.3.3.3 Categorization (grouping) of meaning

According to Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2009), categorizing data involves two activities: developing categories and attaching them to meaningful portions of data. The identification of categories is guided by research objectives and themes. Semi-structured interviews allow the categories to be a coherent set for data analysis. Designing suitable summaries of group answers and placing the gathered data into cells means that the researcher is engaging in the process of analyzing data (Dey, 1993; Miles and Huberman, 1994; Yin, 1994). This approach allows the researcher to keep revising categories and themes. The original number of themes is nine, and the researcher keeps "subdividing and integrating them as ways of refining or focusing analysis" (Dey, 1993, p. 95), and finally six themes remain. Dey also (1993, p. 96-97) states that "categories must have two aspects, the internal aspect (being meaningful in relation to the data), and an external aspect (being meaningful in relation to the other categories)." In this research, the internal aspect is reflected in data reduction and summary (see previous section 3.3.2). The external aspect is the summarized comparison among groups, further resulting in the overlapping structure (common points, partially shared points and group-specific points). The overlapping structure presents the relationship among groups.
3.3.4 Drawing conclusions and constructing solutions

Conclusion is a definitive summary, which begins to emerge at the stage of data reduction. Before writing up the final conclusion, the researcher de-briefs the interviewees (8 out of 20), university partners (total of 4), supervisors and other experts in order to check the validity of her research. This research concludes with a market entry dynamic framework that is specific to the case study university. The qualified research reliability (see section 3.4.1) and validity (see section 3.4.2) make the research findings applicable and transferable. Further research (see Chapter 6, section 6.4) will concentrate on testing the generalizability of this framework.

3.4 Reliability, validity, generalizability and research ethics

The idea of reliability, validity and generalizability is common to all types of research. However, the meaning of reliability, validity and generalizability in qualitative research is different from that in quantitative research. This requires the researcher to carefully consider research objectives and methodology before research begins. The key concern is the way in which the researcher can make sure that the research findings are transferable and applicable.

3.4.1 Reliability

Bryman and Bell (2008) define reliability as related to the question of whether the results of a study are repeatable. Saunders (2008) states that reliability as the degree to which data collection methods and analysis, will yield consistent findings; in other words, similar observations would be made and conclusions reached by other researchers repeating the process. Embodied in their definitions is the idea of replicability, or repeatability of results or observations. In quantitative research, reliability is measured by similar results derived from replicated tests. However, in qualitative research, reliability is interpreted as quality. Eisner (1991, p. 58) states that “if we see the idea of testing as a way of information elicitation then the most important test of any qualitative study is its
quality. A good qualitative study can help us understand a situation that would otherwise be enigmatic or confusing.” A good quality research increases the reliability of research findings in qualitative study. “Reliability evaluates quality in quantitative study with a ‘purpose of explaining’ while quality concept in qualitative study has the purpose of ‘generating understanding’.” (Stenbacka, 2001, p. 551).

Then the question is: how can the researcher know that her / his research is of good quality? And how can s/he convince other audiences that these findings are worthy of their attention? To answer these questions, Healy and Perry (2000) assert that the quality of a study in the qualitative paradigm should be judged by the terms of credibility, neutrality or confirmability, consistency or dependability, and applicability or transferability (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). The researcher judges the reliability of this research by natural data collection and appropriate research strategies. A rich and credible interview transcript also contributes to research quality. Firstly, primary data is collected through semi-structured interviews with open-ended questions. Three sources of data collection (such as interview, observation and documentary) allow the findings to be triangulated with each other. Secondly, the ethnography and participant observation allow the researcher to immerse herself in data interpretation. Thirdly, first-hand participant experience with the case of S1 Academy, China leads to further investigation and provides an opportunity for the researcher to witness the obstacles to the implementation of HE internationalization at the case study university. De-briefing interviewees (see Appendix 17), the case study university partners and other experts on research findings, also adds credit to research quality. Saved interview audio records allow the researcher to review these data as many times as needed. This reduces errors in transcription and data analysis. Finally, the researcher compares research findings with relevant literature. If the findings can fill the identified gap, it implies that this research is of good quality. In addition, technically if no literature is found to be related to the findings, it makes the quality of research even stronger. However, this is not the case in this research, because the researcher does not start with an absolutely clean theoretical slate (Cope, 2009),
which is neither "practical nor preferred" (Perry, 1998, p. 788). This research intends to use international business theories to interpret the process of internationalization in higher education. There should be some related secondary sources (see literature review, Chapter 2) Based on the above points, the researcher believes that this is a reliable, valid and viable research project.

3.4.2 Validity

Validity is concerned with the integrity of the data gathered and the conclusions derived from it (Bryman and Bell, 2008), and the extent to which data collection methods accurately record and measure what was intended (Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill, 2009). This concept is not single, fixed or universal, but "rather a contingent construct, inescapably grounded in the processes and intentions of particular research methodologies and projects" (Winter, 2000, p. 1). Although some qualitative researchers have argued that the term validity is not applicable to qualitative research, they have realized the need for some kind of qualifying check or measure for research findings. Creswell and Miller (2000) suggest that validity is affected by the researcher's perception of validity in the study and his / her choice of research philosophies (epistemologies). This implies that validity in qualitative research is about the researcher's effort and ability to carry out the research project. It is concerned with how the researcher conducts this research, and whether the researcher has explored and interpreted what s/he intends to do. Validity is reflected within the whole research process, including the setting of the research aim and objectives, research design, data collection and analysis.

To ensure validity in qualitative research, the examination of research trustworthiness is crucial. Seale (1999, p. 266) stresses that "the 'trustworthiness' of a research report lies at the heart of issues conventionally discussed as validity and reliability". The accuracy of audio transcripts is a prerequisite for research validity. Before data analysis, the researcher provided each interviewee with a copy of their own interview transcript for checking (see Appendix 16) and also de-briefed interviewees, university partners and
experts on the research findings to check the validity of conclusions. All de-briefing sessions were also audio recorded. Furthermore, the researcher attended two conferences on HE internationalization. One conference is the ‘Vice Chancellor’s 2010 Teaching and Learning International Conference’, organized by the University of Plymouth, in June 2010. The other is the University of Derby’s International Collaboration Annual Conference at the University of Derby, Buxton campus in July 2010. The researcher presented research findings (the dynamic framework) to four overseas partners of the case study university, and gained positive feedback. Some partners also gave their advice about the dynamic framework. Finally and importantly, the whole research process has been supervised. Both the researcher and her supervisors believe that the dynamic framework correctly interprets the international circumstance at the case study university, and suggest that the same principle should be applicable and transferable to other universities in a similar situation. A credible level of validity is achieved and the conceptual framework is qualified with trustworthiness. These follow-up activities ensure that adequate attention was paid to the validity and reliability of research findings (Massey and Newbould, 1986; Seidman, 1991; Patton, 2002).

3.4.3 Generalizability

Generalizability posits the existence of a domain or set of elements, as well as one or more common characteristics shared by those elements. Generalizability is the most

30 The theme of this conference is ‘Internationalization’, focused around five main topics: a) Internationalizing the U.K. Student Experience – producing global citizens, employability in global labour markets, overseas placements and volunteering; b) Overseas Students – recruitment, their student learning experience, changes in market trends, international contrasts, cultural and language issues; c) Partnerships, Exchanges and Alumni – international collaboration between HEIs, student exchanges, joint programmes and research; d) Overseas Staff – opportunities and challenges in appointing and supporting staff from outside the United Kingdom, support for staff exchanges and for colleagues working overseas; and e) Bologna and the European Dimension – funding and EU programmes, international standards and quality assurance (QA).

31 University of Derby Collaboration Annual Conference 2010, University of Derby, Buxton Campus, 6th-7th July, 2010.

32 BA College, Botswana; SHM School, Switzerland; MM Institute, Malawi; W.E Council, Malaysia.
important criterion for deductive research. It is the essential basis of all valid deductive
inference (Pattern 2002). The main purpose of generalizability is to examine external
validity of research findings in order to determine whether the research findings hold true
for any given situation. Maxwell (1992) observes that the degree to which an account is
believed to be generalizable clearly distinguishes quantitative and qualitative research
approaches. Although the ability to generalize findings to wider groups and
circumstances is one of the most common tests of validity for quantitative research,
Patton (2002) states that generalizability as one of the criteria for quality case studies
depends on the selected and studied case. In this sense, validity in quantitative research is
very specific to the test to which it is applied, where triangulation methods are used in
qualitative research. Triangulation is typically a strategy (test) for improving the validity
and reliability of research or evaluation of findings. Research findings in this project
contribute mainly to a better understanding of the phenomena in the present case study,
thus its generalizability is low. The reasons for low generalizability are listed as follows.
Firstly, there is one U.K. university involved; next, all interviewees are from the same
organization (the case study university); and finally, the research findings currently
cannot fully interpret HE internationalization of certain institutions whose international
development contains the establishment of overseas branch campuses.

However, in qualitative research, low generalizability does not affect validity or
reliability because qualitative research aims to interpret rather than generalize research
findings (Winter, 2000; and Joppe, 2000). There is an interesting relationship among
reliability, validity and generalizability in two different research paradigms (Patton,
2002). Firstly, in quantitative research, reliability is a prerequisite of validity: if a
quantitative research cannot achieve reliability, then there is no validity or
generalizability to discuss (Wainer and Braun, 1988). However, in qualitative research,
research quality is referred to as reliability (Patton, 1990); the researcher's effort and
ability are reflected in validity. Therefore, good validity (researcher's effort and ability)
results in good reliability (research quality), but does not have a direct link to
generalizability. The generalizability of qualitative research should be 'judged' by further research. The market entry dynamic framework is just a beginning rather than an end. Further research will be conducted to test its generalizability through a deductive approach (see discussion of further research, Chapter 6, section 6.4).

3.4.4 Research ethics
There are some ethical issues involved, such as informed consent, risk of harm and confidentiality. The participants should be given as much information as might be needed to make an informed decision about whether or not they wish to participate in a research project (Bryman and Bell, 2008). Informed consent means that prospective participants must be fully informed about the research topic, scope, procedures and associated risks involved and their consent has to be obtained before the collection of primary data. The interview questions and a cover letter (see Appendix 13) with an explanation of how their answers are crucial to this research, were sent to the respondents in advance to make sure that all the respondents understand the questions well and have enough time to consider whether they would be willing to participate.

During interviews, the researcher did not deviate from the interview questions that were sent in advance. By doing so and not adding or subtracting from the number of questions (Saunder, Lewis and Adrian, 2003), the researcher ensured that there were no surprise elements during the interview; this created a comfortable environment for the respondents.

Ethical standards also require not putting participants in a situation where they might be at risk of harm as a result of their participation. The BSA (British Social Attitude) Statement says that personal information concerning research participants should be kept confidential. In some cases, it may be necessary to decide whether it is proper or appropriate to record certain kinds of sensitive information (Bryman, and Bell, 2008); this issue of privacy is invariably linked to the issues of anonymity and confidentiality in
the research process. The collection, storage, disclosure and use of research data must comply with the Data Protection Act 1998. The researcher should be aware of the risks of identification and breach of privacy and confidentiality posed by all kinds of information storage and processing (University of [X], Code of Practice on Research Ethics, 2007, section 3.16). Since all the interviewees are members of staff at the case study university, the ethical priority is to make sure that the interview process and final results do not have a negative effect on any respondent's career or cause embarrassment to anyone involved in the research. Thus, no names, initials, job positions, or particular departments appear in this research. The researcher further sought each interviewee's permission to cite their response directly (see Appendix 16). Most of them agreed to direct citing; for those who hesitated or declined, indirect citing was adopted.

Finally, participants' confidentiality and anonymity should be maintained, and their personal privacy protected (University of [X], Code of Practice on Research Ethics, 2007, section 3.15). All the participants were assured that identifiable information would not be made available to anyone who was not directly involved in the study. Each interviewee can access only her/his own interview transcript, but not the others'. Hence, all interviewees' responses would be anonymous and all discussion kept confidential. Thus the sample transcript attached in Appendix 11 is also completely anonymous. Any potential 'suspicious' words have been removed from the transcripts and quotations.
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4.0 Overview
This chapter focuses on the analysis of case study. Research data is collected through three sources (primary data, documentary / secondary data and other data collection). Semi-structured interview approach is adopted for primary data collection. The total of 22 interviewees from three key departments are selected. During data analysis, each interview question is labeled as informative, analytical or evaluative indicating an incremental level of cognitive involvement (for the interviewees). Primary data is reduced and summarized on the group basis. The group findings are presented in three categories that indicate the level of integration among groups: common points, partially shared points and group-specific points. The larger proportion of overlap means the higher level of integration within the university, whereas the smaller proportion of overlap presents the diversity of group views with a lower level of cohesion. The primary data is triangulated with other two sources of data. Critical discourse analysis (CDA), content analysis and categorization of meaning are adopted as strategies for data analysis.

4.1 Background and recent status of the case study university
The origins of the university can be traced back to 1851 when the [D] Institution for the Training of School Mistresses was created. Following a number of mergers the [X] College of Higher Education was established in 1983. It became a university in 1993 and in 1998 the University merged with the [X] College.

This university is located in central England; the main focus is on undergraduate delivery. The university is comprised of four faculties whose subjects cover most common higher education programmes offered in the United Kingdom. For example, Faculty A concentrates on computing, business studies and law; Faculty B deals with programmes in art and technology; Faculty C focuses on health studies, education and science; while, unlike other three faculties, Faculty D offers more niche undergraduate programmes including hospitality, beauty and spa, tourism, and outdoor activities.
In 2008-2009 the university had 18,949 students (14,963 FTEs) studying across its three sites. There were 11,904 full-time and 3,931 part-time undergraduates, 540 full-time and 2,433 part-time postgraduate taught students. There were 1,665 students who studied remotely (designated as online, learning through work or University of [X] Corporate). There were 74 full-time and 67 part-time postgraduate research students, of whom 36 were distance-learners (QAA audit report, University of [X], November, 2009, p. 6).

4.2 Research themes

HE internationalization comprises numerous fields, for example, international joint research, partnership, recruitment, overseas campuses, quality assurance, teaching and learning. The intention here is not to represent all of the case study university, but rather to understand its internationalization dynamics in relation to international recruitment and academic collaboration. To do so, the case study focuses on the following six themes that are derived from observation and interviews:

Theme 1: Internationalization strategy and understanding

Theme 2: International recruitment strategy

Theme 3: Academic collaboration (3A) and Programme delivery (3B)

Theme 4: Overseas branch campus

Theme 5: Problems, issues and challenges of HE internationalization

Theme 6: Internationalization of faculties

Group of interviewees

A total of 20 interviewees participated in this research. Based on positions and job responsibilities, they are separated into three groups:
i) Corporate group, the planners who are senior management in charge of advancing the university’s strategic plan.

ii) Department 2, the supporters who integrate and coordinate across different faculties in charge of international recruitment and student support.

iii) Faculty group, the front-line executives (the lecturers) who are responsible for strategy implementation. Faculty here represents the academic teaching team.

4.3 Nature of interview questions

Interview questions are also separated into three different groups based on the nature of question. They are informative questions (for example, ‘what’), which address objective facts; analytical questions (‘why’ and ‘how’), which expect the interviewees to analyze certain phenomena and explain the cause of the phenomena or describe a particular process; and evaluative questions that aim to investigate the interviewees’ subjective views. Interviewees are requested to evaluate certain circumstance of HE internationalization (such as issues and challenges) that may be partly compatible with or totally against their own point of view.

Labeling the interview questions this way not only helps the researcher to incrementally explore the case study, but also reflects an incremental degree of cognitive involvement of questions. As discussed previously, interviewees may feel hesitant to answer evaluative questions compared to informative questions (see discussion of data collection, Chapter 3, section 3.2.3). That may be the reason why some interviewees declined to answer some questions. Based on the interviewee’s response, five different symbols are used to mark each question:

“●” – nature of interview questions (informative, analytical and evaluative);

“o” – nature of answers. There are three distinct types. “Not addressed” relates to the question not asked by the researcher because the question does not fit the interviewee’s
job responsibility, or the researcher is not given enough time to ask this question. "Decline" means that respondents decline or purposely do not answer certain questions. "Mismatch" indicates that answers do not match the question. This may happen because the interviewee misunderstood the question or the researcher did not provide a clear explanation of the question.

4.4 Three sources data collections

Three sources of data are collected, analyzed and triangulated among each other. Firstly, primary data is collected mainly through interviews (a total of 20 interviewees, 22 digital audio records, two interviewees were interviewed twice, and 329 pages of transcripts were compiled; a sample of an interview transcript is in Appendix 11). Data presentation for qualitative research should achieve a stage where any reader is able to analyze and evaluate the data summary based on the data presented. With a large number of original transcripts, the first task the researcher needs to do is data reduction. Data reduction follows the same procedure in each group. First, each interviewee's answer is grouped under a particular interview question. Second, the key words in the content are highlighted. These key words can be the same words repeated several times or different words with similar meaning (for example, curriculum, syllabus courses and programmes). The key words help the researcher to capture the interviewee's main subjective view. This methodology is known as content analysis that adopts a quantitative way to analyze qualitative data. Besides content analysis, critical discourse analysis (CDA) is also adopted as one of the data analysis strategies (see discussion of critical discourse analysis, Chapter 3, section 3.3.3.2). With CDA, the denotative meaning is presented by text (such as interview transcripts); while, the connotative meaning is interpreted by the researcher (see discussion of denotation and connotation, Chapter 3, section 3.3.3.2.2) because certain underlying meaning will not be automatically revealed, except through the researcher's interpretation. So the researcher seeks connotations and implications by reading transcripts line by line and word by word in each answer. This enables the researcher to better understand and interpret the underlying meaning of different interviewees' subjective views. However, not every answer contains a potential
connotative meaning, especially in the case of informative questions, because the likelihood of connotations in the answers to informative questions is lower than in the answers to evaluative questions.

Then, the key words from each response are listed under particular question. At this stage, the original transcripts are reduced into set of key words summary. These key words are combined within same interview group. The overlapping points are only accounted once. The group key word summary is constructed in each question. Finally, these group key words are compared among three interviewee groups in order to find the overlapping points. This process results in the following three categories (including seven sub-categories): common points (all group); partially shared points between two groups (such as Corporate-Department 2, Corporate-Faculty, Department 2-Faculty) and group-specific points (such as Corporate, Department 2 and Faculty). At this stage, the reduced key points are placed into seven sub-groups. These overlapping data will be presented as primary data in the following data analysis.

Secondly, documentary data is used for comparison and triangulation with the primary data. The sources of documentary data include the case study university’s website, QED handbooks, QAA audit reports (2006 and 2009), conference presentation materials, ISB international student barometer (2010, see Appendix 10), the case study university’s marketing presentation (February, 2010), faculty operational manuals and programme specifications. Not every question can be fully addressed by secondary data, especially in relation to analytical and evaluative questions. Some documentary data does not directly support interview questions, but partially correlates with other data collections. All documentary / secondary data are presented in Appendices.

Thirdly, other data collection is not only used for comparison and triangulation, but also provides opportunities for the researcher to witness first-hand the process of internationalization at the case study university. The sources of other data collection consist of the observed data from the case of the S1 Academy, China, related emails and
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the researcher's own overseas study experience. As a coordinator / representative on behalf of the S1 Academy, the researcher is directly involved in the establishment of an academic partnership between the S1 Academy, China and the case study university. This fieldwork provides an opportunity to observe an example of internationalization at the case study university. Most observed data is collected through interaction with Department 2. The main departments involved are Admissions and International Office. Although there is not a large volume of observed data, the researcher believes that observed evidence paints a truly defined picture (see discussion of participant observation, Chapter 3, section 3.2.1.1).

4.5 Data presentation and analysis

This section focuses on data analysis and presentation. The total of 19 interview questions are discussed. The answers to each question are summarized and compared among the three key departments. This correlation constructs an overlap pattern of the views across different interview groups. Based on the evidence collected (from interview, observation and documentary data), data analysis is undertaken through content analysis, critical discourse analysis, and categorization of meaning.

4.5.1 Theme 1: International strategy and understanding

Q 1.1 What is internationalization strategy of the University of [X]? And what do you understand by 'internationalization of higher education'? Would this include

- A certain number or percentage of overseas students?
- Staff / student exchange?
- Joint research?
- Overseas market-targeted syllabus?
- Collaborated partnership?
- Overseas office?
- Overseas campus?

In other words, what standards should be used to assess the level of internationalization?
Evidence from primary data (Q 1.1 Internationalization strategy)

Q 1.1 investigates the understanding of international strategy of the case study university. This is an informative question (see discussion of nature of interview questions, section 4.3). Most answers match the nature of the interview question. Some interviewees also give analytical responses (see Appendix 18, table 4.1 internationalization strategy, theme 1). One corporate interviewee declines to answer this question. The summary of primary data is presented in table 4.2.

The common understanding of international strategy is that it has to do with the recruitment of international students, academic collaboration, and internationalization of the curriculum. This question seeks information about the 'big picture' of the international strategy at the case study university, which is supposed to be highly consistent among the three key departments. However, besides the corporate group, the answers of the other two groups presented a fragmented picture of what they are doing. For example, the faculty group focuses on the programme delivery methods and teaching style; Department 2's answers concentrate on the international initiatives and key regions for internationalization. The answers to this question reflect the structure of the case study university, and reveal that there is a lack of consistent understanding of internationalization within the university from strategy planning and coordination to strategy implementation. This inconsistency potentially reduces the possibility of a successful operation of international strategy at the case study.

Table 4.2 Primary data of international strategy and understanding (Q 1.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1, Q.1.1</th>
<th>Common points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Groups</td>
<td>• Recruitment of international student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Internationalizing curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Development of collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Overseas study experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• University provides environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Partially shared points

163
Evidence from secondary data (Q 1.1 Internationalization strategy)
The mission of the case study university is to be the learner’s first choice university for quality and opportunity. There are eight core strategies underpinning the university’s 2009-2014 corporate plan and internationalization is one of them. In terms of the corporate mission, faculties also have their own versions of the international strategy (see Appendix 1).

Evidence from other data (Q 1.1 Internationalization strategy): No evidence.

Analysis and summary (Q 1.1 Internationalization strategy and understanding)
This question is about understanding of international strategy at the case study university. The corporate group is directly responsible for it. The common understanding of HE internationalization emphasizes the following three perspectives. The first perspective concentrates on the recruitment of international students, especially in the context of the global economic recession, European financial crisis and recent education funding cuts.
and capping of the number of home students that a university in the United Kingdom can recruit. Internationalization is an alternative way for income generation; the second perspective is about curriculum internationalization that makes the curriculum less British or USA-centric but more global. Curriculum development will prepare students to be global citizens, attract more international students and also benefit home students’ study experience. The third perspective focuses on global engagement and experience, including communicating around the world, understanding different cultures and engaging in different experiences.

Researchers definite HE internationalization from different perspectives (see discussion of HE internationalization, Chapter 2, section 2.5.1). These include the intercultural academic perspective (Wachter, 1999; De Wit, 2002; Knight, 2005), activities perspective (De Wit, 1998; Black, 2004), process perspective (Harari, 1992; Pickert and Turlington, 1992; Hanson and Meyerson, 1995), curriculum perspective (Tonkin and Edwards, 1981; Lambert, 1989; Harari, 1992; Klasek, 1992) and outcome perspective (Francis 1993; Hamilton 1997; Whalley, 1997). The case study university’s understanding is primarily consistent with literature (activities, process, curriculum, and outcome perspectives). The mismatched point is international recruitment, which is highlighted as an important understanding of HE internationalization in the case study. This is reflected in the international corporate strategy at the case study university and can be explained as a response to macro environment, such as the recession (the influence of the U.S. economic crisis, 2009) and U.K. government policy (capping the number of home students and education funding cuts in 2010).

It is interesting to compare the group-specific points with common points. There is a significant difference in answers between the faculty group and the corporate group. Furthermore, like the faculty’s answers, Department 2’s responses are mainly a description of their daily job rather an overall view of the university’s international mission. According to Johnson, Scholes and Whittington (2008), strategy is the direction and scope of an organization over the long term, which achieves advantages in a
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changing environment through its configuration of resource and competences to fulfill stakeholder expectations. Making strategy is the main job of the corporate group. Faculty staff execute the corporate strategy at an implemental level and deal with the curriculum, teaching, marking and assessment. The faculty’s answer is closer to their daily activities, such as programme delivery. Department 2 is in the middle to coordinate across different faculties. Their answers also describe their job scope: for example, recruitment focuses on five key areas (such as China, India, Middle East, Hong Kong/Macau, and Nigeria/Ghana) and student support. The answer to Q 1.1 naturally reflects the structure of the case study university. However, it also exposes a problem. Besides the corporate group, the other two groups are not very clear about the university’s international strategy. The researcher expects them to give an answer relating to a ‘big picture’, but they gave fragmented descriptions of what they do on a day-to-day basis. It is understandable that Department 2 and Faculty are not the strategy makers, but at least they should have a clear understanding of the corporate strategy, since they are the implementers who execute corporate goals. If they do not know what the university’s strategy is, then how do they implement and coordinate it? Weak communication or inadequate information sharing or lack of staff development may be the reasons (Alexander, 1991; Olsen, Tse and West, 1992; Schmelzer and Olsen, 1994; Ai-Ghamdi, 1998; Noble, 1999b; Aaltonen and Ikavaiko, 2002; Heide, Gronhaug and Johannessen, 2002; Okumus, 2001 and 2003; Dobni, 2003; Freedman, 2003, Hrebiniak, 2009; see discussion of strategy implementation factors, Chapter 2, section 2.3.1). Fragmented views indicate that there is lack of integrated internal understanding of the university’s international strategy. HE internationalization as a corporate strategy is supposed to have high consistence within the key departments. However, this is not the case at the case study university. And fragmented understanding can potentially reduce the possibility of executing the corporate strategy successfully (as discussed later, see Q 6.1).

In addition, research findings show that curriculum internationalization is one of the common points of the three interview groups. All groups state that curriculum internationalization is part of the university’s international strategy; for example, all
faculties are asked to re-validate their programmes to explore potential areas of internationalization. The case study university considers curriculum internationalization as a strategy to attract more international students. Thus, Maringe's (2009) view of the lack of focusing on the curriculum is not applicable in this case study (see discussion of lack of focus on the curriculums, Chapter 2, section 2.7.9).

Q 1.2 What are the motives of this internationalization strategy? (Examples might include: income generation, increasing international profile, competition, scholarship, expansion into a new market, dissemination of knowledge, teaching and research)

Evidence from primary data (Q 1.2 Reasons for HE Internationalization)

Q 1.2 investigates the reasons for HE internationalization at the case study university. This question is both informative and analytical. Most answers match the nature of the question (see Appendix 18, table 4.3 motives of HE internationalization). The summary of primary data is presented in table 4.4.

The motives of HE internationalization at the case study university are income generation, intercultural enrichment and mutual learning. Other drivers, for example, altruism scholarship, global trend, employers' requirement are also mentioned in the partially shared points. The interviewees from Department 2 also point out intense international competition as a 'motive' forcing the university towards internationalization. The answers to this question primarily match the four rationales for HE internationalization discussed in literature: economic, political, academic, and social and cultural (see discussion of rationale of HE internationalization, Chapter 1, section 1.0).

Table 4.4 Primary data of reasons for HE internationalization (Q 1.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TI, Q-1.2</th>
<th>Common points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Groups</td>
<td>• Income generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enrich learning – mutual benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Benefit home students by bring in international students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evidence from secondary data (Q 1.2 Reasons for HE Internationalization): No evidence.

### Evidence from other data (Q 1.2 Reasons for HE Internationalization)
The observed data is from environment. Within the United Kingdom, in early 2010, U.K. government announced to cut university funding of up to 315 million pounds. Later, the new coalition government imposed a significant budget cut mainly in the public sector. Education is one of its major targets. The ‘cap’ on student numbers affects most U.K. universities. Outside the United Kingdom, the effect of global recession still affects many countries. The unstable economic situation in Europe (for example, the crisis in Greece in May 2010) slows down the recovery of the U.K. economy.

---

33 Author: Sepherd, J. Title: ‘Cuts will deprive thousands of university place, academics warn - Universities await announcement from funding body to find out’: University funders at the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) will outline where the cuts of nearly £315m will be made today. They are expected to announce that teaching budgets will be reduced for the first time since Labour came to power. (www.guardian.co.uk, Monday, 1S February 2010 12.06 GMT).
Other evidence in terms of the motives of HE internationalization is from the researcher's own overseas study experience, as an international student; the cultural and social rationale is the researcher's individual reason to study abroad. Other personal benefit concerns include employability, salary, social respect and value of qualification.

Analysis and summary (Q 1.2 Reasons for HE Internationalization)
This question is about the rationale of internationalization. The corporate group is mainly responsible for it. The common points (motives) are income generation, mutual learning and global citizenship. The motives derived from this question are consistent with the themes discussed in literature (see discussion of rationales of HE internationalization, Chapter 1, section 1.0). According to Knight (1997), there are four rationales for HE internationalization: economic, political, academic, and cultural and social.

All interview groups mention income generation. Some interviewees state that income is very important and it is one of the main rationales, as interviewee no.13 (Department 2 group) says:

"I think mainly the income generation, ... because of economic recession circumstance and also they introduce a cap this year (2010) for the UK students. So the funding is less and less and mostly the university wants to attract the overseas students and so they can get more pay and more funding, and this is the main purpose."

--- Interviewee no.13 (Department 2 group)

In another question (Q 3.2), the mention of a business model and costing model during academic collaborations also laterally re-confirms the university's concern about economic rationale in HE internationalization (see discussion of Q 3.2).

In respect to the political perspective, most interviewees are aware of the pressure of the recent funding cuts in the U.K. education sector. The political policy includes
government cutting plan that caps the number of home students and forces universities to look at alternative revenue streams. This point is also consistent with the observed data.

The partially shared points are closer to academic rationales, such as encouraging curriculum internationalization, altruism scholarship, and following the global trend. Internationalization brings straightforward benefits of mutual value for both international and home students. Home students comprise the major proportion of the total student number, thus they are the biggest group that benefits from HE internationalization usually through curriculum internationalization without having to leave their home countries, as interviewee no.2 (Corporate group) says:

"International students bring aspects of culture ... to the community which U.K. students alone would not bring. And I think that the diversity gives enrichment in learning, enrichment in social life, and it's therefore very straightforward benefit which is of mutual value, both to those who join us from overseas but also for the many students who are U.K. based students to learn from those who come. So everyone benefits."

--- Interviewee no.2 (Corporate group)

The cultural and social rationale is partially presented in this research because besides the cultural perspective, there is no obvious evidence regarding the social rationale. However, it does not mean that the social rationale is not important or does not correspond to the research findings. The reason is that no group represents students’ point of view. The social rationale is about individual learners improving their life (through HE internationalization) and then further benefiting society. The observed data (the researcher's own overseas study experience) can contribute to this aspect. Furthermore, the existing literature on continuously increasing international student numbers (see discussion of student mobility, Chapter 2, section 2.6.1.1) also partially reflects the social aspect. For example, if those students do not experience benefits from HE internationalization, why do they continue to come over? Thus it is possible to say that the answers to this question (Q 1.2) mostly match literature in terms of the rationales for
HE internationalization (see discussion of rationales of HE internationalization, Chapter 1, section 1.0).

However, there are also some mismatching views in the group-specific points. The corporate group says that HE internationalization not only benefits students, but also enriches academic staff. The Department 2 group mentions competition and the university's international profile. The faculty group points out the university environment and the faculty's involvement in internationalization. These answers draw a picture of responsibilities in each group. The corporate-level strategy focuses on the overall scope of the organization and how value will be added to its different parts or business units (Hatten, Schendel and Cooper, 1978; Rue and Holland, 1989; Johnson, Scholes and Whittington, 2008). Thus the corporate group sees HE internationalization from a broader perspective, and concentrates on how to value the main stakeholders (students and staff) of the university. However, as a business unit, the Department 2 group perceives and analyses this question within a business-level strategy scope where recruiting students and winning international competition are their priority. For this reason, business-level strategy is often called 'competitive strategy' (Hambrick, 1983b; Kim and Lim, 1988; Miller, 1988; Jennings, Rajaratnam and Lawrence, 2003). The academics (faculty group) consider how to implement both the corporate-level and business-level strategies effectively in terms of resource, process, operation and people. Thus the faculty's answer includes more operational words, such as 'increase' and 'provide'.

Q 1.3 What are the international developments of the University of [X]? (Examples might include recruitment of foreign students, international academic collaboration, and E-learning)

Evidence from primary data (Q 1.3 International Development)

Q 1.3 investigates international development at the case study university. This question is both informative and analytical. Most answers match the nature of the question. Some
Although recruiting international students and establishing academic collaborations are commonly considered international development at the case study university (see common points in Q 1.3), the partially shared points between Department 2 and the corporate reflect a more strategic stage of international development: "the trend is moving from a transnational stage (home stage) to an embedded stage (partnership stage)" (according to corporate interviewee no.4). The transactional trend, or the home stage, is highly consistent with the agency approach (see discussion of agency approach, Chapter 2, section 2.1.4); the embedded trend, or the partnership stage, is similar to the resource-based approach (see discussion of resource-based approach, Chapter 2, section 2.1.6). International development at the case study university mainly reflects the characteristics of the related themes in commercial internationalization (agency approach and resource-based approach). In addition, both the corporate and faculty realize that current international development at the case study university is behind other competitor institutions (see Corporate-Faculty partially shared points). The associated reason is that internationalization was not treated as a corporate priority. Recent history of international development involves the end of a 13-year successful overseas partnership, although other potential collaborations have come on board. There is no shared view on this issue between Department 2 and the faculty group.

Table 4.6 Primary data of international development (Q1.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1, Q-1.3</th>
<th>Common points</th>
<th>Partially shared points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| All Groups | • Direct international student recruitment  
             • Collaborations – partner recruitment | • The international development is reflected by a combination of different stages. The trend is moving from a transactional stage towards an embedded stage.  
             • Development of online distance learning |

172
Now the international policy is clear, but it was not clear before. In terms of international development, the university is far behind other universities. Lots of other partnerships come on board, such as Middle East and China.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department 2-Faculty</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Corporate-Faculty     | • Now the international policy is clear, but it was not clear before  
                       | • In terms of international development, the university is far behind other universities.  
                       | • Lots of other partnerships come on board, such as Middle East and China |
| Corporate            | • Department 2 is set up to coordinate different aspects of internationalization.  
                       | • Faculty C used to prioritize other areas, such as online delivery. Online distance learning is Faculty C’s main direction of international recruitment.  
                       | • The university’s major international partnership (Inter College, Israel) ended. |
| Department 2         | • Top-up degree at undergraduate level  
                       | • Curriculum internationalization at postgraduate level |
| Faculty              | • Working with industries  
                       | • We have good connection with European countries through ERASMUS programmes. |

**Evidence from secondary data (Q 1.3 International Development)**

There is no clear secondary evidence about international development in the case study university. The current partnerships were set up in 1996-2008 (according to Department 2’s website: overseas partnership, see Appendix 2). But collaboration is only part of international development; it does not present the full picture of HE internationalization. And the commencement date of each collaboration (1996-2008) cannot be used to interpret the whole development process because there is no clear information about how each collaboration progressed and why it ended.

**Evidence from other data (Q 1.3 International Development): No evidence.**

**Analysis and summary (Q 1.3 International Development)**

International development is part of corporate planning. It indicates the direction and scope for university activities. The partially shared points between the corporate and faculty show that both groups are aware of international competition. The answer to this
question is consistent with first two waves of Mazzarol, Soutar and Seng’s (2003) categorization of the development of HE internationalization into ‘three waves’ (see Chapter 2, section 2.6.2.2): ‘international student recruitment’ and ‘academic collaboration’, as interviewee no.1 (Corporate group) says:

"There are two likely routes – one is direct international student recruitment and, secondly, it is because we have an agreement with the university or college that they are studying at and so we bring a group of students."

--- Interviewee no.1 (Corporate group)

Currently, the case study university does not have an overseas campus, thus no answers can be compared with the ‘third wave’ literature. However, the case study university’s development is slightly different from Mazzarol, Soutar and Seng’s (2003) theory. As the partially shared points show, the university’s international development is reflected in a combination of different ways: for example, export, franchise, validation, credit transfer, articulation (see Q 3.1). These ways are adopted in two basic stages: home stage (‘transactional’) and partnership stage (‘embedded’), as interviewee no.4 (Corporate group) says:

"Internationalizations strategy is to move from our current model, which is very transactional, to a far more embedded model of internationalizations...We are in the developmental stage ...Where we have been quite transactional in terms of just trying to grow the number of ... international students, and we have done that without putting sufficient attention into the academic character of the university...We’re moving to a situation where we will be an embedded integrated university, but that is going to take a period."

--- Interviewee no.4 (Corporate group)

The international development in the case study university presents a trend of incremental involvement (from the home stage to the partnership stage) in terms of HE international initiatives. The home stage emphasizes recruiting international students to come over to the home campus. The partnership stage is seen as a formal academic collaboration which is more stable and reliable (for example, by securing the number of international students
recruited) than international recruitment from an individual agent. The above specific ways (such as export, franchise, validation, credit transfer, top up, articulation) are placed within the two stages (home stage and partnership stage). Export and credit transfer are under the home stage; the remaining ways (such as franchise, validation and articulation) are categorized into the partnership stage.

The case study university identifies its development by evaluating the reliability and partner involvement in internationalization. In other words, it depends on how strong the relationship is and how long it can last. Activities in the 'twinning programme' (Mazzarol, Soutar and Seng's 'three waves', 2003, see Chapter 2, section 2.6.2.2) present similar features of the partnership stage, in which the 'twinning programme' can be launched through franchise or top-up (advanced standing). International development of the case study university also reflects the characteristics of two international approaches: the agency approach (see Chapter 2, section 2.1.4) and resource-based approach (see Chapter 2, section 2.1.6). The agency theory is reflected in HE internationalization as 'student mobility' (see Chapter 2, section 2.6.1.1), and the resource-based approach is compatible with academic collaboration (see Chapter 2, section 2.6.1.4). The 'third wave' in Mazzarol, Soutar and Seng's (2003) theory is close to Maslen's (2009) view of overseas branch campus (see Chapter 2, section 2.6.1.3). It matches the feature of Dunning's (1988, 2000) OLI (ownership, location and internalization) international approach (see Chapter 2, section 2.1.3). However, the case study university does not have an overseas campus, thus there is not much detail addressing this stage.

In addition, the case study university's overall investment in internationalization is low for two reasons. One is that internationalization was not a corporate priority before; the other reason is that the case study university used to have a large partner in Israel (INT College), thus the income from Israeli students was guaranteed for the past 13 years. But recently, this partnership ended and the number of U.K. home students has been capped by the government, so less funding will be available in the coming three to five years. All
these factors force the university to look at international markets as an alternative income stream.

Q 1.4 The University of [X] has a department called [Department 2]. What is the purpose of [Department 2] as part of the organizational structure? What is [Department 2] expected to achieve?

Evidence from primary data (Q 1.4 Role of Department 2)

Q 1.4 investigates the role of Department 2 at the case study university. This question is both informative and analytical. Most answers match the nature of the question, although two interviewees also gave evaluative answers (see Appendix 18, table 4.7, role of Department 2). The summary of primary data is presented in table 4.8.

Primary data presents a clear picture in terms of the role of Department 2 in internationalization. Department 2’s responsibilities are commonly understood as international initiatives (including recruitment and partnership), internal coordination, student support, and the enhancement of online learning. Partially shared points highlight certain marketing functions of Department 2. Part of the faculty’s responsibilities, such as joint honours schemes and partnerships, also overlaps with Department 2’s role.

Table 4.8 Primary data of role of Department 2 (Q 1.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TI, Q-1.4</th>
<th>Common points</th>
<th>Partially shared points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| All Groups | • International student support  
• International collaboration  
• International Office / International Student Centre  
• Coordinate different aspects of internationalization  
• Online distance learning, support technology enhanced learning | • Joint honours schemes  
• International student recruitment  
• Admissions |
| Department 2-Corporate | • Administration (Israel, Africa, franchise, and online distance learning) |
### Chapter Four Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department 2-Faculty</th>
<th>• Marketing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate-Faculty</td>
<td>• Coordinate international initiatives across faculties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Group-specific points</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Corporate           | • Encourage curriculum internationalization  
|                     | • Support faculty and staff  
|                     | • Support and establish international partnerships |
| Department 2        | • Support the university in developing international strategy  
|                     | • Widely support the public (such as stakeholders: students, staff and partners) |
| Faculty             | • Arrangements (administrative arrangement and financial arrangement)  
|                     | • Assist with validation of programmes  
|                     | • Ensure quality process |

### Evidence from secondary data (Q 1.4 Role of Department 2)

There is no direct evidence to address Department 2’s responsibilities. However, there is an official statement (see Appendix 3) on the case study university’s website saying that ‘customer focus’ is one of the university’s five core values. That statement says that there are four key levels of customer focus: responding to customer needs, developing customer relationship, going the extra mile, and championing customer focus. Department 2 is directly dealing with student recruitment and collaboration. Thus both overseas students and partners are customers who are supposed to be the central focus of Department 2’s activities. But in the observed data, a potential partner (Si Academy, China) does not receive substantial attention from Department 2 (see observed evidence of Q 1.4 and Q 6.1).

### Evidence from other data (Q 1.4 Role of Department 2)

Through participant observation, the researcher was involved in the progression arrangement between the case study university and Si Academy, China. It shows a picture of weak customer focus which is opposite to secondary data (‘Core Value and Underpinning Behaviours’, see Appendix 3) and primary data (see analysis and summary Q 1.4 role of Department 2). There is a lack of efficient feedback and support from Department 2, especially Admissions. Although both secondary and primary data highlight the reasons why customer focus is vital for university and also show clearly
how to conduct it, front line implementation (and service) may not be as it is supposed to be.

Analysis and summary (Q 1.4 Role of Department 2)

Department 2 is a department with multiple functions. The main tasks include international recruitment, academic collaboration, student support, administration, online distance learning and technology support. Department 2 acts as a coordinator across four faculties, as interviewee no.18 (faculty group) says:

"From our point of view, the [Department 2] is there to facilitate faculties working with external partners... That's an area where [Department 2] administers and co-ordinates that kind of activity and supports the faculties in doing that, though obviously the faculties have the subject experts who go out and do that... [Department 2] provides the administrative support to that."

— Interviewee no.18 (Faculty group)

On the one hand, Department 2 coordinates and integrates international initiatives across four faculties; on the other hand, it carries out some marketing functions not only to promote programmes but also to react to the international market demand. Recently, the International Student Centre has been re-arranged under Department 2 in order to better support international students, especially new arrivals. The answer to the above question shows that every department knows the role of Department 2. Internationalization should go well; however, in reference to the S1 Academy, China, that was not the case. The early stage was quite smooth but later, after one key person's unexpected resignation, there was no one to follow up, and consequently there was lack of support for the S1 Academy, which highlights an operational issue. Implementation faces more fundamental challenges, for example, understanding, willingness, cooperation and culture. Feedback and monitoring mechanisms should improve in each department (Department 2, Admissions and International Office). Customer feedback should reach both a particular department (for example, Admissions) and the management of Department 2.
4.5.2 Theme 2: International recruitment strategies

Q 2.1 What is the university’s current recruitment strategy? (Examples include; using Education Fairs, Agents, Direct recruitment, Academic partners, Overseas offices and student recruitment directly conducted through faculty.)

Evidence from primary data (Q 2.1 International recruitment strategy)

Q 2.1 addresses the international recruitment strategy at the case study university. This is an informative question. Most interviewees gave their analytical views as well (see Appendix 18, table 4.9, international recruitment strategy). The summary of primary data is presented in table 4.10.

The main international recruitment strategies adopted by the case study university include recruitment through agents, academic partnerships, direct recruitment (online), and education fairs, some faculty academics are directly involved in student recruitment and partnership establishment. These recruitment strategies primarily reflect the application of the agency and resource-based approaches (see Chapter 2, section 2.1.4 and 2.1.6). The principles of the two international approaches are consistent with the development of HE internationalization. Agent recruitment leads to international student mobility (see Chapter 2, section 2.6.1.1). With the resource-based approach, both partners not only strengthen their own resources but also build up a dynamic capability that can be developed into competitive advantages. Faculty C highlights that currently they do not have a proper international strategy, but focus on seeking potential areas of internationalization within their faculty (see Corporate-specific point). [---] Story and CRM (customer relationship management) are introduced by the corporate as particular recruitment strategies in order to differentiate the [case study university] from other competitor institutions. Instead of numerous small collaborations, the university prefers ‘big partners’ and focuses on five key geographic regions.
**Table 4.10 Primary data of international recruitment strategy (Q 2.1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T2, Q-2.1</th>
<th>Common points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| All Groups | • Agents  
             • Academic partners / progression arrangement  
             • Academics, faculty staff participate in student recruitment  
             • Education fairs  
             • Direct recruitment (online) |
| Department 2-Corporate | • None |
| Department 2-Faculty | • None |
| Corporate-Faculty | • An undertaking scoping strategy will shortly indicate the direction of internationalization for Faculty C. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate</th>
<th>Group-specific points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • [---] Story  
• Persuade foreign governments to change policy  
• Focus on key geographic areas / markets rather than spread out across all.  
• Tri-apartheid arrangement working together with Department 2, faculty (Faculty A) and central marketing  
• Internal financial support – business planning and budget  
• Faculty C does not have recruitment strategy  
• In terms of partnership recruitment, the strategy focuses on a few big partnership rather than numerous small partners.  
• Develop links to different foreign markets |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department 2</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Recruitment through International Office  
• Use own staff who has specific knowledge of certain region  
• Public seminars |
| • Faculty C academics were rarely involved in international recruitment in the past.  
• Faculty dean is keen to develop international markets.  
• Certain faculty mostly develops internationalization on its own.  
• Recruitment strategy also supports the curriculum internationalization. |

**Evidence from secondary data (Q 2.1 International recruitment strategy):**

There is clear evidence of secondary data. According to the marketing strategy of the case study university (February, 2010), international recruitment includes ‘establishing collaborative partnerships’, ‘use of network of agents’, ‘use of exhibition attendance’, ‘web content – [---] story – CRM (customer relationship management)’, ‘providing target
media relations' and 'using alumni' (see central marketing strategy for international recruitment 2010, Appendix 4). In addition, five key recruitment markets are highlighted: China, Hong Kong / Macau, India, Kuwait / Middle East and Nigeria / Ghana (see Appendix 4).

Overseas partners play an important role in recruitment. For example, with the MBA programme, the number of student enrolled in 2008-2010 at the BA College, Botswana (existing partner of the case study university) is much greater than the number of students recruited for the same programme on the case study university's main campus (see Appendix 5).

Evidence from other data (Q 2.1 International recruitment strategy)
The researcher's own overseas study experience can be used as observed data. In 2003, the researcher graduated from [N] College, Malaysia (the previous partner of the case study university) with the case study university's qualification. After that, the researcher came to [---] for a Masters programme and PhD research. Thus, her own experience is an example of recruitment from partnership.

Analysis and summary (Q 2.1 International recruitment strategy)
International recruitment strategy is under the corporate job scope. The common points highlight five main recruitment strategies including agents, partners, faculty conducted recruitment, direct recruitment and education fairs (rarely used). In group-specific points, the corporate group mentions that the university prefers 'big partners' and focuses on 'key geographic markets':

"I think it is a big thing to get one underway and operating, and it is even bigger if it can work through for a number of years. But it emphasizes the importance of having just a few where one puts in a lot of energy, instead of trying to have a large number which was counter productive."

--- Interviewee no.2 (Corporate group)
"We have also identified key geographic areas that we intend to concentrate on and ruled out some we do not feel it is worth pursuing ... so that sort of geographic area ... we will restrict ourselves to that, rather than spread out across. So we have got some geographic boundaries as well."

--- Interviewee no.5 (Corporate group)

A corporate interviewee realizes the importance of integration; for example, the 'tri-apartheid' arrangement among Department 2, faculties and central marketing, as interviewee no.5 (corporate group) says:

"we work very closely with the International Student Centre, the International Office at the university and we all work towards the same international strategy so ... and the central marketing department as well, so we have a tri-apartheid arrangement within International Office, the faculty and marketing department and we all agree what we want to do and then we all put resources into doing it."

--- Interviewee no.5 (Corporate group)

However, the above interviewee's (no.5) answer does not fully address international circumstance at the faculty or Department 2 level. This answer is not consistent with other primary data collected from interviewees from faculty and Department 2. Instead of the 'tri-apartheid' arrangement, at the faculty level, there is a strong resistance in cooperation in terms of HE internationalization (pointed out by Department 2 interviewees; as discussed later, see Q 6.1). The faculty interviewees state that the internal support from Department 2 for both students and staff is not as strong as it supposed to be (see Q 6.1). The integration of international initiatives among the three key departments (Corporate, Department 2 and Faculty) is not as smooth as the above corporate interviewee (no.5) states.

In terms of job responsibility, the corporate identifies strategies (such as strategy of internationalization); Department 2 coordinates the strategies (for example, through
International Office and faculty), and, finally, the faculty group implements the strategies. The answers to this question show a smooth movement from the corporate level to the operational level, which is consistent with the relationship between business strategy and operation performance. When examining business strategy as a context in operational strategy, both functional and business are assumed to exist that lead to a better performance when there is a fit between them (Matsuno and Mentzer, 2000; Slater and Olson, 2000; Olson, Slater, Tomas and Hult, 2005). In addition, the international development within each faculty is different. In some faculties, the academics have been formally involved in international recruitment, while other faculties are conducting an internal scope research to find out where they should invest in internationalization and how to do it, as interviewee no.6 (Corporate group) says:

“No. (Faculty involved in international recruitment?) I would say that [Faculty C] has done very little. It does not have a recruitment strategy and it (recruitment) has not done much in terms of education fairs. We have done a little bit with agents around education and psychology, and that is about it. We are towards the end, of a scoping strategy for [Faculty C], that is looking at all of this sort of thing, and by the end of July (2010) will deliver some recommendations on what our strategy should be, in what countries, what routes to market, do we want to use fairs, do we want to use agents. So by the start of next academic year (2011) we will have a much clearer strategy. We do not have one (international recruitment strategy) at the moment.”

--- Interviewee no.6 (Corporate group)

In respect to literature, recruitment strategies are compatible with two approaches of international strategy: agency approach (see discussion of agency approach, Chapter 2, section 2.1.4) and resource-based approach (see discussion of resource-based approach, Chapter 2, section 2.1.6). The above strategies also indicate two forms of HE internationalization: student mobility (see discussion of student mobility, Chapter 2, section 2.6.1.1) and academic partnership (see discussion of academic collaboration, Chapter 2, section 2.6.1.4).
The agency approach (Carney and Gedajlovic, 1991) is based on the principle of a contract where principals delegate work and part of their authority to agents. The feature of agency approach is information transfer. Although it is from business background, this theory is also applicable to education. In HE internationalization, universities release recruiting information and delegate overseas education agents to recruit students on their behalf. Overseas agents deal directly with local enquiries and recruitment. Through agents, students do not directly contact their potential universities but instead agree that agents should apply for them. Information is transferred by email, phone, fax, mail. Agent recruitment leads to international student mobility. In respect to the mode of entry, instead of exporting the programmes, universities actually 'import' students.

The resource-based approach is to develop a dynamic capabilities / resource. This theory views the organization as the source of competitive advantage (Barney, 1991). A firm competes well in a setting in which there is fit between the firm resources and external opportunities (Ekeledo and Sivakumar, 2004). Through collaboration, both institutions not only strengthen their own resource but also develop a dynamic capability that will become competitive advantage for both of them. For example, firstly collaboration is only possible when resource in each side is compatible. This resource includes similar programmes, syllabus, language, assessment and qualifications. Secondly, the developed new resource creates mutual benefit. A further education (FE) institution (the overseas partners) gains competitive advantage by linking itself with a U.K. university (higher education) that will increase the FE institution’s local enrollment. On the other hand, the U.K. university can enter overseas markets and increase its international profile and reputation. This can enhance its direct recruitment.

[---] Story is a special recruitment strategy to differentiate the case study university from its competitors by efficient CRM (customer relationship management). The differentiation strategy provides products or services that offer benefits different from those of competitors and that are widely valued by buyers (Sharp and Dawes, 2001). The aim is to achieve competitive advantage by offering better products or services at the
same price or enhancing margins by pricing slightly higher. The differentiated products and service are the case study university’s unique programmes (such as Spa Management, Outdoor Activities, Hospitality and Travel Management) and efficient student support (customer service). As interviewee no.3 (Corporate group) says:

"We’re not at the top of the league table ... but we are very good at individual teaching and supporting (students) ... It ([---] Story) is a very personal approach to selling the university...”

--- Interviewee no.3 (Corporate group)

"...what we’re moving towards is looking at agents as partners more, and this is really the CRM (customer relationship management) as well, in the sense that ... we should train agents, and have a dialogue with them, all of these have got different levels within them in a way...”

--- Interviewee no.10 (Department 2 group)

However, whether the [---] Story really works efficiently is questioned (by the researcher). The corporate may think that it should work as such, but in the front line of recruitment (for example, Admissions), things may not work as they are supposed to (see Q 6.1 evidence of observed data). Furthermore, other research findings show that student support in the case study university is not efficient, but is a problem. Faculties suggest that the International Student Centre should work closely with faculties to provide better student service (as discussed later, see Q 6.1, issue of student support).

Q 2.2 Faced by the competitive pressure, has the university adopted some special or different recruitment arrangement? If yes, what are they? (Examples might include; ‘3+1’/‘2+2”, Top-up programmes, Credit transfer and language programmes.)

Evidence from primary data (Q 2.2 Special recruitment arrangement)

Q 2.2 discusses whether the case study university employs a special recruitment strategy during internationalization and how these special arrangements are conducted. This
question is labelled as informative, analytical and evaluative (see Appendix 18, table 4.11, special recruitment arrangement). Answers present various recruitment arrangements with different examples (see Appendix 2), such as BA College, Botswana (see Appendix 5) and the case of S1 Academy, China (see Appendix 6). The summary of primary data is presented in table 4.12.

In respect to academic collaboration, articulation and top up arrangements (such as ‘3+1’ or ‘2+2’) are considered as common special arrangement. In early stages of a partnership, informal progression arrangement (strategic alliance) can be adopted in order to assess the students’ work and the capability of potential partners. The level of cooperation falls within a broad range of parameters from informal swapping of resource or knowledge (through alliance and progression arrangement) to more formal agreements (such as franchise and validation). The university automatically allows formal partners’ students to articulate or top up its own programmes (for example, allowing ACCA or CIMA holders to top up to MBA). For individual applications, there is no automatic recognition. Students need to go through an evaluation procedure, where their previous qualifications, study credits, works and English language must be accredited by the home university. Special recruitment arrangements may vary in different regions (such as China and Middle East). Department 2 considers the study centre as a potential area for further HE international development.

Table 4.12 Primary data of special recruitment arrangement (Q 2.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T2, Q-2.2</th>
<th>Common points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| All Groups | • Articulation or top-up arrangement (for example, 1+3 or 3+1)  
• Establishing progression arrangements with partners |
| Partially shared points |
| Department 2-Corporate | • Top-up degree can adopt online delivery |
| Department 2-Faculty | • Creating progression arrangement with partners  
• Focus on five key areas (India, China, Middle East, and Nigeria/Ghana)  
• International Office creates International Foundation Programme (IFP) to support English language study. |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate-Faculty</th>
<th>• Informal partnership and individual interview procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>• Balance of international activities between faculty and Department 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Department 2      | • In China, changes from direct recruitment to partner recruitment and progression arrangement, using ‘feeder partners’.  
|                   | • Chinese partners may seek permission for extra quota of student recruitment numbers from government  
|                   | • Study centre is a potential direction  
|                   | • Grow existing partnerships and extend the offer extent  
|                   | • Encourage partners to offer programmes that are more than one faculty can be involved. |
| Faculty           | • Contract arrangement is involved in student recruitment in nursing subjects.  
|                   | • University makes sure students get good experience and support. |

**Evidence from secondary data (Q 2.2 Special recruitment arrangement)**

Secondary data is available from Department 2’s official website – overseas partnership (see Appendix 2). The partners of top-up / advanced standing arrangement examples include IHTTI School, Swiss and SHM School, Switzerland.

**Evidence from other data (Q 2.2 Special recruitment arrangement)**

The evidence of individual interview is consistent with observed data. Two students from Si Academy, China applied for top-up undergraduate degree in 3D animation through individual interview procedure in Faculty B. The interview arrangement and procedure indicate that individual interview is a special recruitment arrangement for top-up (advanced standing) acceptance of individual case (more observed data is available in Appendix 6).

**Analysis and summary (Q 2.2 Special recruitment arrangement)**

Department 2 group deals directly with special recruitment arrangements. The responsibility of Department 2 is to integrate internationalization across different faculties. Department 2 acts as a coordinator to link market demand (partners / students’
request) with the university. Top-up (advanced standing) and progression arrangements are common methods. Interviewee no.14 (Department 2 group) gives some examples:

"We have an agreement with a college in [---] in Spain where the students study... The students come on to our top-up year. So they do one of our undergraduate business degrees, top-up, and they do three years in their local country... that gives them progression on to our top-up, and again another example is in Africa, in Botswana. Students do the top-up MBA, so they do not do the whole MBA. So they come on with their ACCA or CIMA accounting qualification, and then they just have to do four modules and a dissertation, to top up their ACCA or CIMA to an MBA."

--- Interviewee no.14 (Department 2 group)

"For example, institutions from Saudi Arabia or Turkey saying ... we can provide you with 20, 30, 40 students. We're saying ok, in the first iteration we will use you as an agent. Give us those 20 or 30 students and let us see how it goes ... the students are coming in with advanced standing ... we will test out the quality of the students ... it also gives us the opportunity from a business perspective to see can they deliver the numbers? And have progression agreements to begin with, see if the progression agreement works for you, for me, and for the students... If it works, let us move to the next stage of the partnership. Let us maybe look at articulation."

--- Interviewee no.4 (Corporate group)

"... there's tertiary education up to 18 and we are looking to do top up qualifications with them (D.C College, China)... we have an informal arrangement with the areas like fashion, potentially animations. We have interviewed two students who are coming over from that institution this year to come into our fashion programme and they come in the first year because the level at which they are operating is the same level as an art and design foundation course in the United Kingdom... we are obviously looking to develop informal links like that, it is informal partnerships."

--- Interviewee no.7 (Corporate group)

According to corporate interviewee no.7, in the Faculty B, currently, most international collaborations are through informal progression arrangement and individual interview. Corporate interviewee no.4 points out a similar view that the informal progression arrangements are normally adopted at the early stage of partnership development. It can be used to test the capabilities of potential partners and quality of the students. Both
informal arrangement and progression partnership are presented as strategic alliances that are agreements between two or more organizations to cooperate with each other. The degree of alliance (cooperation) falls within a broad range of parameters from informal swapping of resource or knowledge to more formal agreements (Yoshino and Rangan, 1995). If the relationship is sustainable, the informal arrangement (for example, alliance) can be updated to formal arrangement (such as franchise and articulation).

Interviewees state that there is no international benchmark or standard in terms of automatic and full qualification recognition (due to differences in national education systems and curriculums, see discussion of recognition of foreign qualifications, Chapter 2, section 2.7.4). Research findings show that the case study university automatically recognizes only its partners' qualifications and allows students to top-up to its qualification. The formal automatic qualification recognition is based on mutual long-term partnership and trust. Current partnerships include the BA College, Botswana; IHTTI School, Switzerland; and SHM School, Switzerland. For other individual applications, the procedure is to recognize the student's previous qualification through an interview where students are required to present their skills, knowledge and works. Faculty evaluates the applicant's work, credits and study period. When the progression arrangement with new partners moves to a mature and stable stage, it can be updated to a formal partnership (such as articulation, validation and franchise) where the partners' qualifications will be automatically recognized by the case study university.

Observed evidence (for example, individual interview procedure) is consistent with the partially shared points between the corporate and faculty. Different markets adopt different recruitment strategies; for instance, in China, recruitment emphasises partnership and some partners need to get permission of extra quota from the government in order to recruit more collaborative students, while in the Middle East and Nigeria, agent recruitment is the main strategy. A Department 2 interviewee (no.11) mentions that the study centre is a potential direction where numerous individual students could be gathered. Lecturers in the university can teach them intensively through internet (for
example, by Wimba classroom or video conference). A local study centre can act as a facilitator or coordinator to assist those students in accessing study resource as much as possible.

"It might be useful to use partners or people who offer themselves to be partners as study centres, because... if there is enough people in an area, you can have a study centre, and that study centre can take different forms. It could just be literally physical resource like computers or it could be what we call a study centers... physically or online but quite often physically. Bahrain was one that we came across, but then they say well instead of going to the United Kingdom, we will do the online version. But if they all do it together, then their institution could be a study centre. So that is worth a conversation."

--- Interviewee no.11 (Department 2 group)

Currently, the case study university has not got a study centre yet, but it can be a potential area for further international development. It shows that the university (especially Department 2) 'listens' to the market, negotiates and also modifies its products (programmes) in order to better fit market demands.

4.5.3 Theme 3A: International Academic Collaboration

Q 3.1 Could you please give examples of different ways the University uses to collaborate with overseas partners? Examples might include

- Franchise programmes
- Alliance with partners (such as '3+1' top-up programmes or '1+3' international foundation programmes)
- Online programmes
- Hybrid programmes (online + teaching abroad)
- Joint venture to form new institutions / organizations
- Acquire foreign institutions
- Joint research / international conference
- Exchange students / staff
- Credit transfer
Evidence from primary data (Q 3.1 Academic Collaboration)

Q 3.1 addresses the different ways of international academic collaboration and entry strategy adopted by the case study university. This is an informative question, although most interviewees also gave their analytical opinions (see Appendix 18, table 4.13, academic collaboration). The summary of primary data is presented in table 4.14.

This question investigates how the case study university establishes international academic collaborations and enters foreign markets. The associated modes of entry are categorised into two main groups: the business-based entry strategy (export, franchise and alliance), and education-based entry strategy (articulation, validation, credit transfer, top up and E-learning). The business-based entry strategies are derived form commercial internationalization (see discussion of the mode of entry, Chapter 2, section 2.2) and are applicable to and compatible with HE internationalization; the education-based entry strategy are education-specific entry modes, bespoke for institutions’ international market expansion.

Table 4.14 Primary data of academic collaboration (Q 3.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T3A, Q-3.1</th>
<th>Common points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Groups</td>
<td>• Franchise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Top up (advanced standing, such as '3+1' and '2+2')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Articulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Validation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accreditation / Credit transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No joint venture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department 2-Corporate</td>
<td>• Hybrid arrangement (teaching abroad + online)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Online distance learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The university is not at the stage of joint research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department 2-Faculty</td>
<td>• None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate-Faculty</td>
<td>• Alliance with partners (progression arrangement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Student exchange – SOCRATES programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Advanced standing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group-specific points
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| Corporate | • No formal staff exchange  
|           | • Faculty D’s collaborations are in China, Japan and Swiss |
| Department 2 | • Israel used to be the biggest partnership but due to the change of policy, this partnership ended in October 2010.  
|           | • W.E Council, Malaysia is a new partner  
|           | • MM. Institute, Malawi is a growing area. It moves from the block section (‘flying faculty’) into a franchise relationship where MM. Institute, Malawi teaches the case study university’s programmes themselves.  
|           | • The new partnership with M.E College, Greece is across faculties (Faculties A and B); the programmes will be delivered in Greek. |
| Faculty | • Faculty C used to adopt agent recruitment, but relationship ends due to high cost. |

Evidence from secondary data (Q 3.1 Academic Collaboration)
Secondary data is available from the Department 2 website (see Appendix 2) and QED Collaboration Handbook 4 (Definition of Collaborative Provision, section A17, p. 10-11; see Appendix 7). There are the total of seven formal overseas collaborations including franchise, validation, advanced standing, top-up, credit transfer and online.

Evidence from other data (Q 3.1 Academic Collaboration)
The researcher’s own overseas study experience can be used as observed evidence. The researcher completed a three-year undergraduate course (BSc in Business Information System) in [N] College, Malaysia (previous partner of the case study university). The first two years were [X] College’s own programmes; the final year syllabus belonged to the case study university. The case study university evaluates and validates [N] College’s first two years of programmes as equivalent to its own syllabus and allows the students to top-up to a degree qualification. All [N] College’s successful graduates were awarded the case study university’s degree qualifications.

Analysis and summary (Q 3.1 Academic Collaboration)
Establishing collaboration is one of the key tasks for Department 2. Department 2 feeds back university market demands, negotiates particular collaboration methods with potential partners, coordinates with faculty academics and finally delivers the
arrangement (for example, contracts or agreements). Normally, the corporate group is not directly involved in collaboration. Their job is to approve or reject the collaboration arrangement proposed by Department 2, because they look at the corporate-level strategy and collaboration is a task for the business-level strategy. Department 2 is a particular business unit to deal with it. There is not much for the faculties (the operational level) to do at this stage. Some interviewees state that Department 2 deals with collaboration arrangements, and then the collaboration is approved. The consequent tasks move to faculties; these tasks include programme delivery, assessment, moderation, syllabus and teaching materials. That explains the reasons why Department 2 has more group-specific points than the other two groups.

The ways of collaboration are consistent with the external university-oriented resources (see discussion of resource-based approach, Chapter 2, section 2.1.6) that can be reflected in different modes of entry, including franchise (for example, the BA College, Botswana and the MM. Institute, Malawi), validation (for example, the VAD School, Greece and the W.E Council, Malaysia), articulation / top-up / credit transfer (for example, the SHM School, Switzerland) and online distance learning.

From a business point of view, this process is a market expansion activity. In other words, how does the case study university enter a foreign market; and through which mode of entry? Answering this question leads the researcher to look at the existing literature of the mode of entry (see discussion of mode of entry, Chapter 2, section 2.2). From the business and manufacturing background, Hollensen (2004) classifies ten existing modes of entry into three mode groups (see discussion of mode of entry, section 2.2, Chapter 2). Here the researcher uses theories of commercial internationalization to explain HE internationalization; however, not every mode of entry is applicable to HE internationalization because some theories (for example, licensing, contract manufacturing, acquisition, management contracting) are constructed based on goods manufacturing or commercial business. Education broadly belongs to the service industry. In a comprehensive examination of the services marketing literature, Zeithaml,
Parasuraman and Berry (1985) identified four primary characteristics of services: intangibility, inseparability of production and consumption, heterogeneity and perishability. All of these characteristics can be reflected in education.  

Besides the feature of educational service, other issues of resource, controlling and maintaining (such as foreign governmental policy) are bound to influence the mode of entry. Primary data show that only few existing business modes of entry - franchise and alliance - are compatible with HE internationalization. The rest of the modes of entry are particular for education, as education-based modes including validation, top-up (advanced standing), accreditation / credit transfer, and online distance learning. At the case study university, the eliminated modes of entry are joint venture, acquisition and greenfield (foreign direct investment, or FDI). But other universities may adopt them; for example, the University of Nottingham (United Kingdom) and the Curtin University of Technology (Australia) have adopted greenfield as one of their market entry strategies and have established their overseas campuses in Malaysia and China.

Both the business-based mode and education-based mode belong to the partnership stage rather than the home stage (see Q 1.3). The modes in the partnership stage require higher involvement and responsibilities from partners; for instance, partners are often involved in teaching, assessments, supervision and facilitation. Unlike the overseas branch campus, the main characteristics of the partnership stage is academic collaboration, which is described as a very "21st century thing": "David Pilsbury, chief executive of the

---

34 Intangibility - educational service are described as 'idiosyncratic' (Erramilli and Rao, 1993), characterized by unusually high levels of professional skills, specialized knowledge and customization in the delivery of instruction. Inseparability - the principal outcome of this aspect of services is the need to involve the customer in the production of the service (Booms and Nyquist, 1981). This is particularly the case with education, where student participation in their learning process is a critical factor in determining success (Shuell and Lee, 1976). Heterogeneity - the heterogeneity of services poses significant problems in the area of quality control and standardization (Booms and Bitner, 1981; Berry, 1984). Quality management within education is a major focus of attention for countries such as Australia, France, United Kingdom (QAA, 2009) and USA (Baldwin, 1991; Marceau, 1993; Harman, 1994; Lindsay, 1994; Edmond, 1995). Perishability - Perishability of services means that education cannot be placed into inventory and thereby creating the problem of under or over supply (Sasser, 1976).
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Worldwide University Network states that setting up an offshoot abroad is risky. It is also a very 20th century thing to do. 'The 21st century is about relationship,' he says, 'It is about partnerships, if you look at the commercial world, there is no doubt that relationship-building and partnerships are the way forward, where people are combining their experience to create something that really does enhance their brand'” (Hodges, 2007, n.p). Comparing answers to Q 3.1 and literature on the mode of entry, only franchise (see discussion of franchise, Chapter 2, section 2.2.2.6) and articulation (see discussion of academic collaboration, Chapter 2, section 2.6.1.4) are mentioned in the existing literature. Furthermore, the existing literature offers somewhat unstructured stances on academic collaboration, which are not systematically addressed as the market mode of entry for HE internationalization. There is no literature on the mode of entry that is particularly designed for institutions to enter foreign markets. Therefore, a literature gap has emerged. The findings from this question not only present a more comprehensive picture of how a university enters foreign markets through different modes of entry, but also potentially update current literature on the subject.

Q 3.2 Why does the University of [X] adopt these collaborative methods?

Evidence from primary data (Q 3.2 Reasons of adopting particular collaboration)

Q 3.2 investigates the reasons why the case study university adopts particular collaborations during internationalization. This is an analytical question; some interviewees also evaluate the different choices for collaboration (see Appendix 18, table 4.15, reasons of adopting particular collaboration). The summary of primary data is presented in table 4.16.

The partner's educational ethos fitting the home university’s ethos is commonly shared as a main reason why the case study university adopts particular collaborative ways of internationalization. Risks, opportunities and cost are also considered (see partially shared points between Department 2 and Corporate). Resource compatibility and
complementarities are seen as the basis for the reasons why the university adopts different collaborative methods. The more similar shared resources (such as curriculum, staff, facilities, assessment, quality standard), the more likely a favourable outcome. Resource complementarity emphasises reciprocal strengths, or a ‘fit’ between partners identified as a premise for successful consortia. In addition, foreign governments’ policy and local students’ preferences also impact the choice of collaboration (see Faculty-specific points).

Table 4.16 Primary data of reasons of adopting particular collaboration (Q 3.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T3A, Q-3.2</th>
<th>Common points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Groups</td>
<td>• The partner’s educational ethos fits the university’s ethos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accountability, management and resource can be correspondent with a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>particular kind of collaboration, also the partner’s preference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department 2-Corporate</td>
<td>• Minimize the risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maximum the opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Business concerns (business model and costing model must be financially viable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department 2-Faculty</td>
<td>• Resources (staff and capital)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Collaboration is initially set up through personal contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate-Faculty</td>
<td>• None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group-specific points

| Corporate | • The university prefers big partnerships and does not want to spread itself too thin. |
| Department 2 | • Quality assurance concern – QAA and University of [X]’s own version of quality assurance (such as QED: Handbook 4) |
|            | • Level of management and control                                           |
| Faculty   | • Foreign government regulations (30% delivered by U.K. lecturers)           |
|           | • With VAD School, Greece, validation is more advanced than others (such as franchise) in terms of allowing programmes to be developed locally. |
|           | • Local students prefer U.K. qualifications                                  |

Evidence from secondary data (Q 3.2 Reasons of adopting particular collaboration)
No evidence.
Evidence from other data (Q 3.2 Reasons of adopting particular collaboration)
No evidence.

Analysis and summary (Q 3.2 Reasons of adopting particular collaboration)
The common point is that the partner’s educational ethos has to fit the case study university’s ethos. The accountability (such as risk, opportunity, and quality assurance), management (responsibility) and resources (staff and capital) must be compatible with a particular kind of collaboration, as interviewee no.8 (Corporate group) says:

"...as a partner of the university ... that their educational ethos fits with the university’s ethos, that they have appropriate lines of accountability and management and overall resources to be able to cope with that sort of collaboration."

--- Interviewee no.8 (Corporate group)

Other reasons for choosing particular collaborative ways include foreign government policy and local students’ preferences. As an external factor, foreign government policy can impact on HE internationalization. It can ‘float’ the boat immediately as well as ‘sink’ it suddenly. For instance, the Ministry of Education of Malaysia (2001) enhanced international collaboration in order to enable Malaysian institutions to attract more international students. Singapore intends to become an international education hub by encouraging the world’s top ten universities to establish branch campuses over there. But other countries, such as China, Japan and South Korea do not open their gates of education widely. Another example is the Israeli government. It used to officially welcome and promote foreign universities (mostly U.K. universities) to establish their presence in Israel. But in 2010, Israeli government imposed a strict policy and regulations on foreign university activities, and began to control HE qualifications centrally. If a student graduates in Israel, it must be from an Israeli institution, and the government will not recognize any foreign qualification gained within Israel. This policy keeps all the foreign universities out of Israel, as interviewee no.1 and interviewee no.2 state:
“...the Israelis have decided that if you take a degree in Israel, it must be with an Israeli organization. So you can do a degree abroad and it is recognized but if you do the degree in Israel, it must be an Israeli organization...It is affecting everybody, it is not directed at us. And so that change in the law meant that our partner had to get degree awarding powers and they have...so they will deliver their own degrees...it is meant that we have had to withdraw from that partnership because they need to deliver their own programmes.”

--- Interviewee no.1 (Corporate group)

“In Israel ... the government has taken the view that it can provide all the education that it requires through its own universities, and so they have now placed a major obstacle on any students who graduate from foreign universities in Israel, and that means that it is impossible to continue there.”

--- Interviewee no.2 (Corporate group)

Local students’ preferences also reflect the market demand for U.K. qualifications. This is because of the historic reputation of UK university qualifications around the world. Other reasons, like the short length of study (for example, on average a Masters programme only takes one year in the United Kingdom), are also an attractive point.

Department 2 is primarily responsible for designing particular collaborations. In terms of choosing particular ways, the corporate group is more involved than the faculty group because the corporate has to evaluate whether related resource (for example, investment, budget and capitals) can be allocated efficiently or whether the university can manage potential risks. Risk assessment is reflected in the validation approval procedure (see Q 3.4). The senior management in Department 2 and the corporate deal directly with collaborative validation. The faculty group is only involved in the implementation of approved collaborations. In other words, more tasks will be handed to the faculties after the collaboration is approved. The main tasks include operational activities, such as how to implement the collaboration; who is responsible for programmes delivery; how to deliver it; who will access and moderate it (partner institutions or the case study university); preparation of teaching materials; and whether to revise or re-validate current syllabus.
Resource is an important factor (see partially shared points of Department 2-Faculty). In the resource-based view (RBV, Wernerfelt, 1984; and Barney, 1991; also known as the 'resource-based approach'), organizations are seen as bundles of resources. In the 1980s, RBV (see discussion of resource-based approach, Chapter 2, section 2.1.6) introduced an alternative perspective on strategic management whereby emphasis was placed on analyzing a firm's opportunities and threats in a competitive environment (Caves and Porter, 1977; Porter, 1985 and 1990). RBV claims that the rationale for alliances is the value-creation potential of firm resources that are pooled together (Das and Teng, 2000). The resource-based principle can also be traced in this case study. And this principle can be reflected in resource complementary and resource compatibilities.

Resource complementary emphasizes reciprocal strengths and complementary resources, or a 'fit' between partners as a premise for a successful collaboration. According to Beerkens and Derwende (2007), the key implication of RBV is that universities will search for partners to bring about some sort of fit or synergy between their resources and those of their targeted partners. The study states that the resources of a university that are interesting to international partners can be diverse, ranging from physical resources like research facilities or library collections, number of students, to educational resources, such as specific programmes or teaching methods, human resources, or more symbolic organizational resources like reputation and prestige. Although these are not traded on factor markets, they can be accessed through engaging in a cooperative arrangement (for example, collaboration).

The notion of resource compatibility is that the more compatible academic partners, the more successful the collaboration. That is related to Evans's (1963) 'similarity hypothesis': the more similar the parties, the more likely a favorable outcome. Thus if both partners offer similar programmes with compatible syllabi, the more possible it is to collaborate. Potential ways can be franchise, articulation, top-up, validation and credit transfer.
RBV propagates an economic rational perspective on organizational behaviour (Beerkens and Derwende, 2007). In other words, resources are not random. There must be certain rationales to enhance the resources synergized. The answer to Q 3.2 reflects the underlying economic rationale for collaboration as a ‘business concern’, ‘business model’ and ‘costing model’ (see Q 3.2, partially shared points of Department 2-Corporate). The economic rationale is consistent with Knight’s (1997) framework for understanding different rationales in HE internationalization (see discussion of rationales of HE internationalization, Chapter 1, section 1.0).

Q 3.3 What is the role of overseas partners? It might be as a facilitator, recruiter, local marketer, course deliverer, local administrator/coordinator or a ‘mixed’ role?

Evidence from primary data (Q 3.3 Roles of partners)
Q 3.3 discusses the roles of partners during an academic collaboration. This is an informative question (see Appendix 18, table 4.17, roles of partners). Due to the job scope and responsibilities, not every interviewee answered this question; however, available answers do show a highly consistent agreement: partners play a mixed role that primarily depends on the type of collaboration adopted. The summary of primary data is presented in table 4.18.

Table 4.18 Primary data of roles of partners (Q 3.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T3A, Q-3.3</th>
<th>Common points</th>
<th>Partially shared points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Groups</td>
<td>• Recruiters</td>
<td>• None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Course deliverers</td>
<td>• Local marketers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A mixed role</td>
<td>• Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department 2-Corporate</td>
<td>• None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department 2-Faculty</td>
<td>• Local marketers</td>
<td>• None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate-Faculty</td>
<td>• None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evidence from secondary data (Q 3.3 Roles of partners): No evidence.

Evidence from other data (Q 3.3 Roles of partners): No evidence.

Analysis and summary (Q 3.3 Roles of partners)

The roles of the partner (recruiter and/or course deliverer) depend highly on the type of collaboration, as interviewee no. 5 says:

"It depends on the type of partnership we have with them (partners). In some instances, ... like D.C College (the case study university's Chinese partner); they purely 'feed' students to us. In some other instances it is much more of a joint activity, so we teach things together, so we have a partnership in Spain where the students do two years of the Spanish degree, one year here and they get a Joint University of [X] and [---] qualification."

--- Interviewee no. 5 (Corporate group)

If the collaboration is built on a home basis, the role of the partner is more of a recruiter. 'Feeder' partnerships (for example, D.C College and G College, China) are typical examples. If the collaboration is constructed on a partnership basis, the role of the partner usually involves teaching (programme delivery). Sometimes, different roles overlap because some partners are responsible for both teaching and recruiting.

A total of four out of nine interviewees from the corporate group answer this question; four out of the six respondents from Department 2 group replied; and one out of the five faculty interviewees was involved. The total number of respondents to this question is nine out of 20. Why did nearly half of the interviewees not address this question? There are two possible reasons. Firstly, besides Department 2, this question is beyond the job scope of the corporate and faculty groups. It is too 'detailed' for the corporate to look at,
nor is it the stage where the faculty should engage. It is purely Department 2's task. Secondly, due to the time limit and job responsibility, not every interviewee was able to answer this question. But the current answer does show a high consistency with common points. Thus the researcher believes that the answer is still accountable.

Q 3.4 How should the associated responsibilities between the University of [X] and overseas partners be arranged? And how should the related resources (staff and financial), involvement, risk and return be managed by both sides?

Evidence from primary data (Q 3.4 Responsibility, risk assessment and involvement)
Q 3.4 discusses the responsibility, risk assessment and involvement of academic collaboration for both the case study university and foreign partners. This is an analytical question; several interviewees gave evaluative responses as well (see Appendix 18, table 4.19, responsibility, risk assessment and involvement). The summary of primary data is presented in table 4.20.

Primary data shows a clear picture in terms of responsibilities, involvement and risk assessment between the case study university and overseas partners. The responsibility and involvement are arranged through a development approval document, such as a contract and operational manual (see Appendix 8). Once an agreement has been reached, more responsibilities are moving down to faculties for implementation. Partner institutions and related programme delivery methods must go through a risk assessment procedure before a partnership is formally launched. Department 2 is more concerned with the risk regarding return on investment (ROI) within a business model, which requires a minimum payment or a minimum number of students provided by the partner in order to sustain a collaboration. This concern is partially corresponding to the feature of transactional cost analysis (TCA, see discussion of TCA approach, Chapter 2, section 2.1.2). Both the corporate and Department 2 realize that a more hands-on way is more expensive; on the other hand, a more hands-off way is riskier. Although answers present a well defined role in terms of responsibilities, involvement and risk assessment during
internationalization, some underlying issues still exist, especially in operation (see discussion of implementation issues of HE internationalization, Q 6.1).

Table 4.20 Primary data of responsibility, risk assessment and involvement (Q 3.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T3A, Q-3.4</th>
<th>Common points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Groups</td>
<td>• Responsibility is arranged through a development approval document, contract and operated model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Two stages of validation: (i) risk assessment of the partner; (ii) risk assessment of the programme delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The operational manual indicates particular details in terms of who is responsible for certain things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Site visits, annual monitoring reports, spot check, CVs checking and staff re-approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic standards of service provision is always the ultimate responsibility of the case study university.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partially shared points</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department 2-Corporate</td>
<td>• Department 2 and International Office are responsible for setting up agreements (agent / partners).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Return on investment (ROI) is based on the business model / costing model, and charges will be against income.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A minimum payment or a minimum number of student is set to ensure that the business model is sustainable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• More hands-on way, more expensive; more hands-off way, higher risk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Department 2-Faculty         | • Once an agreement has been signed (proved), more responsibilities are moving down to faculties for implementation. |

| Corporate-Faculty            | • None                                                                                           |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group-specific points</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>• Partners are responsible for recruitment and programme delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The university assures the quality through relevant procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Mutual financial arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The university always makes the final decision for admissions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Department 2                  | • The university has to balance the hands-on way and hands-off way and also grow partners' confidence. |
|            | • Certain aspects are fixed (such as the authorization of students' grades) and other aspects are flexible (such as teaching methods and technology). |

| Faculty                      | • Faculty C’s strategy includes two parts: (i) understanding the current situation; (ii) scoping strategic direction and setting development priorities. |
|            | • The deans are responsible for the business plan and deciding developmental priorities.             |
|            | • Faculty liaises with other departments (such as central marketing and}
Evidence from secondary data (Q 3.4 Responsibility, risk assessment and involvement): secondary evidence is available from QED Handbook 3: ‘Validation and Approval of Taught Programmes’ (section 2, Risk associated with programme development, p. 18; and section 3: Managing Risks, B12, p. 20, see Appendix 8). More secondary evidence is derived from the operational manual (Section 3: Responsibilities, p. 45-56, see Appendix 8).

Evidence from other data (Q 3.4 Responsibility, risk assessment and involvement): No evidence.

Analysis and summary (Q 3.4 Responsibility, risk assessment and involvement)
Primary data corresponds with secondary data, showing that the responsibilities and risk assessment are clear in each group. Firstly, the corporate (especially QED) is in charge of risk assessment in relation to quality assurance. Quality assurance is reflected as benchmarking in strategic management (Camp, 1989; Spendolini, 1992; Watson, 1993; Bullivant, 1994). QAA35 is a compulsory standard for each U.K. University to maintain the quality of collaboration. Every U.K. University has to make sure that their collaborative activities are compatible with QAA section 2: Code of Practice. Secondly, Department 2 is involved in risk assessment in terms of collaborative arrangements. Distinct from the risk of quality (academic standard), Department 2 is more concerned

35 QAA was established in 1997 to provide an integrated external quality assurance service for U.K. higher education. QAA is independent from the U.K. government. Universities and colleges are responsible for the academic standards and quality of their own degrees and other awards; this is done through internal quality assurance. QAA carries out external quality assurance by judging how reliably the universities and colleges fulfill their responsibility. It also encourages universities and colleges to keep improving the management of their standards and quality. QAA also contributes to and influences international quality assurance through the membership of many international organizations and involvement in higher education projects (source: www.qaa.ac.uk).
with the risk regarding return on investment (ROI). They consider risk within a business model where cost is measured against income. So some minimum payment or a minimum number of students is required from the partner in order to minimize risk for the university. As interviewee no.10 evaluates, the hands-on ways of teaching are more expensive; the hands-off ways of teaching are higher risk. Thus university needs to balance the hands-off and hands-on ways of programme delivery:

"...that is a sensible way of looking at it. The more we behalf in what we would call a hands-off way, the more potential risk there is for the standard of the provision, the academic standards...... the more hands-on way are in general terms, the more expensive, so you have to balance... You have to grow confidence in the partner."

--- Interviewee no.10 (Department 2 group)

"...they have to recruit in line with what is a minimum business model...we set that out at the beginning of the relationship... And if they are not agreeing with that then ... their business interpretations may not be particularly valid...we are trying to do going forwards; if you run this programme ...you must pay us so much money based on getting so many students on the programme. The other option is, if you do not recruit the minimum number of students, we will not allow you to run the programme, because we think that that would then produce a non sustainable business model for you..."

--- Interviewee no.10 (Department 2 group)

The Department 2 and corporate partially shared points for Q 3.4 show that return on investment (ROI) is based on the business model where cost and charge are against income during the process of academic collaboration. A minimum payment or a minimum number of students is set to ensure that the business model is sustainable. Universities have three options whereby to conduct international expansion: agents, partnership collaboration or satellite campus. Cost is the main concern under which the institutions decide a particular mode of entry and the level of international involvement. For example, agents work on commission, thus universities do not have to invest heavily in them. Academic collaborations (such as top-up, articulation, credit transfer) enable students to study at local institutions for up to two years and then come over to foreign institutions and carry on with the rest of their programme. Foreign students will join the
home students' schedule with a traditional face-to-face teaching model. Home institutions do not have to make additional investments for these advanced standing students, either. Although the cost of recruiting through partners is higher than through agents, it is still much lower than establishing a satellite campus. Recruitment through partnership can secure the number of students needed and the return on investment (ROI) is guaranteed, too. Department 2, in between the corporate and the faculty, coordinates and makes sure that collaborations operate within a sustainable business model. Other responsibilities of Department 2 include enrollment, marketing promotion, online distance learning and technology support.

Thirdly, consistent with the operational manual, the faculty group is mainly responsible for programme delivery. According to Slack, Chambers and Johnston (2007), operation is the activity of determining the physical form, shape and composition of products, services and processes. In education, a programme leader is the 'designer' who is responsible for implemental activities, including initial student counseling, approving student applications, checking student qualifications for authenticity, approving module handbooks, producing programme handbooks, creating learning and teaching materials, setting coursework assignments, second marking of assessments, carrying out internal moderation, approving the moderation sample, writing annual monitoring reports, approving partner staff, and providing academic support to students. There are many responsibilities for the faculty group. It seems that once collaboration has moved to the implementational level, many activities come straight to the academics. Sometimes, tasks have tight deadlines which can put stress on faculty (see Q 6.1, issue of operational process - work load).

The answers to Q 3.4 show a clear picture of the role of each department in terms of responsibility, cost and risk assessment. Corporate goals are transferred to Department 2 and finally implemented by the academic staff. On the surface, it appears that everyone knows what they should do. Accountabilities and responsibilities are both in 'black and
white’ (see Appendix 8), and nothing is hidden. However, there are some underlying issues that are more challenging (as discussed later, see Q 6.1).

Q 3.5 What is the difference between conducting internationalization through overseas agents versus academic partnership?

Evidence from primary data (Q 3.5 Difference between agents and partners)

Q 3.5 addresses the difference between conducting internationalization through overseas agents versus academic partnerships. This question is both analytical and evaluative (see Appendix 18, table 4.21, difference between agents and partners). The summary of primary data is presented in table 4.22.

All groups agree that agents work on commission and do not bear any risk, thus they are not always reliable and may be less loyal to the home university. This view reflects precisely the weakness of the agency approach (see discussion of agency approach, in Chapter 2, section 2.1.4). In contrast, academic partnership is not a purely commercial coalition, but a long-term sustainable relationship. This relationship can guarantee the number of students recruited and provide opportunities for staff development. Thus, both the corporate and faculty groups prefer academic partnerships. However, since the case study university does not have ground support in foreign markets, such as an overseas office, it has to rely on agents in certain regions. Unlike other groups, Department 2 points out that the university should build up strong relationships with agents (especially with superagents), and treat them as partners. A study centre can be created as a potential area for further international development in order to seize every possible opportunity of recruitment.

Table 4.22 Primary data of difference between agents and partners (Q 3.5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T3A, Q-3.5</th>
<th>Common points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| All Groups | • Agents work on commission; non-exclusive relationship, not reliable, bear no risks and represent many universities.  
• Academic partnership is not purely commercial. The partner is always involved with academic teaching in a more sustainable and reliable partnership. |
Evidence from secondary data (Q 3.5 Difference between agents and partners):  
No evidence

Evidence from other data (Q 3.5 Difference between agents and partners):  
No evidence

Analysis and summary (Q 3.5 Difference between agents and partners)  
Dealing with agents and partners is a day-to-day work for Department 2. The other two groups are not directly involved in this process, thus Department 2 has a higher proportion (four out of six) of participation with this question. The common points show that a partnership is more preferable than agents, and faculty would like to work with partners rather than agents. The difficulty of management and lower sustainability of agents are their main concerns. The reasons are listed as follows: a partnership guarantees the number of students recruited. A partnership is more reliable and loyal than purely commercial agent business. Academic collaboration provides opportunities for further development, such as joint research and exchange of students / staff. The nature of agent recruitment is highly compatible with the agency approach (see discussion of the agency
approach, Chapter 2, section 2.1.4). It fits the characteristics of the home stage where international students tend to come over to the United Kingdom (see Q 1.3). Most agents are rarely involved in teaching. They work on commission and act as commercial recruiters. The difference between conducting internationalization through agents and partnerships reveals the weakness of the agency approach – lower loyalty and less reliability, as interviewees say:

"...agents always represent lots of different universities, and the turnover is quite high, and it is a lot of effort to develop a really good agent, so we are trying to focus on developing more collaborative agreements."

--- Interviewee no.12 (Department 2 group)

"... the agents are not always that reliable... are the agents just there to support the partnership in an academic way? or are they there really as businesses? Currently, we are more reliant on agents because we do not have our own offices out there, and that is unfortunate because I think it is more difficult working through agents."

--- Interviewee no.18 (Faculty group)

"... Academic partnership is established for a period of time it is more sustainable, it is more secure and the number of students is guaranteed in theory... Agent is not going to take any financial risk. He (agent) will just be paid for his success or he will not get paid because he did not."

--- Interviewee no.12 (Department 2 group)

The group-specific points present different opinions regarding agents. The corporate group represents the senior management who always view things in a strategic way. They prefer partnerships because collaborative partnerships are part of their planning.

On the other hand, some Department 2 interviewees are keener to build a strong bond with agents because Department 2 has to meet recruitment targets. Working with agents is one of the main methods of achieving it. Compared to the partnership, agent-led recruitment is more possible to achieve in a short term, and it does not require heavy
investment. Although agents are not reliable, they can cover a broad geographic area simultaneously and cost a university less investment (for example, superagents with their own regional offices across the country). In certain areas (for example, Nigeria, India and Middle East), agents still make the main contribution to international recruitment. Department 2 highlights certain potential areas for further development with agents (such as a study centre).

"...what we want to do is build a strong bond (with agents) by training them to be aware of any strengths that we have that others may not have... one of the issues that is emerging is whether to use agents or people who offer themselves to be partners as study centre ... if there is enough people in an area, you can have a study centre, and that study centre can be different forms. It could just be literally physically resources like computer ... they (agents) are not teachers on the course, they could do some student support."

--- Interviewee no.10 (Department 2 group)

“And other example is some of the new agreements that we are in the process of signing at the moment, which is for online students studying...it is in Middle East area, where there is cohorts of students who are signing up to study online and the arrangement will be that they will go to the local centre, study centre. They will be an online student with the University of [X], but there might be some local support.”

--- Interviewee no.14 (Department 2 group)

“... that (study centre) is a different kind...and we have got to think how we would handle that because it is not something we have done. So that is a new kind of partnership for online... I mean Bahrain was one that we came across, but then they say well, instead of going to the UK, we will do the online version. But if they all do it together, then their institution could be a study centre.”

--- Interviewee no.10 (Department 2 group)

From the business point of view, both agents and partners are clients of Department 2. They are complementary resources. The Department 2 group points out that a study centre can be a potential area where agents will be treated the same as partners and more training will be provided. In contrast, the faculty group prefers partnerships because
partnership is involved in their daily work; they are more familiar with or are more used to work with partners than agents. Dealing with agents is beyond their job scope.

4.5.4 Theme 3B: Programme delivery methods

Q 4.1 What are the different ways the University of [X] uses to deliver its programmes?

- *Our own lecturers teaching abroad*
- *Partners delivering our syllabus on our behalf*
- *Partners delivering their syllabus on our behalf and we validate it*
- *Using part-time / sessional lecturers deliver our programmes*
- *Hybrid teaching (teaching abroad + online)*
- *Online distance learning (Wimba classroom, ICT and video conference)*
- *Others*

Evidence from primary data (Q 4.1 Programme delivery)

Q 4.1 investigates different programme delivery methods. This is an informative question; some interviewees gave analytical responses and two interviewee evaluated differences among programme delivery methods (see Appendix 18, table 4.23, programme delivery). The summary of primary data is presented in table 4.24.

Programme delivery methods may vary depending on the market entry strategies (both business-based and education-based; see previous discussion, Q 3.1) adopted by the university. The programme delivery methods highlighted in the case study include partners delivering the home university’s syllabus, partners delivering their own syllabus accredited by the home university, home academics teaching abroad, on-campus traditional programme delivery, online distance learning (E-learning), and hybrid delivery. In addition, the contribution of E-learning in terms of programme delivery and market entry strategy is commonly recognized by all interview groups.
## Table 4.24 Primary data of programme delivery (Q 4.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T3B, Q-4.1</th>
<th>Common points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **All Groups** | - Partners' lecturers deliver the home university's syllabus (70%)  
| | - Partners' lecturers deliver their own syllabus, the university validates / accredits their programmes as equivalent to its own.  
| | - Flying faculty / teaching abroad  
| | - On-campus traditional programme delivery  
| | - Hybrid (online plus flying faculty) delivery  
| | - Online and distance learning (such as Wimba classroom)  
| | - Employing part-time / sessional lecturers |
| **Department 2-Corporate** | - None |
| **Department 2-Faculty** | - None |
| **Corporate-Faculty** | - None |
| **Corporate** | - None |
| **Department 2** | - Using part-time staff  
| | - Delivery in various languages, such as Greek and Hebrew  
| | - Home lecturers teaching abroad in China for a brief period |
| **Faculty** | |

### Evidence from secondary data (Q 4.1 Programme delivery)
Secondary evidence is available on the Department 2’s website – overseas partnership (see Appendix 2).

### Evidence from other data (Q 4.1 Programme delivery): No evidence.

### Analysis and summary (Q 4.1 Programme delivery)
Programme delivery is mainly the faculty’s responsibilities. Both the corporate and Department 2 groups agree with different ways of programme delivery. Organizations should treat the design of products and services and the design of processes all together because they are clearly interrelated (Carpenter and Sanders, 2007; Slack, Chambers and Johnston, 2007; Johnson, Scholes and Whittington, 2008). In HE internationalization, it would be difficult to create a detailed programme design without considering how to deliver it and who is going to deliver it. Slack, Chambers and Johnston’s (2007) views are in respect of goods manufacturing; in education, their view is also applicable, but
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slightly different. In academic collaboration, programme delivery processes and methods depend highly on the type of collaboration rather than the design of product (programme) itself. That is because educational programmes are different from commercial products. The syllabus is usually ready (standardized) and cannot be revised simply following the market demand. The re-validation of programmes is a common way to modify them. But if major revisions are needed, the university needs to design a new curriculum rather than making major changes to existing programmes. Since most programmes are kind of 'ready products' (already existing), the university is concerned more with the ways to deliver them. This is one of the main implemental tasks for the faculty group.

Programme delivery corresponds to the arrangement of collaboration (Q 3.1, T3A). The two are highly interrelated; for example, if franchise is a particular collaborative arrangement, then the delivery method will be the partners' lecturers delivering the university's syllabus; if validation is adopted, then the delivery method will be the partners' lecturers delivering their own syllabus with the home university validating or accrediting their programmes as equivalent to its own. If online distance learning is adopted, the programme delivery method will be through the internet; if the type of collaboration is top-up (advanced standing) or articulation, then the delivery method will be the same as a traditional on-campus delivery because with these collaborative arrangements, students will come over to the UK and join a regular academic schedule.

The faculty group points out that local language (such as Hebrew and Greek) can be adopted in programme delivery. But additional translations are needed for moderation, examination (internal / external) and audit. The Department 2 group states that they may use part-time or sessional staff in programme delivery, but this is project-based or determined by specific circumstances.

In addition, it is necessary to highlight the contribution of E-learning (such as online distance learning) in terms of programme delivery and market entry strategy. Although many scholars (for example, Windhan, 1996; Mason, 1998, Mazzarol, 1998; Nichols,
2003) discuss E-learning, no literature categorizes it as a market entry mode, but research findings (Q 4.1) show that E-learning is an efficient and common entry mode in education. Technological advances in communications are powerful instruments which can serve to further HE internationalization and to democratize access to education opportunities (International Association of Universities, 1998). E-learning can be seen as an independent entry mode or a supplementary option for traditional study during market expansion. For example, it can be arranged within intensive block-blended teaching (such as ‘flying faculty’) or hybrid programme delivery; it can also play the primary role in online programmes. Examples of the institutions that involve the above programme delivery methods include the MM. Institute (Malawi), INT College (Israel) and BA College (Botswana). There is a big success in online psychology programmes (both undergraduate and postgraduate) in Faculty C at the case study university. In other faculties (for example, Faculties A and D), ‘Wimba classroom’ is combined with traditional face-to-face teaching. E-learning increases the flexibility of programme delivery and the scope of international expansion. Thus, E-learning represents not only a programme delivery method, but also a formal mode of entry. Its contribution should be recognized and the category of E-learning as a formal mode of entry in terms of HE internationalization should be added to the list.

4.4.5 Theme 4: Overseas branch campus

Q 5.1 Does the University of [X] establish an overseas branch campus? Why?

Evidence from primary data (Q 5.1 Overseas branch campus)

Q 5.1 seeks interviewees' opinion on the establishment of an overseas branch campus. This question is both informative and analytical; answers also contain evaluative concerns (see Appendix 18, table 4.25, overseas branch campus). The summary of primary data is presented in table 4.26.
All interview groups confirm that the case study university does not have an overseas branch campus or consider it as part of the university’s strategic agenda. The establishment of an overseas branch campus is highly corresponding to the policy of the OLI approach (see discussion of OLI, Chapter 2, section 2.1.3). Although some reputable institutions have moved into this stage, most interviewees do not recommend it as the right trend for most U.K. universities due to the associated uncertainties, including risks, cost, foreign government policy and unpredictable international environment.

Table 4.26 Primary data of overseas branch campus (Q 5.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T4, Q-5.1</th>
<th>Common points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| All Groups | • The university does not have an overseas branch campus.  
• The university prefers to recruit students through internet or partnerships.  
• An overseas office will be a good ground support for collaboration and recruitment, but currently the university does not have one. |
| Partially shared points |
| Department 2-Corporate | • It is risky and with high uncertainty.  
• The university neither has the big scale of operation, nor an ambition of establishing a satellite campus. |
| Department 2-Faculty | • The university gives permission to INT College, Israel to market itself as the university’s Israel Campus. But this is for marketing purpose only. The university does not own INT College. |
| Corporate-Faculty | • Corporate is cautious about spending money.  
• The university’s own overseas office will open soon in Beijing, China. |
| Group-specific points |
| Corporate | • Difficult to manage and evaluate operational processes at the overseas branch campus. |
| Department 2 | • None |
| Faculty | • None |

Evidence from secondary data (Q 5.1 Overseas branch campus): No evidence.

Evidence from other data (Q 5.1 Overseas branch campus): No evidence.
Analysis and summary (Q 5.1 Overseas branch campus)

The overseas branch campus is not a new notion nowadays. The Wharton Business School, Johns Hopkins University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, University of Chicago Graduate School of Business, and University of Nottingham and University of Middlesex all have their own overseas branch campuses, a physical 'bricks and mortar' presence (Maslen, 2009). The overseas branch campus is described as the 'third wave' in Mazzarol, Soutar and Seng's (2003) 'three-wave' model (see Chapter 2, section 2.6.2.2). LaRosa, Joseph and Javalg (2009) interpret the overseas branch campus as 'commercial presence' or 'satellite campus' (see Chapter 2, section 2.6.2.1). According to Van Damme (2001), the main characteristic of the overseas branch campus is that it is a full service campus, wholly owned and operated by the awarding institution, providing degrees taught face-to-face, supported by a traditional physical infrastructure including library, laboratories, classrooms, and faculty and staff offices. It is highly compatible with Dunning's (1988 and 2000) OLI approach (see Chapter 2, section 2.1.3) where the entry modes are determined by ownership, location and internalization (OLI). The overseas branch campus is a big scale operation containing high risk and requiring heavy investment. All interviewees comment that the case study university does not have an overseas branch campus;\(^{36}\) nor does it have the ambition or agenda to do so. But an overseas office is a possible way to increase international profile and recruitment, as interviewee no.18 (Faculty group) says:

"... a lot of universities have got offices for recruitment and for developing partnerships in those countries, that is what we are missing... and they (overseas offices) can give the student more confidence that the students know there is a point of contact in their home city or reasonably close who speaks the language and so on."

--- Interviewee no.18 (Faculty group)

\(^{36}\) In respect to marketing perspective, the case study university allows INT College, Israel to market itself as the case study university's campus in Israel. But they are two independent institutions. The case study university does not have the ownership of the INT College, Israel.
The case study university’s current recruitment strategy is to recruit from existing local partners or directly through the internet. It is a ‘safe’ way because the associated risk, cost and resource are manageable. A satellite campus may not be the right move for most institutions although some large reputable universities have launched their own overseas branch campuses. Most related literature only describes the phenomenon of the foreign satellite campus; there is no sufficient evidence (for example, statistics or financial report) to say that a university should or should not move to the overseas branch campus stage, although there are many forces motivating the establishment of branch campuses (for example, such an establishment often seems to be driven by the policies of the local government). Are these reputable universities going after the right goals? Some experts believe not. They argue that there are acute difficulties in making overseas campuses work. Professor Shattock, of London’s Institute of Education is currently writing a report for EUERek (European Universities for Entrepreneurship) on the subject; he has carried out a study of the University of Nottingham’s campuses in China and Malaysia, and also undertook an audit of the Australian Monash University’s campuses. He states that “It seems to me that setting up overseas campuses is a strategic mistake ... they are a leap in the dark, a diversion from what universities should be doing.’ He further stresses that ‘the Nottingham Campuses were not breaking even37 ... that was also true of Monash, both in Malaysia and South Africa’.” (Hodges, 2007, n.p). Furthermore, the ‘third wave’ branch campuses (Mazzarol, Soutar, and Seng, 2003) only represent a minority of players. Most universities, especially those of middle or lower ranking may not gain such strong financial support from local governments to launch the establishment of overseas campuses. Unlike other ways of internationalization (see Q 3.1), branch campuses are not viewed as being primarily commercial in nature. These overseas campuses still need a substantial period of time to fully develop and become financially independent. But how long will it take? And how strongly these branch campuses are committed as a fully

37 Although Shattock acknowledges that his figures might be out of date – indeed, Nottingham says that it is now breaking even or making a small profit on its Malaysian outfit – Shattock argues that it still difficult to make overseas campus work, because most home staff are often unwilling to travel and teaching abroad unless a temporary promotions or motivation is offered (Shattock, cited in Hodges, 2007).
functioning campus is still doubtful. Moreover, the impact on the home university (for example, profile, reputation and ROI) is difficult to predict. So no one really knows the future of the branch campus, for example, what is going to happen if the foreign government withdraws local support (through capital, land and property) or becomes totally opposed to foreign institutions (like what happened in Israel). This may be a disaster for the home institution to bear the expense of exiting. Andrew Colin, the chairman of Into University Partnership, agrees with Shattock's view and explains the reason why overseas campuses (in China) are a gamble: this is because "the universities are at the mercy of government whim 'This is pioneering, gold-rush stuff,' he says, 'as long as you are useful, you will be there, but not otherwise. You will not be able to get a long-term commitment to enable you to have a long-term business strategy'." (Hodges, 2007, n.p). A similar view from China (one of the potential foreign markets) partially confirms the above concerns. Andrew Halper, head of the China Business Group at Eversheds, believes that "establishing own outfit in China can be expensive. He states 'I advise companies that do deals in China ... setting up an offshoot is often a complicated way to proceed, but I do not mean that as a criticism'." (ibid). Therefore, currently, it is difficult to say whether U.K. universities should or should not move towards this stage.

4.5.6 Theme 5: Problems and issues in HE internationalization

Q 6.1 During the process of internationalization, what are the challenges you face?

- Resources (staff and capital)
- Political issues (such as policy and regulation)
- Competition, league table and international profile
- Partnership management
- Agent management
- Culture and language
- Communication and integration
- Efficiency of processing (such as application, enquiry and feedback)
- Dilemma between standardizing university’s own curriculum and adopting local requirement and design new programmes.
- Quality assurance, especially with off-campus programmes
Evidence from primary data (Q 6.1 Problems, issues and challenges)

Q 6.1 investigates the problems, issues and challenges of HE internationalization at the case study university. This question seeks interviewees' views on three cognitive levels: informative, analytic and evaluative. Two interviewees declined to answer this question (see Appendix 18, table 4.27, problems, issues and challenges of HE internationalization). Interviewees from different groups addressed the issues they face in the process of internationalization. The summary of primary data is presented in table 4.28.

Problems and issues raised in the case study include resource allocation, communication, operational process, cooperation and coordination, motivation and incentive, organizational culture and resistance to change, student support, and external environment.

The corporate group considers resource less of an issue of HE internationalization because they have already planned for it in the business budget. However, Department 2 states that resource in terms of capital is a challenge because more capital is needed to develop international markets. Human resource puts more pressure on academics as they have to deal with work overload and peak schedules. A potential reason for this discord is that the corporate group may hand off the 'ball' of implementation to other departments and focus on strategy formulation rather than field operation.

Communication is a critical issue within one group or among the three key departments. Department 2 interviewees point out that there is lack of staff development and training. Sometimes, they find it difficult to promote certain programmes that are out of the scope of their understanding. Faculty interviewees state that there is inadequate central
Most operational process issues exist within faculty, including loading, scheduling and sequencing. Academics state that work overload is the main challenge. International collaboration overextends the academic schedule and may clash with their teaching at the home institution. Department 2 believes that it is unfair that academics always put international activities (for example, marking and assessment) at the bottom of their list of priorities. International students should be treated equally to home students, even though they may be far away. HE internationalization also creates a conflict between standardizing existing curriculum and adopting foreign market demands by designing new programmes.

There is lack of understanding and cooperation among the three key departments, especially between Department 2 and the faculty. The unclear responsibilities and accountability between Department 2-driven and faculty-driven international initiatives do not enhance positive outcomes of internationalization. Similar argument occurs about who should go for recruitment abroad: Department 2 or faculty. The faculty’s own purpose may also conflict with Department 2’s central planning in internationalization. Furthermore, within Department 2, inefficient coordination in terms of preparation of contracts and agreements can frustrate its own staff’s enthusiasm for internationalization.

In terms of motivation and incentive, there is a mindset conflict between the faculty group and the other two groups. This issue is reflected in the statements about staff’s efforts of internationalization not fully recognized, allowance reimbursement delays, and lack of internal support. A mismatch exists between what is asked for and what is given.
The issue of organizational culture is reflected in the culture clash among departments. The culture of Department 2 is more forceful in promoting internationalization, while faculty academics see teaching as their main task and international initiatives as additional work. Therefore, their cooperation is more reluctant and passive. Consequently, Department 2 perceives that there is strong resistance in faculties in terms of cooperation in internationalization. The fear of change and uncertainty, and struggling to deal with stress may be the underlying reasons for the faculty’s reaction.

The issues of student support concentrate on English language requirements and international student settlement. International students at different campuses should have the same access, opportunity, and experience. The faculty suggests that the International Student Centre needs to play a greater role and work closely with faculties to provide better student service, including improving the efficiency in processing international applications.

The external factors raised by the case study university include governmental policy, overseas environment (such as safety and health), competition, volatile international market, campus location and level of technology. Although these external factors mostly match the literature (see discussion of choice of international market, Chapter 2, section 2.4), they do not primarily impact on HE internationalization, compared to the internal issues raised in the case study.

Table 4.28 Primary data of problems, issues and challenges (Q 6.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T5, Q-6.1</th>
<th>Common points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Groups</td>
<td>• Resource in terms of staff.&lt;br&gt;• Staff attitude – need to understand internationalization more.&lt;br&gt;• Work overload (faculty academics).&lt;br&gt;• Peak academic schedule.&lt;br&gt;• U.K. Boarder Agency regulations (English language requirements) and government policy (United Kingdom and foreign countries).&lt;br&gt;• Quality assurance and periodical reflection of the home university always need to pay more attention, especially to programmes delivered in the local language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Competition, league table position and international reputation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resource–capital and investment (although some interviewees disagree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Marketing and international recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lack of staff development and regular training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Anglo-centric curriculum barriers – contextualization in terms of re-evaluation – the issue between standardizing own syllabus and adopting local requirements, designing new programmes. It may result in losing the home market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff attitude - the root is fear, uncertainty, culture and stress. Staff struggle to deal with stress; fear of change and uncertainty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organizational cultural issues (such as different working styles in the United Kingdom, Israel and Malaysia).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Partially shared points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department 2-Corporate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Partnership management – partnership is all about people, trust and sharing, and it takes longer to establish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faculty cooperation – staff attitude with strong resistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Unexpected recruitment fluctuation may be a problem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department 2-Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Staff’s effort need to be fully recognized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental uncertainty – health and safety in African states.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilities barrier, such as lack of research base (science subjects).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate-Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Technology issues (receiving equipments).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knowledge gap of internationalization within Faculty C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Language barrier for both students and staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Physical environment is not ready for international students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Due to the geographical scope, Faculty A prefers working with large organizations and may reject potential smaller partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The university needs to understand how fragile, volatile, variable and risky the international market is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• International Office needs to support international students more (such as providing airport pick up, language, advice and local community connection).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low efficiency in processing applications by the International Office.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Group-specific points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Identifying suitable partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agent arrangement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contract negotiation especially in early stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Marketing need to be more focused on internationalization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Distance learning for doctoral students is not highly recommended.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Workload for academic staff should not be a problem because international activities are part of their annual work and institutional agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Currently the focus is on the quality of student experience and the most efficient way (such as direct recruitment through CRM) to bring students to the university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Low efficiency in terms of agreement preparation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• International initiatives in terms of teaching and marking need to be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>treated equally in both U.K. and partners’ sides.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Poor internal communication among different departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Faculty priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Allowance delays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Internationalization is additional workload.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of synchronization between partners and home institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Administration – examination board arrangements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conflicts around who goes abroad, faculty academics or Department 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conflict between faculty’s own purpose and Department 2’s central priority in terms of HE internationalization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Department 2 needs to clarify its role with the International Office and work closely with faculties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• International students in Faculty D should have equal access, opportunity, and experience as those in other faculties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Faculty D feels that they are always left out of internationalization by the current international recruitment strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Transport and location is the biggest problem for Faculty D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Different departments need to work internally to improve student support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• More support should be given to January intake students in Faculty D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence from secondary data (Q 6.1 Problems, issues and challenges)
The secondary data (‘Values 2007’, see Appendix 9) does not directly provide evidence for this question. Instead it shows how the case study university should (or should not) treat customers and value employees. This partially corresponds to the primary and observed data.

Evidence from other data (Q 6.1 Problems, issues and challenges)
The observed evidence is derived from the case of the S1 Academy, China. As a coordinator on behalf of the S1 Academy, the researcher assisted the S1 Academy’s students to apply for a top-up degree through UCAS 38 (University and College Admissions Service) and intended to establish a progression arrangement between the S1 Academy, China and the case study university. However, the process was not smooth. At the initial stage, there was strong support from a Chinese project leader, but then s/he suddenly resigned and there was no one following up on this potential collaboration. The researcher was told by the International Office that they were not responsible for

---

38 The University and College Admissions Service (UCAS) is the organization responsible for managing applications to higher education courses in the United Kingdom.
anything until students arrived. The researcher asked several times regarding U.K. visa application documents and requirements. This is important for the S1 Academy’s students, because the case study university does not have an overseas office for ground support, so the S1 Academy, China has to assist student visa applications. But Department 2 (International Office and Admissions) did not provide any information of visa application. As potential customers, the S1 Academy did not get any answers they expected. And after four months, no contract / agreement (even an agent contract) was prepared for the S1 Academy. The students could not get efficient response to their applications. Due to Admissions policy (data protection), the researcher could not enquire on behalf of the S1 Academy’s students. So the only way to gain response was that students had to email Admissions and enquire by themselves. However, there was no efficient response, either. The students posted their portfolio works, and kept emailing and waiting. The researcher was asked by the S1 Academy to find out why there was no response. But by the same token (data protection) Admissions could not release any information because the researcher was not a student. The researcher personally perceived that Admissions did not actively support the collaboration; in contrast, some staff in Admissions even felt bothered because they believed they were ‘chased’ by the researcher. And the researcher’s perception was later confirmed by a Chinese international officer who acted as a ‘middleman’ to assist the researcher to find out further information. Finally, the researcher was told by the Chinese international officer, not by the Admissions, that the case study university could not accept these students because the university did not have any EAP (English for Academic Purpose) programme over 15 weeks (the S1 Academy’s students were planning to study on an English course for up to six months before starting their top-up degree). The university suggested that the S1 Academy’s students re-apply next year (2011). This feedback is out of expectation of both the S1 Academy and the researcher. If a university cannot collaborate with the S1 Academy, accept these students, issue recruitment contract, support students' visa applications, or arrange the length of study, then it should be made clear from the start so that the students could make other arrangements or apply to other universities. The researcher also felt embarrassed to explain this to her previous employer (the S1
Academy), since part of the reason why the S1 Academy decided to collaborate with the case study university was that the researcher used to be a student at the case study university and trust had been built between the S1 Academy and the researcher. However, the university’s response was disappointing.

The observed evidence and feedback from Admissions are inconsistent with most interviewees’ responses. All interviewees confirm that it is important to recruit international students especially in the current economic recession. It is a clear message that the university needs international students. However, when international recruitment is available, there is lack of sufficient attention and constant support from the front line execution. The front line implementation is vitally important because customers (partners or students) are unlikely to reach senior management directly, especially during the early stages of interaction. This observed data provides a disappointing picture in contrast with the university’s corporate goals and secondary data about ‘Customer Focus’ (see Appendix 9), but it is partially consistent with some problems (such as additional burden) raised by interviewees (see primary data collection of Q 6.1).

This is an implementation problem. The Admissions staff react passively to international initiatives (according to the participant observation). They do not feel responsible for international recruitment and may think that it is additional work that will not bring direct benefit to individuals. But their inefficient responses gave a negative message to students and a potential partner. For the Admissions staff, this issue may mean not replying efficiently to applications; but for students, it means frustration, impact upon personal study, and loss of opportunities to apply to other universities. The researcher understands that she explores a negative picture here. It is more likely that, should those front line staff be involved as interviewees in this research, their answers would be definitely opposite to what they have done because they would be in front of an audio-recorder. The researcher believes that at some points, the observed data is more truthful and reliable than other data sources. This inference is corresponding with Chan’s (2009) statement that validity is the best available approximation to the truth of a given proposition,
inference, or conclusion. Observational research findings are considered strong in validity because individuals may not know that they are being observed and, consequently, are unlikely to change their actions in order to show the researcher their reactions or make up information. Similarly, Cook and Campbell (1979) point out that subjects or respondents tend to report either what they believe the researcher expects to see or what reflects positively on their own abilities, knowledge, beliefs, or opinions. Due to the fact that the researcher’s identity is not revealed to the Admissions, the observed data in terms of reaction of the Admissions department is more accurate.

Analysis and summary (Q 6.1 Problems, issues and challenges)

This question investigates the challenges and issues during HE internationalization discussed by the three groups. Most interviewees interpret their problems in relation to their daily work. The issues and challenges identified are concentrated in the area of international strategy implementation: resource, communication, operational process, motivation and incentives, student support, cooperation and coordination, external environment, organizational culture and resistance to change. These issues reflect each interview group’s concern. For example, the corporate considers planning, university strategy and quality assurance; the faculty concentrates on programme delivery, curriculum re-validation, work overload, peak schedule and allowance; Department 2 emphasizes partnership, recruitment, cooperation, effort recognition and organizational culture. However, interviewees often point out other key departments’ problems and rarely realize their own issues.

The first issue highlighted by most interviewees is resource. Grant (1991, p. 120) says that “the capabilities of a firm are what it can do as a result of teams of resource work together”. Sanchez (2001, p. 7) states that competences are “the ability of an organization to sustain coordinated developments of assets and capabilities in ways that help the organization achieve its goal”. Broadly speaking, resource can be separated into tangible and intangible. An organization’s resource can be listed under four main categories (Johnson, Scholes and Whittington, 2008): physical resources, financial resources, human
resource, and intellectual capital. There is an inconsistent view among the three key departments in terms of resource being an issue. Both the Department 2 group and faculty group comment that resource in terms of financial and investment (capital) is definitely a problem. But not every interviewee in the corporate group agrees with that:

"Capital is less of an issue for us (the case study university) because we are not talking about building abroad (campus) ..."

--- Interviewee no.1 (Corporate group)

"Resourcing should not be an issue because we should have planned that so we should be able to cope with that... all of our overseas activity has to be fully costed before we start... we have a very sophisticated system of estimating what the cost of delivery will be. We know how many teaching hours it will require, what consumable items will be required, cost of flights, etc. So we cost it out thoroughly and in the budget we agree with the partner we allocate the costs to where they should be. So everybody right from the start knows this is what it costs to run that programme and this resource is in place to do it."

--- Interviewee no.5 (Corporate group)

"...the university has very limited resources... setting up partnerships is incredibly expensive when you consider the opportunity cost involved. I do not want to waste anyone's time doing that and then they do not work. One of the major challenges for our school (Department 2) is we get contacted on a daily, hourly, basis, from Korea, China, India, Mexico, Brazil, etc... we have to have a way of sifting... because otherwise, I would literally bury my staff in fly here and there... We will not step on a plane unless we know there is the potential for..."

--- Interviewee no.4 (Corporate group)

Some say that resource in terms of capital is a challenge; some say that it is less of a problem. Why? Since arranging resource is a corporate responsibility, the reason must lie within the corporate’s job scope. The corporate group manages the resource and competences that the university can use to provide value to students and partners. Resource is a vital factor, but it is primarily manifested during the corporate planning stage deciding on strategic plans. As part of planning, resource is a given, or predetermined input to the implementation process. In other words, strategic plans and
activities already have approval by the corporate group, and commitment of the required resource has already been made (as stated above in interviewee no.5’s answer). Thus some corporate interviewees do not think that resource in terms of capital is a problem. Another reason may be that the corporate group plans the university’s strategy, and then ‘hands off the ball’ to other departments (such as faculty and Department 2) for implementation. But making strategy work is more difficult than the task of strategy making. The corporate group is much more knowledgeable about planning but may not know a great deal about strategy implementation and potential operational obstacles. This may be one reason why the corporate group considers resource to be less of an issue, but there is no strong evidence to support the reason for ‘handing off the ball’. But logically the ‘handing off’ activity could happen. It also can explain why the faculty and Department 2 groups realize more problems than the corporate group (see group-specific points), since they are the actual ‘doers’, while the corporate is the ‘planner’.

There is a consistent view of resource in terms of staff. The corporate group agrees that staff resource may put short-term pressure on the faculty, especially when the university over-recruits students and may not be able to buy in more people immediately. Since the university can buy in staff, it is not surprising that the corporate group does not consider human resource an issue. Partially shared points show that resource issues are emerging in the university’s physical environment, such as research foundation (for example, science labs) and accommodations (for example, single gender areas for certain religions). The Department 2 group argues that resource is an issue in terms of investment in internationalization. The faculty interviewees stress that they do not have enough staff to handle work overload and peak academic schedules.

**External environment** is the objective factors that universities cannot control, such as U.K. Boarder Agency visa regulations and English language requirements (for example, IELTS), overseas environment in relation to health and safety especially in African states, international competition (for example, league table and reputation), volatile and variable
international market, campus location (for example, Faculty D), and the level of technology (such as access to internet) in some African countries:

“There are issues about the tension between what the U.K. government requires in relation to Tier 4 border controls, the changes we have had in all those particular areas, requirements for English language and things like that, which have become much more problematic than they were...”

--- Interviewee no. 7 (Corporate group)

“And there is always like external factors, like the government might decide that it does not want to have partnerships with U.K. universities anymore...Like Israel...it is a volatile sort of political environment, so there are things that are out of our control.”

--- Interviewee no. 12 (Department 2 group)

“It is a very fragile market, not a stable and reliable market as the British market is. For example, one or two problems in the Middle East with government (Kuwait) saying, 'We will put a quota on the number of students'. And we suddenly have to change what we are doing...You put a lot of effort, a lot of money into developing the partnerships abroad, and it only needs a change in the currency or a political change, and the whole thing disappears. So that is an issue that we need to actually understand properly...by everybody in the university.”

--- Interviewee no. 19 (Faculty group)

“It is very volatile markets, so again international students, when swine flu hit, we were expecting a lot of students over that year ...SARS was the same when that happened, half the students did not turn up because they did not want to catch it.”

--- Interviewee no. 5 (Corporate group)

“It is becoming increasingly competitive because of the changes in the United Kingdom...we have a small share of the international market. There are a lot of universities who are a lot stronger than us, so we are sort of starting off from behind the starting blocks...we have to compete with these people who have got a higher profile; we have got to build our own reputation. A lot of the international students want to know where we stand in the league tables and University of [---] does not stand well because of the things that they judge on.”

--- Interviewee no. 12 (Department 2 group)
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"I think the challenge for this campus (Faculty D) is the fact that we are so far away from the main campus... The transport is dreadful and the students from here are more likely to socialize in [---] than they are in [---] because we have got a direct bus link, direct train links... So we need to be making those links for our international students and we need a different support network for them here and for us that (location and transport) is one of the biggest problems that we face."

--- Interviewee no.20 (Faculty group)

Most interviewees state that international competition is a big challenge for the case study university. Some interviewees (no.7 corporate group, no.10 Department 2 group and no.16 faculty group) point out that international development at the case study university is actually far behind other competitors. There is a lot that the university needs to do to catch up. Competition issues exist objectively and cannot be improved in short term; for example, improvement in the position in league tables 39 (the case study university is ranked at no.91 out of 118 in the United Kingdom, 2010), and reputation take a long time to build up and maintain.

GATE (2007) has presented six categories of governmental restrictions (see discussion of external issues, Chapter 2, section 2.7.2). In the case study, the governmental restriction is primarily reflected in the first two categories: national legislation and higher education policy, and qualifications authorities and policy. A recent typical example is INT College, Israel (see discussion of Q 1.3). Another example is given by interviewees from Faculty B. They point out that in Faculty B, around 300 students from Kuwait are enrolled through an agreement between the case study university and Kuwait government. However, in September 2010, the Kuwait government did not renew that agreement because they do not want to send all their students to the same institution; they want the students to have varied study experience. Thus, the Kuwait government started sending students to other UK institutions instead. This reduces international student recruitment in Faculty B. As corporate interviewee no.7 mentions, Faculty B has to look for other

markets and cannot rely heavily on one single market. Most interviewees realize similar external issues; however in terms of implementation, the faculty groups' views concentrate on the operational process.

Unlike environmental factors, the operational process issues are more likely to be managed by the university and faculties. Operation (implementation) is a process of translating strategic plans and objectives into short-term operative objectives. Implementing a strategy would be an even bigger challenge than creating a strategy. Hrebiniak (2009, p. 3) states that, “[e]ven with careful development of an execution plan at both corporate and business levels, execution success is not guaranteed” because there is a gap between strategy formulation and strategy implementations. The categories of factors include planning, organizational, managerial and individuals (Alexander, 1991; Olsen, Tse and West, 1992; Schmelzer and Olsen, 1994; Noble, 1999b; Aaltonen and Ikavaiko, 2002; Heide, Gronhaug and Johannessen, 2002; Okumus, 2001 and 2003; Dobni, 2003; Freedman, 2003; see discussion of strategy implementation factors, Chapter 2, section 2.3.1).

Faculty is the implementation group who faces the problems directly. As the ‘doers’, faculties are the most qualified group to identify execution problems. It is interesting to note that, compared to the corporate group (nine interviewees) and Department 2 group (six interviewees), the faculty group has only five interviewees, but they identify many more problems than the combination of the other two groups. Why? Because they are at the bottom of the organizational structure and their responsibilities are extremely broad and sometimes with restricted deadlines. If things go awry or strategic plans are not successful, the problems are normally placed at their feet. Some faculty staff feel stressed from dealing with international initiatives.

Operational issues can be separated into four overlapping implemental activities: loading, sequencing, scheduling and control (Daft, 2003; Slack, Chambers and Johnston, 2007); these are primarily rooted within the faculty group.
Firstly, loading is the amount of work allocated. Most faculty interviewees state that work load is a big challenge. Faculty interviewee no.17 directly points out that "internationalization is kind of additional load":

"There is the issue of something starting up and additional load being created that you had not planned for. But then as you are aware of things starting, like we have also got BA College, Botswana who are delivering our undergraduate accounting degree. That is obviously created an additional load on the accountants which is now being planned into their work schedules."

-- Interviewee no.17 (Faculty group)

"...the second semester is a difficult one because they have taken the exams and we start teaching again, so the staff have to be marking while they are teaching. But you can imagine where a pile of moderation of assessment comes in from overseas in the middle of that as well, the workloads can peak and get quite high at some points in the year."

-- Interviewee no.17 (Faculty group)

"The staff are busy and the institution needs to say 'right'...you can not keep asking the same people to do it because they are loaded...."

-- Interviewee no.16 (Faculty group)

Some faculty interviewees are programme leaders or programme coordinators who hold a negative view of internationalization and their consequent cooperation may be reluctant. The climate created by the programme leaders and coordinators may influence other lecturers at the implemental level, and further affect the strategy execution. Programme leaders or coordinators should influence other team members (lecturers) with the desire to provide better performance, but some leaders themselves hold strong negative views on HE internationalization (such as additional workload, time clash and lack of support). Consequently, if a programme leader resists internationalization, then s/he is unlikely to influence other lecturer to pursue it. Although there is no direct evidence of how difficult it is to lead staff, this interpretation is linked with the issue of organizational culture (see discussion of issues of organizational culture and resistance to change). The Department
2 interviewees point out that academics' negative attitude results in strong resistance to participation in international initiatives at the faculty level. Department 2 also suggests that the changes of organizational culture must start with the top management. In order to achieve a culture change, the efficient step within the faculty should be behaviour changes of higher positions (such as deans and senior management), using action to demonstrate how the corporate management treats and evaluates staff’s achievements, contributions and mistakes (see discussion of how to change culture and reduce resistance, Chapter 2, section 2.3.3.5.2).

The above primary data implies that some academics are uncomfortable with and resistant against internationalization if their workload is too heavy. Some academics do not understand how their jobs contribute to an important strategy implementation. The reasons may be lack of motivation, lack of understanding, lack of support, lack of experience, various personal attitudes or organizational culture. However, Department 2 interviewees have an opposite view of workload: they believe that workload for academic staff should not be a problem because international activities are part of their annual work:

"...this activity (internationalization) should be built into the academic workload of appropriate faculty staff...It should be part of their overall annual workload. And we have institutional agreement about how many hours an academic member of staff is supposed to have to do each bit of activity that they have to do. That is part of the overall institutional agreement. So all of this work, the flying out, the teaching, all the moderating somebody... all of that should be part of their annual work."

--- Interviewee no.10 (Department 2 group)

This view implies that no allowance (as discussed later see issue of motivation and incentives) should be given because international activities are arranged within staff’s annual workload.

Secondly, sequencing is a process of ranking priority where decisions must be taken in the order in which the work will be tackled. This results in determining which task is at
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the top of the priority list, and which one is at bottom. The sequencing problem is pointed out by a Department 2 interviewee:

“You are trying to ensure that the home provision is catered and people are free to do their marking in time for the assessment board. You want the students overseas to have a good experience as well as home students. And it is very natural human reaction to leave that till last because the students are long way away and they will not come to your door [laughs]... if people are very busy, you then have the problem of priorities. Staff will naturally prioritize the things that are here and now in front of them, and the people that are a long way away will be bottom of the list... it is difficult.”

— Interviewee no. 14 (Department 2 group)

In other words, the faculty group may not realize that sequencing is a problem for them because they simply follow their priorities. But Department 2 believes that it is unfair if academic staff always put international activities at the bottom of their priority list, such as marking, assessment, moderation, preparation and arrangements for the students of overseas partners. Department 2 points out that overseas students do not have the same experience as home students. Department 2 suggests treating international initiatives equally on both the UK and partners’ sides. The faculties’ version of sequencing puts pressure on Department 2, especially the coordinators or project leaders, because sometimes they feel uneasy having to explain the faculties’ response to collaborative partners. It can affect the trust and communication in the establishment of a collaboration.

Thirdly, scheduling is a term used in planning and control to indicate the detailed timetable of what work should be done and when it should be done. Scheduling is another major problem for the faculty because collaboration tightens up academic schedules. It can clash with the home university’s teaching, staff annual leave and individual holidays. If scheduling is not arranged well it can increase resistance to participation in internationalization. As faculty interviewee no. 17 mentions, the current schedule lacks synchronization between the partner and home institution:
There are obviously ongoing issues. If you take something like delivering Africa, if you are using your own faculty and your own faculty is also delivering on the home programmes in the UK and the member of staff need to go to Africa for two or three weeks, you have then got to make sure that you schedule their work so other people are covering them either full time staff or an associate brought in to do that, so that causes a logistical problem.

--- Interviewee no.17 (Faculty group)

...we have got a very finite pool of academics. Then, if you take one out for three weeks, that has quite a big impact on the faculty and on the students that we have got here in the UK...so that is quite a pressure. I mean it is manageable, we do it, but it is a pressure there.

--- Interviewee no.12 (Department 2 group)

We have the variety of challenges from scheduling...you can get a situation where staff have nowhere to take a holiday. And where you get that, you have to be almost saying, 'Well actually, if a lot of their work is with the partner institution, it is very difficult for them to do work here because of the lack of synchronization between things'.

--- Interviewee no.17 (Faculty group)

In addition, controlling provides feedback about whether desired performance outcomes are being attained. This feedback is important because strategy execution is an adaptive process. Top management rarely gets everything right. Feedback on performance at the front line level is important, so that the corporate can evaluate whether the right things are indeed being accomplished in the strategy implementation process. Any deviation from the plans can then be rectified through some kinds of intervention in operation. Also, feedback is absolutely essential to organizational change or adaptation over time. However, not every implemental problem is fed back to the corporate management, which can be a reason why the corporate group realizes fewer issues compared to the other two groups. Although this is the researcher’s subjective interpretation because there is lack of obvious primary data showing a weak control and feedback system at the case study university, the observed data collected from the case of the S1 Academy, China is partially corresponding with the issue in terms of feedback and control (see observed evidence to Q 6.1). Observed data shows that there are insufficient mechanisms to
monitor the front line implementation within Department 2 (such as Admissions). Potential partners and students do not have efficient feedback from Admissions, and Department 2 does not pay more attention to a potential collaboration. Due to weak feedback and evaluation, most corporate group interviewees thought that the current situation is viable and there is no need for big changes (as discussed later, see Q 7.3). However, the other two groups' answers are different. Two potential reasons are summarized as follows: one reason is insufficient or inefficient feedback, whereby either the information is not fed back to top management or only positive feedback is given; thus the corporate thinks that everything is viable. This is an internal communication problem (as discussed later). The other reason may be that the corporate group purposely does not want to address certain issues because they need to show the researcher their confidence due to ethical concerns. And one corporate interviewee even declined to answer some questions and refused to give his/her evaluative views. However, declining is also an answer because it implies the potential context where his/her personal concerns lie. It may imply that there are some problems that s/he does not want to address. In contrast, both Department 2 and faculty group highlighted many issues; some issues are within their own departments and some are from other departments.

In addition, the faculty group points out another operational issue: a paradox between standardizing own curriculum and adopting local requirements to design new programmes. It is a dilemma of concerning internationalizing or re-evaluating some Anglo-centric curriculum in order to accommodate internationalization because simply changing curriculum may result in losing the U.K. home student market. Some programmes, such as British law, nursing and education are in high demand by the home students. These bespoke programmes are difficult to open to international markets because of government regulations; also compulsory placements (such as education, nursing and law) are not available for international students:
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"My Masters (programme) in education is an excellent one but it is very Anglo-centric, and it is very bespoke for people who are going to teach in England. If I was going to open it up to international students I would have to rewrite a different curriculum that would not be appropriate for home students.

-- Interviewee no.6 (Corporate group)

"There is a certain amount of contextualization... for instance, our law in the UK is going to differ from European, is going to differ from Chinese and Korean etc. Similarly with taxation, what do you teach to in order for it to be relevant to those students? So there is the issue of balance, it is an English degree or a British degree, delivered by a British university with... if you deliver into an international audience you

-- Interviewee no.17 (Faculty group)

"The dilemma between standardizing our own curriculum, adopting local requirement and designing new programmes... that is a particular challenge, and that is to do with staff development and making staff aware of the why those international students are here."

-- Interviewee no.19 (Faculty group)

Motivation and incentive

Motivation is the intensity of a person’s desire to engage in some activity (Locke and Latham, 2004). Motivation can build staff’s skills and self-confidence. Only few interviewees say they are passionate about internationalization. Most faculty interviewees see internationalization as extrinsic (see discussion of motivation and incentives, Chapter 2, section 2.3.3.4), and outside their area of interest. The word allowance is repeated by interviewees, and the number of repetitions implies how important allowance is to the faculty staff members. The researcher believes that allowance is important because there is a lot of work for the faculty to do and therefore they need motivation to do it. Allowance is an incentive to show the management’s appreciation of the faculty’s effort. On the other hand, some interviewees (Department 2 and corporate) hold a different opinion. They think that allowance should not be given because internationalization is part of the faculty’s job. Every staff member has a working contract stating how many hours the employee should work for the university. The university does not ask them to do international activities in off-work time, thus no allowance should be given. Department 2 thinks that the root of reluctant participation is that staff fear uncertainty
and struggle to cope with stress. But the faculty (for example, faculty interviewee no.17) highlights that delays of monetary allowance do de-motivate them.

Actually internationalization is Department 2’s main job, but it needs the faculty’s cooperation to implement. Department 2’s work seems to be adding another work on the faculty’s home teaching task. When academics experience work overload, resistance appears at the faculty level. Furthermore, a Department 2 interviewee also points out that monetary incentive does not really work because Department 2 used to give allowance to academics, but there was not much difference in subsequent performance. Thus Department 2 concludes that the root is not money, but the fear of the uncertainty and struggle to cope with pressure:

"People will be concerned about allowances or workloads...that will be a genuine concern...People thought they wanted time or money...But then when we experimented and we gave people the allowance, nothing changed. It was not to do really with the allowance, it was maybe more to do with dealing pressures and stress, things have changed and mindsets have changed now. So although money and allowances is important, if you solve that, that does not solve the problem, because there are more fundamental things. Culture, fear is a good one. Fear about the unknown. Fear about difference..."

--- Interviewee no.14 (Department 2 group)

Here, the researcher does not intend to judge whether allowance should be given or not. But she does perceive that allowance is a big concern for the faculty staff. The staff’s concern is not just money but recognition. Their work needs to be recognized efficiently. Incentive is a way to show appreciation of their effort and it does not have to be money. The issues of motivation and incentives at the case study university are mainly raised by Department 2 and the faculty; both state that they do not feel motivated or enthusiastic about their job. Some interviewees feel unsatisfied and even frustrated at work. While Department 2 interviewees are looking for motivation in terms of their effort being recognized, some faculty interviewees prefer monetary incentive, such as allowance and more time given for international activities. But the corporate and some senior managers do not think that allowance should be given because they believe that international
activities should be arranged into the academics' normal working schedule. Furthermore, due to previous personal experience, some managers comment that monetary incentive (for example, allowance) does not work because the root of the resistance to change is not allowance but fear and stress. It is evident that there is a conflict between what is asked for and what is given, and also a clash of different mindsets.

However, does monetary incentive really not work? Literature provides an opposite view (see discussion of motivation and incentives, Chapter 2, section 2.3.3.4). According to Hrebiniak's (2009) study of more than 200 organizations, many organizations always seem to be grappling with the right incentives to facilitate strategy execution. For example, more and more CEOs can be seen striking deals that tie pay to performance. Paul Anderson, CEO of Duke Energy, has a contract under which he is paid only with company stock. GE CEO Jeffrey Immelt is paid in 'performance share units', which will become stock shares if performance measures related to the cash flow and shareholder value are met. This suggests that money is an important incentive to international CEOs. By the same token, the researcher does not think that allowance has no effect on the faculty staff.

Senior management may overlook incentives and motivation, reward the 'wrong' thing, or only reward individuals rather than a team because rewarding individuals may have deleterious effects on the effectiveness of the group or team-based approaches (Buchaman and Huczynski, 1997; Locke and Latham, 2004). This may explain that Department 2 thinks that allowance does not work because Department 2 may focus on individuals while expecting an outcome from teamwork. However, there is no direct evidence to state that the management rewards individuals rather than teams. But the researcher believes that allowance does work if it is used correctly because other studies have shown that monetary incentives play an important role in terms of motivation.
Communication, integration and information sharing

Sharing information effectively and achieving coordination of important structural units is clearly vital to making a strategy work (Taylor, Flanagin, Cheney and Seibold, 2001; Jones, Watson, Gardner and Gallois, 2004; Lewis, 2006). Effective communication is critical to achieving successful and persisting change (Smith, 2006). Previous research (Kotter, 1990 and 1995; Olsen, Tse and West, 1992; Schmelzer and Olsen, 1994; Okumus, 2001 and 2003; Heide, Gronhaug and Johannessen, 2002; Dobni, 2003; Freedman, 2003, see Chapter 2, section 2.3.3.2) shows that “poor or inadequate information sharing between individuals or business units responsible for strategy execution” was ranked by the managers responding to surveys as one of the largest obstacles to strategy execution (Hrebiniak, 2009). This obstacle is also typical for the implementation of internationalization at the case study university (especially within Department 2). Communication between Department 2 and the faculty, and even within Department 2, does not appear efficient. The faculty group mentions poor internal communication among different departments, as interviewee no.16 (Faculty group) says:

"... they (academics) do not know what to do, there is a knowledge gap...who are they going to ask to tell them what they need to do to make the developments, how do we (faculty) engage with British Council. There is a diversity of advice and no central repository of that...they (faculty) find it difficult. So there is an inertia which means they tend not to do things because it is difficult to find out how to do it, get the knowledge...We do not always recognize where the expertise is in the university. So that if we wanted to develop in a particular country, we do not know who else has been there and that needs to be increased."

-- Interviewee no.16 (Faculty group)

Meanwhile, according to the answers to Q 1.4 (the role of Department 2) and Q 3.4 (responsibility arrangement and involvement between the case study university and partners during an academic collaboration) shows clearly that Department 2 holds the central responsibility for international initiatives. Department 2 is supposed to give faculties advice, support academics and their knowledge gap on internationalization. There is an inconsistency between what the faculty staff have said (see answers to Q 1.4 and Q 3.4) and practice. For example, in respect to answers to Q 1.4 and Q 3.4, every
interview group understands the role and responsibility of Department 2; it is a clear 'picture'. But in practice, the faculty states that there is lack of expertise, internal support and information about where to seek advice. The faculty gives a muddled answer to this question in terms of problems and issues of HE internationalization, which conflicts with their previous answers (to Q 1.4 and Q 3.4). There is no obvious evidence to explain why this kind of conflict occurs. Three potential explanations may address the conflict. Firstly, Department 2's support lies only in documents or words, thus there is lack of real practical operation and the faculties struggle with insufficient internal support (pointed out by the faculty); next, faculties intend to explain their difficulties with the excuse of the lack of support from Department 2. The root cause behind this may be that the faculty is not willing to participate in HE internationalization (pointed out by Department 2); and finally, communication and interaction between Department 2 and the faculty is weak (see the answer of faculty interviewee no.16).

However, contrasting with the faculty's view, Department 2's explanation is highly corresponding to the researcher's second point of interpretation (see previous paragraph) as that there is strong resistance to internationalization at the faculty level and Department 2 perceives that faculties are neither keen to cooperate in internationalization, nor willing to change anything (more detail see issue of organizational culture and resistance to change, Q 6.1).

"It (international activities) depends on the attitude of the staff (faculty academics) and when the staff is more open-minded... but they probably do not want, if the staff sees there is something extra for them to do they probably just ignore it and I met a lot of problems like this and different people have got a different attitude."

--- Interviewee no.13 (Department 2 group)

During interviews, the researcher was surprised to hear that some Department 2 staff who are responsible for international recruitment commented that they do not know the
international strategy of the case study university and that no one told them or did a proper induction about it:

"I am not very clear about it (international strategy) and I know the university has an internationalization strategy, but I am not very clear because nobody ever tell me about this, therefore, I think the university should tell people, even the temporary or sessional staff to clear about this strategy..."

-- Interviewee no.13 (Department 2 group)

That is surprising. If international recruiters do not know the university's international strategy, how do they go out and recruit students? Another inconsistent answer is from the management of Department 2: a key interviewee from Department 2 mentions that s/he has no idea about what Faculty D (offering programmes in Hospitality, Travel and Hotel Management) is doing. It is hardly unexpected that a Faculty D interviewee (no.20) complains that they are struggling to deliver their messages out to international markets. There is not enough support from Department 2:

"We (Faculty D) are almost on that second stage really in their (Department 2) marketing strategy. They are going out there with Management with Business and tackling that area and then if it happens to work with it being Tourism or Hospitality or Leisure Management then it comes to us..."

-- Interviewee no.20 (Faculty group)

"I think the challenge for us is to work with the [Department 2] about how they would ensure equal access and equal opportunity for international students here (Faculty D) and equal experience for the international students here, even though we may be a smaller body of students."

-- Interviewee no.20 (Faculty group)

Since Department 2 does not know Faculty D well, it is not difficult to understand why Faculty D asks for equivalent support from Department 2. And Faculty D perceives that they are always left out from Department 2's central international recruitment strategy (as discussed later, see Q 7.2). However, from the other point of view, the response of that key Department 2 interviewee (s/he has no idea about what Faculty D is doing) is consistent with one corporate interviewee's (no.3) explanation in terms of the reasons why the degree of internationalization among the faculties is different (more detail see Q
7.2), saying that "that faculty (Faculty D) has always done their own thing. Because they did not feel that the international office centrally was strong enough or just because they are always like this, they have always got to be autonomous..." Faculty D’s autonomy can partially explain the reason why the key Department 2 interviewee commented that s/he does not know what Faculty D is doing, while Faculty D may not fully agree with it. In short, here the primary data implies a critical internal communication issue within the case study university. This is an example of inadequate communication. Although other faculties claim ‘adequate’ communication, they also have some issues of integration and coordination. Interviewee no.17 states that another issue is ‘conflicts around who (faculty academics or Department 2 staff) goes around to recruit’:

"...there will be conflicts because as a faculty we will feel that we can represent ourselves better than someone general from the university...if you try to sell particular courses...it will be better to have our programme leader going out and talking to them (potential students) rather than him (Department 2) passing information about the course to somebody...there will always tend to be some sort of conflict around who goes because we think we can do it better than they (Department 2) can."

— Interviewee no.17 (Faculty group)

Academics are experts on the curriculum and subjects and therefore can deliver much more detail to potential students rather than an international officer giving out flyers at a university fair. Thus, who should go out becomes an issue. The researcher believes that it is reasonable for faculty academics (especially programme leaders) to be more involved in international recruitment because the schedule must be well arranged for the academic delivery and Department 2’s international recruitment schedule may not always match it. In order to achieve high levels of consistency, the faculty should be more involved in internationalization. Furthermore, sometimes faculties are desperate to hit their recruitment target by recruiting more international students, thus some projects proposed by the faculty may conflict with Department 2’s central priority. There is a mismatch between the faculty’s own purpose and Department 2’s central planning:
“With Department 2, it might be that we wish to run a particular programme and we want to get it off the ground quickly, and because it is going through a central department (Department 2) who is looking at the whole picture, they might have a different perspective on it than we do. We might want it for our own purposes and to increase our numbers but it might not fit in the overall university strategy so they might not give it the priority we want. So there will always be factions and groups who will be fighting for one thing or another. What needs to happen is a compromised solution that has to be reached which, in part, satisfy both parties.”

-- Interviewee no.17 (Faculty group)

A Department 2 interviewee (no.13) points out another perspective of inefficient information sharing within Department 2 as the lack of internal updating, support and training. Staff find difficult to promote certain programmes that are outside their personal knowledge. It is difficult for them when there is no regular training:

“(when I start the work) nobody does a proper induction for me. I have to explore on my own. Some subjects (programmes) I am very familiar with because I learned before, but some subjects, like computing or architecture that I have no idea. If I do not know this programme, how can I sell it internationally? It really needs staff development and regularly updating.”

-- Interviewee no.13 (Department 2 group)

Why are there so many communication problems? Logically, strategy implementation always involves more people than strategy formulation. This presents a potential communication problem. Communication across the university or across different departments (Department 2 and faculties) becomes an inevitable challenge.

The case study also explores another aspect of communication: external communication between the case study university and potential students or foreign partners. At the case study university, Admissions is the key department that deals directly with international applications and Department 2 primarily handles academic collaborations. Both departments are engaged in external communication. The Department 2 case study indicates that external communication is weak (see the observed evidence to Q 6.1), and there is lack of efficient mechanisms to monitor the front line service and performance.
The researcher believes that the root of the communication issue is that it is difficult to measure the efficiency and quality of communication. Since the scope of external communication is larger than internal communication, the associated efficiency becomes more difficult to evaluate.

**Student support** is another issue (pointed out mainly by the faculty). The particular responsible department is the International Student Center (previously called the International Office), a recently formed department that mainly supports new students. The partially shared points of the corporate and faculty show that the International Office (under Department 2) needs to support international students more, including offering English language provision, settlement, enquiry and relevant advice about studies and social life in the UK. Faculties are not satisfied with current student support. A Faculty D interviewee (no.20) points out that Department 2 must provide equal support for international students at another campus to ensure equal access, opportunity and experience as those in other faculties at the central campus; in particular, *more support should be given to our (Faculty D) January intake students* (according to Faculty interviewee no. 20):

> "It is very important that the [Department 2] consider that (student support), and how they (Department 2) support the students in [Faculty D] is as equally important to how they support them in [the university of [X]], even though there may be a smaller cohort here."

--- Interviewee no.20 (Faculty group)

> "I think another thing is when we take January starters, that often not only means that they are out of kilter with their academic side but the support structures are not as strong for the people that join in January as they are in September. So we need to be thinking about what we do in terms of January starters and the international community. We need to make our induction much stronger for them."

--- Interviewee no.20 (Faculty group)

Faculty B interviewee no.19 says that the International Office needs to play a greater role and work with faculties closely to provide better student support and service:
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"I think that the international office needs to play a greater role in supporting staff and students in the faculties (they are changing now) ... giving them (international students) financial advice, helping them to settle, and greet them at the airport, helping them to sort of connect with local network groups."

-- Interviewee no. 19 (Faculty group)

However, the issue of international student support (see primary data of faculty group-specific points to Q 6.1) may not be fully realized by the International Student Centre and Department 2 because no Department 2 interviewee considers student support a potential issue during HE internationalization.

Coordination and cooperation are important for all kinds of organizations. Coordination is the process of achieving unity of action among interdependent activities (Hrebiniak, 2009). Cooperation concerns building certain mechanisms and linking individuals in the ways that permit them to perform given tasks, such as implementing a strategy efficiently (Thorpe and Morgan, 2007). At the case study university, Department 2 is the central coordinating department that deals mainly with internationalization. Programme leaders or faculty coordinators make sure that international activities are implemented at the faculty level.

The corporate group makes strategic decisions; the faculty group implements the strategy. Department 2 is in the middle as a coordinator that centralizes international activities across faculties; other responsibilities of Department 2 include administration, student support, recruitment, and online and distance study. In respect to cooperation scenarios (Wyner and Malone 1996; Handfield and Nicols, 1999; Udomleartprasert and Junghirapanich, 2006; see discussion of coordination and cooperation, Chapter 2, section 2.3.3.3, figure 2.4), the ‘centralized cooperation’ is the expected position that the case study university aims to achieve. In respect to figure 2.4 (see Chapter 2, section 2.3.3.3), Department 2 can be seen as the ‘central department’. Around it, the associated departments are the faculties, corporate, overseas partners and international students.
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However, the case study university’s current position is between ‘decentralized cooperation’ and ‘centralized cooperation’ (see figure 2.4) because there are overarching responsibilities and accountabilities between the faculties and Department 2. The corporate allows the faculties to directly conduct internationalization if international activities are more faculty-driven:

"...we're looking to do is to have an overarching approach and that that will be driven by a partnership between the international office and the [Department 2] and the faculties. And it may be that the balance of activity in any particular initiative will be more international office and less faculty and, sometimes it will be more faculty, less international office. And, in particular, if a faculty said, "For our particular programme, there is this country, which is worth going to, but it is not good for others" then that would be very much more a faculty approach supported by the international office. Where if it is somewhere like China or India then all the university is interested so it would primarily be lead by International Office."

-- Interviewee no.1 (Corporate group)

Each faculty has to hit international recruitment targets. Some academics are directly involved in international recruitment and faculties have the authority to carry out business planning in terms of internationalization. Currently, the overarching accountability and responsibility between Department 2 and faculties has become muddled. Faculty can be directly linked to potential partners and therefore the role of Department 2 is not completely centralized. The Faculty B interviewees state that most of their internationalization is done by the faculty; they also state that Department 2 should work closely with the faculty and offer more support. The root of internationalization, especially academic collaboration and partnership, should always be within the faculty because faculties have expertise and can independently handle academic collaborations and particular subject areas (this includes syllabus, programme articulation, moderation, validation and programme delivery). In terms of partnership, faculties should get more involved and Department 2 should play the role of coordinator rather than commander in order to achieve desired performance outcomes.
Responsibility and accountability are two of the most important prerequisites for a successful cooperation and coordination. Staff in different departments need to know who is doing what, when, and why, as well as who is accountable for the key steps in both coordination and implementation. However, it seems that the role of the International Office is not clear to the faculty:

"In terms of [Department 2], I think what we really need a real constructive dialogue across the university about the role of the International Office, how it is resourced, how it is organized, and to make sure that it is working closely with the faculties, because I do not think at the moment it is as strong as it could be perhaps."

-- Interviewee no.19 (Faculty group)

Faculty interviewee no.19 also mentions that most international activities have been done by the faculty rather than through Department 2. Since internationalization is Department 2's main focus, Department 2 should have the major accountability and responsibility for it. But Department 2 does not have expertise and associated functions to fulfill its responsibility and accountability because it is a coordinating department without implementation functions. Thus the role of Department 2 implies that Department 2 cannot fully manage HE internationalization, although Department 2 claims they do. And another potential difficulty is deciding which aspects of internationalization should be done by Department 2 and which should be handled over to the faculty. In practice, it is difficult to fully separate an international initiative into 'Department 2-driven' and 'faculty-driven'. As subject experts, the faculty suggests that the foundation of international partnerships should be within faculties.

"I think the faculties have to make the links, because if they are all centralized, it is very difficult for a centralized, non-academic department (Department 2) to understand what the needs might be. So it has to be a partnership really, and the (plant) branches have to be...in the sense the roots of the plant have to be the faculty, and then the centre (Department 2) also needs to sort of take a very clear administrative role within that as well.

-- Interviewee no.19 (Faculty group)
It is evident that, in terms of academic collaboration, faculty suggests that Department 2 should focus mainly on administration and internal support. However, whether Department 2 fully agrees with the faculty's view is questionable.

The issue of cooperation and coordination is also reflected in low efficiency (in Department 2). The faculty staff state that Admissions takes too long to pass student applications (such as advanced standing or applications with exemption requests) to the faculty (for example, programme leaders), and the feedback to the applicants is also inefficient:

"I think applications have not been dealt with as speedily as they could do... They apply to the International Office, and then the International Office sends the application to the faculty, to the programme leader. The programme leader then says, 'yes' or 'no', and sends it back again. But then there seems to be a delay between sending it back again to the international office and the student actually getting the offer."

-- Interviewee no.19 (Faculty group)

Practically, one application needs several lines of enquiry and communications. If potential students cannot get efficient response the faculty may lose those students. Triangulating with the observed data from the case of the S1 Academy, China (see observed evidence to Q 6.1), this is exactly what has happened with the S1 Academy students. These two different data sets correlate and highlight the issue of low efficiency in application processing. Furthermore, another department has a similar problem. As interviewee no.13 states, Department 2 takes a long time to prepare an agreement or contract for an agent or a partnership.

"...low efficiency and working, we needed agency or partnership agreement... the agreement is very slow goes through a certain procedure... and obviously disappointing, which is another reason I am leaving this university soon... frustrating."

-- Interviewee no.13 (Department 2 group)
Inefficiency in contract preparation may break the trust that the International Officer has built up with potential partners or agents. This can directly affect their work and frustrate staff. The observed data from the case of the S1 Academy (see Q 6.1) also demonstrates how slow the preparation is. Up to now, there has been no contract or even a draft contract sent to the S1 Academy.

Organizational culture and change

Besides communication, another major issue is organizational culture and change (see discussion of how to change culture and reduce resistance, Chapter 2, section 2.3.3.5.2), which is pointed out mainly by Department 2, saying that the faculty’s culture and attitude lead to the academics’ strong resistance to participating in international initiatives. A great deal has been written about organizational culture. Culture helps define performance outcomes (Gordon, 1991 and Hofstede, 1997), including how work gets done, what rewards are valued, how mistakes or errors are treated, and what management styles are appropriate. Subcultures within organizations or across operating units affect employees’ behaviour (Neuijen, Ohayv and Sander, 1990; Garibaldi De Hilal, Ursula and Ferreira, 2009). Negative behaviour is normally reflected in resistance to change and accept something new. Maurer (1996) states that resistance can stem from two sets of circumstances. Level 1 resistance is based on the lack of information or honest disagreement over facts. It is mainly driven by the uncertainty of environment, rather than personal attitude or emotion; thus if the ‘unknown’ gap can be fully filled with desired facts this kind of resistance will disappear. In the case study, weak communication directly contributes to this level of resistance because the staff are not well informed (see previous discussion on communication issues). In contrast, level 2 resistance is more personal and emotional; individual attitude and styles are hardly changed by external environment or facts. For example, one boss asks a staff member to work in another office in a nearby city. The staff may reject this because of the associated costs of fuel and time. But when s/he is offered transport allowance and a flexible schedule, s/he may still refuse to do it because the true underlying reason is not petrol or time, but something else (such as willingness, stress or workload). In the case study, level
2 resistance is reflected in the individual academics’ attitude and resistance to change. Since the root cause resistance is not solved, Department 2 and corporate interviewees conclude that allowance does not work (see previous discussion of motivation and incentive issue). In short, both types of resistance are consistent with the interviewees’ answers. As the common points state, ‘the issue of staff attitude, the root is fear and the unknown’. The staff are ‘struggling to deal with stress, fear of change and uncertainty’:

“I think fear has a lot to do with it... Fear about the unknown. Fear about difference... I have (academics who) work with these partners in Greece or Malaysia or Botswana... What will it be like? I think there was a lot of fear initially about what happens if academics over there are more qualified than I am? This feeling that we are the UK university and we have got to tell you how to do it, but then this fear of well how can I do that if you are more qualified than I am. There was a lot of fear and a lot of unknown.”

-- Interviewee no.14 (Department 2 group)

The resistance of faculty is primarily individual. Some academics resist change simply because change represents uncertainty, and they fear the unknown (Visagie and Botha, 1998; Karim and Kathawala, 2005). Some academics might resist change because they are concerned about their own personal failure (Mink, 1992) or potential threats (Giangreco and Peccei, 2005), such as ‘what am I going to do if the partners’ qualifications are higher than mine’ (according to Department 2 interviewee no.14), because most staff are used to teaching or demonstrating to partners how to deliver programmes. But when their partners have higher qualifications, some faculty academics may feel uncomfortable teaching in this situation.

Oreg (2006, p. 76) states that resistance is a “tridimensional (negative) attitude toward change”, which can be reflected in the affective dimensions of individual reactions: how one feels about the change. Affective reactions to change include experiencing such emotions as elation, anxiety, anger, fear, enthusiasm, and apprehension (see discussion of relationship between organizational culture and employees’ behaviour, Chapter 2, section 2.3.3.5.1). According to Department 2’s interviewee no.14, the form of resistance by the faculty academics can be seen as staff taking their own frustrations out on the partner:
"They (academics) can see it (internationalization) as a drain on themselves and they can blame the partner. Quite often, people used to take their frustrations out on the partner and so they were cross about their workload and so it would make them uncooperative... When they moderated work they were naturally inclined to be very negative..."

--- Interviewee no.14 (Department 2 group)

Research findings show that there is strong resistance in terms of internationalization at the faculty level. Other primary data in terms of staff attitude are listed as follows:

"There is quite a lot of resistance to anything new anyway. I do not think a lot of the academics here are that happy with change... some of the management really do not want to do international although they say that they do because Vice Chancellor is asking them. But I think one or two of them do not want to, others will say, 'well, my subject is very specifically British'...I just think we do not quite understand it really...and the management here can never quite get a grip on and they just think we do not really understand this."

--- Interviewee no.3 (Corporate group)

"The challenge I face is the attitude... something (new partner or collaboration) the faculty probably does not want... that is the bigger problem, and it is difficult for me."

--- Interviewee no.13 (Department 2 group)

"That it depends on the faculty. Actually, it is dramatically different between the Faculty A, Faculty B or Faculty D. Faculty D and Faculty B are very warm and keen...but when there are some (potential) partnerships, nobody in this school (Faculty A) is interested. I think because they (Faculty A) have two Chinese partners and they probably think they have enough to manage...if staff sees there is something extra for them to do they probably just ignore it... different people have got a different attitude."

--- Interviewee no.13 (Department 2 group)

"...you will get those faculties want to embrace this stuff (international initiatives) and those that do not want to. So you always have a cultural issue of trying to get people onboard and interested and so on...really it is the internal culture and perhaps acknowledging people's efforts when they do contribute. So it is not seen as 'oh god' something else we have got to do... like a burden."

--- Interviewee no.11 (Department 2 group)
It is clear that strong resistance and staff attitude really affect internationalization. Most interviewees (such as the Department 2 staff) suggest staff development and training in order to help change faculty academics' attitudes. The Department 2 interviewees view faculty's resistance to change as a problem; consequently, they view staff development and training as a potential solution. However, can staff development and training really change attitudes? How can the existing organizational culture be changed? According to Herbinia (2009), an efficient solution is not staff development; culture change should start with behaviour, using the leader's influence to change the organizational climate (Gordon, 1991; Trice and Beyer, 1993; Smith, 2006; Self and Schraeder, 2008), rather than changing the culture or attitude, since attitude is personal and will not be changed easily but it can be influenced efficiently (see discussion of how to change culture and reduce resistance, Chapter 2, section 2.3.3.5.2).

Quality assurance is always a challenge. Interviewee no.7 (corporate group) says that QAA is an issue against HE internationalization. It evaluates international collaboration closely and requires every U.K. university to operate within its compulsory rules. Some partners may find it difficult to understand and accept it:

"... there are issues about against internationalization as a whole, about the way in which we have to operate to QAA benchmarks, the procedures that we need to undertake there."

--- Interviewee no.7 (Corporate group)

"Quality issues, you always have to be mindful of quality assurance issues. You have got to be mindful of collaborations. There are special rules in relation to collaborations that you must comply with..."

--- Interviewee no.1 (Corporate group)

"...the quality processes can be quite hard for some partners to get used to, so we have to do a lot of development with them...if you are working in collaboration and working abroad, then when you are quality assured as an institution, so the QAA here will look very closely at those types of partnership"
because they do see them as high risk. You have to be totally assured that what you are doing is right, because otherwise it could affect your status back in, with our own quality assurance regimes.”

--- Interviewee no. 5 (Corporate group)

The case study university is fully aware of the quality issues as “all faculties have responsibility for the majority of the University’s extensive further education provision. All faculties have collaborative provision” (University of [X] Collaboration Audit Report, December, 2006, p. 4). Quality Enhancement Department (QED) was established mainly to be responsible for quality assurance. All types of collaboration have to go through a strict validation procedure, which will be regularly audited by QAA. 40

Here the researcher posits that having the issue of quality assurance does not mean that the case study university has a problem with quality or offers bad service; actually, quality assurance is what the university is good at. But maintaining that quality with different overseas partners in different collaborations does challenge the university in terms of integration, administration and partnership management. For example, some partner institutions are allowed to use their local languages (such as Greek and Hebrew) in programme delivery. That not only adds more cost of translating teaching materials, second marking and assessment, but also affects U.K. quality assurance. The case study university needs to prepare more complicated materials (for example, minutes of meetings, recommendations, progression report, monitoring report, moderation reports, site visiting records, and translated materials) with different kinds of collaborations to assure the quality. Furthermore, since collaborative partners carry the case study university’s brand, the case study university has to bear more responsibility in terms of quality assurance, moderation, assessment and collaboration management. Generally, a more hands-on way (students are taught by the home university academics through ‘flying faculty’) means lower risk in terms of quality assurance but higher cost; the more hands-off way (students are taught by local lecturers) means higher risk but less expense.

40 The latest collaboration audit is conducted in December 2006. Audit report of University of [X] is published in QAA official website (source: www.qaa.ac.uk).
Thus the university has to balance it. The answer to Q 3.1 is interrelated with the challenge of quality assurance. The answers to Q 3.1 show that the university adopts various modes of market entry in HE internationalization, which puts the concern of quality into a particular focus in terms of mode of entry; for instance, if franchise is adopted, the quality challenge links to local programme delivery; if validation is adopted, the quality challenge links to the validation of the partners' curriculum (for example, how to make sure that the partner's programme is equivalent to its own curriculum). And if credit transfer / articulation is adopted, then it should be agreed how many credits can be transferred without affecting academic quality. These are the areas that require more scrutiny (by QAA).

Research findings show that all academic partners are required to meet academic standards of the case study university because they carry the name of the home institution. Interviewees mention that sometimes, it is difficult for foreign partners to fully understand and uphold the regulations from the home institution. A corporate interviewee (no.3) points out that quality in terms of service provision is considered less of an issue at the case study university for two reasons. Firstly, international development at the university is far behind other competitors and quality assurance is not a major challenge with only a small number of international students; secondly, because of a previous bad international experience (approximately five-seven years ago), the senior management considers internationalization a high risk initiative; thus HE internationalization was not posited before as a priority for the university. This explains the reasons why the case study university has a small number of international students and its international development is behind other U.K. competitor universities. Due to these reasons, quality in terms of internationalization is not an obvious challenge.

Other issues
Other issues include 'identifying a suitable partner' and 'mismatched international recruitment strategy'. The corporate group states that 'identifying a suitable partner,
agent management and contract negotiation’ is always problematic (see Corporate group-specific points). As interviewee no.1 (Corporate group) says,

"You have to be wary of the offers you’re made because, anybody (potential partner or agents) will make as good a claim as possible and you have got to be able to ensure that they are a partner... Not just that there is a business opportunity but you and they match well enough to be able to work together. Because if you are very different in what you are trying to achieve, you both may be very good, but working together will not be easy."

— Interviewee no.1 (Corporate group)

Compared to other faculties, Faculty D only has a small number of international students and faculty interviewee no.20 from Faculty D mentions that Faculty D is always left out of the central international recruitment strategy, which does not fit Faculty D’s niche programmes properly. This is one of the reasons why Faculty D has few international students. One corporate interviewee (no.3) does realize that there is a mismatch between the central international strategy and Faculty D’s niche programmes (as discussed later, see Q 7.2). However, Department 2’s explanation (according to Department 2’s interviewee no.4) is that Faculty D’s programmes are too unique to find ‘feeders’ and Department 2’s resource is limited, thus it is impossible to seize every opportunity or potential market. Currently, the recruitment strategy focuses geographically on five key markets (see discussion of international recruitment strategy, Q 2.1 and Appendix 4), rather than starting with particular niche programmes. This increases the barrier to promote Faculty D’s programmes globally.

When considering all the issues, it is interesting to note that each group points out other groups’ problems, but rarely realizes their own problems. Sometimes, people cannot see themselves objectively from the insider perspective. Views from different groups provide a more comprehensive picture in terms of issues and challenges of HE internationalization. It can help different departments to better understand their own problems that may be overlooked or missed.
Will the following present any concern? Please comment:

Q 6.2 If the trend towards internationalization on traditional centralized campuses will mean that more foreign students come here, what impacts will this have? Are there any challenges to teaching and learning practice, faculty or facility? Will a larger number of overseas students cause overcrowding or unbalanced groups?

Evidence from primary data (Q 6.2 Impact of overcrowding or unbalanced groups)

Q 6.2 investigates the issues and associated impact of overcrowding or unbalanced groups in classes caused by a large number of overseas students. This is an evaluative question. Some interviewees gave analytical responses as well (see Appendix 18, table 4.29, impact of overcrowding or unbalanced groups). The summary of primary data is presented in table 4.30.

Due to a small proportion of international students, overcrowding or unbalanced groups are commonly considered less of an issue at the case study university. However, most interviewees realize that the potential impact of overcrowding or unbalanced groups can affect students' study experience and challenge teaching, learning and quality standards in practice. The corporate group points out that the university should not rely heavily on the income from international recruitment, but focus on its core activities on the original site. Therefore, the university prefers a mixed student group than a large number of international students from one nation. However, it is difficult for the university to completely separate international students, especially in the out-of-class situations.

Table 4.30 Primary data of impact of overcrowding or unbalanced groups (Q 6.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T5, Q-6.2</th>
<th>Common points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| All Groups| • The university does not have this issue due to small proportion of international students.  
• Generally, over-recruitment of one nationality can affect students’ study experience. It needs to be balanced. |
| Partially shared points | |  
| Department 2-Corporate | • None |
| Department 2-Faculty | • None |
Evidence from secondary data (Q 6.2 Impact of overcrowding or unbalanced groups): No evidence.

Evidence from other data (Q 6.2 Impact of overcrowding or unbalanced groups): Full time Masters programmes in business subjects are most likely to be overcrowded, often with students from one nation dominating a class. The researcher's own overseas study experience proves that there is overcrowding or unbalanced groups: in the researcher's Masters programme, Chinese students dominated classes; there were only two British students and a few European students. Foreign students (including the researcher) preferred to stay together and speak their native language, especially outside classes. In addition, the researcher feels that some British and European students purposely do not want to mix with foreign students, either. But the problem of overcrowding or unbalanced groups only occurs in certain programmes, and therefore cannot represent the whole phenomenon in the university.

Analysis and summary (Q 6.2 Overcrowding or unbalanced groups) Generally, overcrowding or unbalanced groups is not an issue for the case study university because the case study university only has a small number of international students (approximately less than 700). But all interviewees realize that overcrowding or unbalanced groups can be a problem that may further affect the students' study experience. However, this issue only occurs in certain programmes, such as full-time Masters programmes, where students from one nationality might dominate classes.
Lecturers have to separate them to ensure efficient interaction among the students because the quality of service provision is always the university’s priority. Students are strongly encouraged to interact with foreign classmates to ensure better mutual enrichment.

As one corporate interviewee states, maintaining student balance is important for the students to gain inter-cultural experience in terms of learning, English language speaking and social life. Student experience is the key task for the university, also in relation to international recruitment. Sometimes the university has to say “no” to feeders and limit the number of students from one feeder, as interviewee no.5 (Corporate group) says:

"...that (overcrowding or unbalanced groups) is one of the challenges, because we have partners in China and they say, 'I can send you 200 students in September.' And I have to say 'I do not want 200 from you'. I do not want 200 from one place because they will not get an English experience ...they will stay together, they will not speak English. We have to be quite carefully if somebody says that to us, we might want the business, we would say 'well, you can send 200 students, but they are not going to get an English experience'."

-- Interviewee no.5 (Corporate group)

The university prefers a mixed student group rather than a large number of international students from one country. Under the current economic recession, the university needs more international students, and ensuring that the students have a satisfactory study experience is always an academic priority. Furthermore, the corporate also mentions that the home students should always be the primary market. It is dangerous for the university to rely heavily on international income:

"It would be very unwise for any university to become too reliant on international student income because it is so volatile...all you have got to have is a volcano goes off, half your students do not arrive. If 50% of your income was dependent on overseas students, you had be bankrupt. By 2014, in the Corporate Strategy, our aim is to have at least 1,500 overseas students but that will be split between the four faculties...so 1500 students out of 24,000 is not a lot and we do not want to be much more reliant on it.”

-- Interviewee no.5 (Corporate group)
The corporate interviewee (no.5) further gave two examples to explain the reasons why the university cannot rely too much on the recruitment of international students. In 2003 the SARS disease spread worldwide, which resulted in fewer Asian students recruited in September 2003. Another example is the epidemic of swine flu in Mexico in 2009. It had a significant impact on the recruitment in Latin America, especially Mexico in 2009.

The problem of overcrowding or unbalanced groups also can be interpreted as ‘neglect of the local at the eclipse of the global’ (Maringe, 2009; see discussion of neglect of the local at the eclipse of the global, Chapter 2, section 2.7.10), where local issues are eclipsed by the preoccupation with internationalization. When foreign students dominate a class, the home students may be overlooked and consequently good study experience is not guaranteed. However, this is not the circumstance at the case study university because firstly, this challenge only occurs when internationalization becomes the top priority of an institution; however, internationalization is just one of eight key corporate strategies in the following five-year plan at the case study university. Secondly, the issue of overcrowding or unbalanced groups is more likely to occur when an institution has a large number of international students. But the number of international students at the case study university is small (around 700 out of 23,760, up to 2010), and the international recruitment plan is to have 1500 international students by 2014 (there are over 25,000 on-campus students). The expected 1500 international students will be across four faculties and this number still represents a small proportion of the total of 25,000 students, thus this issue is less likely to happen. Thirdly, as a British university, the U.K. home market should always be the institution’s priority. As “Professor Shattock of London’s Institute of Education says ‘universities have to got to stick to their knitting – the core purpose to provide teaching and research on the original site’ and David Pilsbury of Worldwide Universities Network believes that HE internationalization should not simply be a money-making vehicle, but a ‘healthy’ activity such as a true partnership or joint academic research” (Hodges, 2007, n.p). Internationalization is definitely an
alternative channel of income generation, but it should not be the principal development direction.

There are too many uncertainties and risks within international markets. In terms of student integration, both the faculty and corporate realize that sometimes student integration is a cultural issue (such as religions), and it may be difficult to achieve cross-cultural outcomes, as Corporate interviewee no.3 says:

"There is cultural issue where they (foreign students) want to be with their type of people or they only want to be with... Muslim women only want to be with Muslim women, that kind of thing... some of the things you have to respect."

-- Interviewee no.3 (Corporate group)

Q 6.3 If the trend towards internationalization focuses on partnership collaboration that means more overseas students will study in their home countries (with our partners). What is the impact on off-campus course delivery, such as, staff arrangement and quality assurance?

Evidence from primary data (Q 6.3 Impact on off-campus study)

Q 6.3 investigates the impact of off-campus study during HE internationalization. This is an evaluative question. Most interviewees also gave analytical responses. Two answers do not match the interview question (see Appendix 18, table 4.31, impact on the off-campus study). The summary of primary data is presented in table 4.32.

The commonly agreed impact on the off-campus study (academic collaboration and partnership) primarily lies in the operational process, especially at the faculty level, including heavy workloads, overextended academic schedules, cooperation, change, culture clash and limited resources. These issues have been addressed in previous discussion (see Q 6.1). Based on different understanding of the impact of the off-campus study, there are inconsistent views on quality among interviewees. Some interviewees state that there is a significant drop in quality in respect to study experience because local
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students who choose to complete the entire programme in their own country will not have the same experience as those who study abroad; in relation to quality assurance, some interviewees stress that off-campus activities do not impact on the university in any way because quality is well controlled and monitored by both QAA and the Quality Enhancement Department. However, studying locally or abroad is the students' choice. The university can only make sure that learning opportunities, academic standards and academic experience will not be different between on-campus and off-campus studies. In addition, the faculty group points out that the level of technology (such as access to the internet) and physical facilities in some developing regions can affect teaching and learning in off-campus studies.

Table 4.32 Primary data of impact on off-campus study (Q 6.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T5, Q-6.3</th>
<th>Common points</th>
<th>Partially shared points</th>
<th>Group-specific points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| All Groups | • Teaching abroad may disrupt home delivery. A sessional delivery team (such as part-time or sessional staff) may overcome it (loading).  
• Impact on academic schedule and workload. | • A significant drop in quality in terms of study experience for local students who choose to complete their study in their own countries. However, that is the students' choice.  
• Quality assurance has no impact.  
• Staff resource, staff arrangement and the need for more staff. |  
| Department 2-Corporate |  
| Department 2-Faculty |  
| Corporate-Faculty | • Challenge for management to motivate staff (resistance).  
• The learning opportunity, academic standard and academic experience must be no different between on-campus and off-campus. |  
| Corporate | • Impact on quality assurance.  
• Partner training and monitoring (partner/agent management). |  
| Department 2 | • Off-campus activities do not impact on university in any way because it is well controlled.  
• University does not benefit a lot from internationalization, but it does an investment job to build its international reputation that can increase direct recruitment. |  
| Faculty | • Impact on unexpected and fluctuated recruitment (loading).  
• Impact on capital resources (investment / budgeting). |
Evidence from secondary data (Q 6.3 Impact on off-campus study): No evidence.

Evidence from other data (Q 6.3 Impact on off-campus study): No evidence.

Analysis and summary (Q 6.3 Impact on off-campus study)
Some impacts on off-campus delivery overlap with the issues and challenges (see discussion of Q 6.1), such as staff workload, resource, scheduling and external environment issues. Answers to Q 6.3 show that most impacts are concentrated at the operational level within the faculties’ scope. Different views in terms of quality are emerging: some interviewees comment that there is no impact on quality in the off-campus study, while others state that there is a significant drop in quality:

“I suppose the impact would be that more staff would be out there teaching so, you had have to look at your staff base and your resource and see how you would cope with that. The quality of the course should not be altered because that is...The quality is sort of developed here and goes through our quality procedures and everything, so the quality should not be impacted.”

-- Interviewee no. 12 (Department 2 group)

Others are concerned that there is a significant drop in quality because students who study locally cannot have the same experience as those who study abroad in the on-campus traditional settings:

“...if you do the course 100% in the country, it is ok, they get the qualification, but they may not get the experience. But some people choose to do that...In terms of quality, obviously there will be a drop because they do not have the experience...I think it will drop significantly...That is why we have got to do a blended model where they study the course here (UK) and also there (foreign countries).”

-- Interviewee no. 15 (Department 2 group)
The former view is based on academic standards which are normally audited by QAA, while the latter view is from student experience. Experience of studying abroad is definitely different from studying locally. But that is the students' choice. Due to various reasons (for example, distance, economy and jobs), some students choose off-campus study without leaving their own countries. That is not the scope that the university can control. What the university can do is to ensure that the academic standard is the same, no matter which study model is adopted. In addition, a Department 2 interviewee (no.10) views HE internationalization from the marketing point of view. HE internationalization is an investment that builds up the university's international reputation and profile and therefore helps increase direct recruitment:

"Once it is up and running, it is quite a secure thing, it is about growing reputation, it grows our reputation internationally, which then results in more international students coming direct to here. So partially it is an investment."

-- Interviewee no.10 (Department 2 group)

Section 4.5.7 Theme 6: Internationalization of faculties

Q 7.1 Could you please rank the level of internationalization among the following four faculties on a four-point scale (for example, 4 indicates the highest level of internationalization; 1 indicates the lowest level):

Faculty A:
Faculty B:
Faculty C:
Faculty D:

Evidence from primary data (Q 7.1 Ranking of level of internationalization across faculties)

Q 7.1 requires interviewees to rank the degree of internationalization across the four faculties in the case study university. This is an evaluative question. Two interviewees declined to answer this question (see Appendix 18, table 4.33, ranking of level of internationalization across faculties). The summary of primary data is presented in table
4.34. The answers reveal a highly consistent agreement among the three key departments: Faculties A and B are ranked one and two in terms of higher levels of internationalization; Faculties C and D are ranked three and four because of lower levels of internationalization.

Table 4.34 Key points summary of ranking of level of internationalization across faculties (Q 7.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T6, Q-7.1</th>
<th>Common points</th>
<th>Partially shared points</th>
<th>Group-specific points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Groups</td>
<td>Faculties A and B are at top, Faculties C and D at bottom</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department 2-Corporate</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department 2-Faculty</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate-Faculty</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department 2</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence from secondary data (Q 7.1 Ranking of level of internationalization across faculties): Secondary evidence shows that the ranking in terms of international student numbers is (from high to low): Faculty A - Faculty B - Faculty C - Faculty D (see ISB International Student Barometer, 2010, Question: What school / faculty are you in? p. 13, Appendix 10).

Evidence from other data (Q 7.1 Ranking of level of internationalization across faculties): No evidence.

Analysis and summary (Q 7.1 Ranking of level of internationalization across faculties)
The answers to this question show a highly consistent and integrated agreement among the three key departments. Nearly all interviewees agree that the top two faculties are Faculty A and Faculty B, and the bottom two faculties are Faculty C and Faculty D. This corresponds to secondary data.
Q 7.2 Why do you think the level of internationalization in each faculty is different? Reasons would relate to:

- Characteristics of the programme, the design of curriculum
- Facilities requirement (such as, studio, lab, workshop)
- Human resource limitation (enough staff?)
- Financial support / resources (cost or insufficient investment)
- Level of international experience in each faculty
- International market demand for particular programmes
- Recruit strategy or prior focus
- Internal support and training in faculty or departments
- Communication from / with other departments
- Language / foreign policy barrier
- Others

Evidence from primary data (Q 7.2 Reasons of faculty international status)

Based on the results gained in Q 7.1, Q 7.2 investigates the reasons why the level of internationalization is different across the four faculties at the case study university. This question is both analytical and evaluative. One answer did not match the question; and one interviewee declined to answer (see Appendix 18, table 4.35, reasons of faculty international status). The summary of primary data is presented in table 4.36.

The answers to this question contribute to the faculty-specific factors that affect the degree of internationalization among the faculties. The identified faculty-specific factors in the case study university are faculty priority, the nature of programmes, the level of international experience, promotion priority and market demand, industry-related collaboration, the ‘me too subject’ phenomena, faculty autonomy and inconsistent management, faculty culture and academic attitude, and the marketing position. Due to the inconsistent result of triangulation of this point, the Department 2-specific view ‘good reputation of service’ is ineligible as an accurate representation of the reality in terms of the level of internationalization across faculties. These faculty-specific factors imply that internationalization cannot be conducted the same way in every faculty, but should be considered a part of each faculty’s focus. In addition, some interviewees stress that a
higher level of internationalization may not always be better and the faculty’s success should not be simply measured by the level of internationalization.

Table 4.36 Primary data of reasons of faculty international status (Q 7.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T6, Q-7.2</th>
<th>Common points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| All Groups | • Whether faculties see internationalization as their priority, whether it is at the top of their agenda, and how faculties perceive the international message from the corporate.  
• Market demands.  
• Faculty’s capability – international experience, expertise, enthusiasm.  
• Nature of programmes. |
| Partially shared points |
| Department 2-Corporate | • Department 2 has promoting priority in certain programmes.  
• The university focuses on five key regions.  
• The central recruitment strategy does not fit Faculty D’s niche courses.  
• The faculty internal culture and academics’ attitude. |
| Department 2-Faculty | • Resource impact – staff and investment. |
| Corporate-Faculty | • Home market – Faculty C has many famous programmes in U.K. home market and holds multiple funding sources and secured student numbers, thus may be under less pressure. But they are in the process of exploring potential opportunities. |
| Group-specific points |
| Corporate | • Facilities and human resource are not the reasons.  
• Faculty C prefers online rather than through traditional on-campus approach.  
• Faculty D has niche courses, but they are too unique to find feeders.  
• Inconsistent leadership management (in Faculty D) and faculty’s own autonomous and fragmented activities.  
• Research facility – working with industry will attract more international students (Faculties A and B).  
• Government policy – visas and English language regulations.  
• Environment (such as placements, facilities and labs) is not ready.  
• Disadvantage of the campus location (Faculty D).  
• Different market targeting / positioning – Faculty D focuses more on further education than higher education.  
• A high level of internationalization may not always be better.  
• Staff development in terms of international student support.  
• Dean-level peers are all cooperative and open. |
| Department 2 | • In terms of collaboration, the case study university has a good reputation of service. That is a reason why partners choose this university. |
| Faculty | • None |
Evidence from secondary data (Q 7.2 Reasons of faculty international status): no evidence.

Evidence from other data (Q 7.2 Reasons of faculty international status): no evidence.

Analysis and summary (Q 7.2 Reasons of faculty international status)
There are many reasons why the level of internationalization is different across the faculties. This question explores why the central corporate strategy is translated into different versions in each faculties. Since this question is more faculty-specific, the faculty and corporate (such as deans and senior management) are mainly targeted. That is why most reasons are linked with the faculty and corporate groups.

Faculty’s priority— the first reason is whether faculties view internationalization as their priorities and whether internationalization can be placed at the top of the faculty’s agenda. Although internationalization is important, it is not a priority for every faculty. In other words, it depends on how faculties perceive the international message from the corporate. It reflects how a business unit (Miller and Roth, 1994; Williams, Souza, Rosenfeldt and Kassaee, 1995; Rhee and Mehra, 2006) cooperates with the corporate and competes with other universities in their particular areas, such as business and IT, art and design, science and education. Within the institutional context, the business unit is represented by particular facilities. In respect to the corporate international strategy, faculties need to provide best value service to students and partners. It can be achieved through re-validating programmes, teaching abroad, and cooperating with other departments. Research findings show that some faculties (for example, Faculties A and B) with big international targets are more interested in internationalization; other faculties may not be. As interviewee no.4 (Corporate group) mentions:

"[Faculty C], which is running successfully; you have got high demand from UK base. You have got three different funders you are dealing with. You are dealing with teaching fund. You are dealing with funding
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from the health authority, strategic health authorities, and your HEFCE funding. So you have not just got one funding stream like the others have. And if you have got, if everything is going really well, and you have got students coming out of your years, why would you go for international students? It is only when external circumstances change the markets, change the position that you do need to think more broadly."

-- Interviewee no.4 (Corporate group)

Currently, Faculty C is thinking broadly and trying to find a potential niche to get more involved in internationalization. However, there is still a big gap to fill. Since in the past, internationalization was not Faculty C’s priority, Faculty C is far behind other faculties especially in terms of international knowledge and experience, as interviewee no.6 (Corporate group) says:

“some areas of the faculty (Faculty C) being difficult, and prioritizing other things, because we have very little international experience amongst the staff, means that we are way behind in terms of international compared to some of the other faculties ...Having said that, I have watched some of the other faculties really struggle and I am prepared to learn from their lessons rather than make the mistakes myself. So we will do some learning.”

-- Interviewee no.6 (Corporate group)

Lack of international experience and expertise is a big challenge for certain faculties. Since some faculties are not used to participating in internationalization and may therefore lack international experience, they may feel more uncertain in international initiatives. This is one of the biggest challenges for Faculty C, as interviewee no.6 (Corporate group) says:

“My staff, they are not geared up to either internationalize the curriculum or deal with international students. They do not have the experience...do not know how and need a lot of staff development...there are a few, who have good contacts internationally and they would be the people who do have some knowledge, but the majority do not...There is some real issues abound finance, but the biggest issue is lack of experience in the faculty of international working. I have got one, maybe two, members of staff, out of 250 who have got any idea about internationalization and making international links. That is my problem.”

-- Interviewee no.6 (Corporate group)
International market demand is highly interrelated with the nature of programmes. For example, technology programmes are in high demand in the Middle East; IT and computing courses are more popular in India; most Chinese students choose to study business and management. The diversity of market demand makes the choice of international market in education more flexible compared to commercial internationalization, because the international market in education is less constrained by the increasingly global homogeneous customer demands, national culture and geographic distance (see discussion of market analysis factors, Chapter 2, section 2.4.2). International market demand is an external factor that not only impacts on the faculty’s internationalization, but also reflects the nature of the programmes.

The nature of programmes also affects the level of internationalization across faculties. For example, all interviewees state that business and IT programmes are more transportable across the world. Thus there are more possibilities for Faculty A to get internationalized globally. In contrast, some courses have difficulties in internationalization; for example, it is hard to internationalize most Faculty C’s programmes, especially education and professional and health programmes (such as nursing), because it is difficult to find placements for international students. Under Faculty A, the School of Law faces a similar issue. The School teaches U.K. law, not international law. If the university re-validates the U.K. law curriculum to international law, it may lose the U.K. home market. A similar situation happens to some accounting programmes (such as U.K. taxation). Besides Faculty C and the School of Law, the nature of programmes also constraints Faculty D’s international steps. The niche programmes of Faculty D are Beauty and Spa Management, Outdoor Activities, Hairdressing Management, Hospitality and Travel Management. As Department 2 interviewees (for example, no. 4) state, these programmes are too unique to find feeders. They are niche courses with less market demand. Furthermore, unique resource does not guarantee core competence; for example, Faculty D’s niche programmes are unique resource because only two universities in the world offer formal degree courses in these subject areas. But this unique resource has not yet been developed into core competence.
Part of the reason is that some countries do not consider these kinds of programmes serious subjects, as interviewee no.3 says:

"I suppose in certain kind of countries... the cliché in somewhere like China is the subject you have to do has to be a serious subject. You have to do business internationally. Spa Management is not a serious subject. Sometimes, you cannot do that ... the government is not going to pay for (sponsor) you to go...so it is not a serious subject so people say 'well, I am not going to do it'."

-- Interviewee no.3 (Corporate group)

It is true that some governments (such as Russia, India, China, Mexico, Malaysia and the Arab countries) will not sponsor their students on these types of programmes. The nature of programmes in certain regions may conflict with local religions; for example, it is impossible for Muslim students to study Spa Management, and learn how to massage people.

In some science courses, U.K. historic reputation can attract more international students because the nature of science study is more objective. However, international reputation is another concern, and the case study university is not at the top of the league tables. In science programmes, particularly at the postgraduate level, a good reputation can attract more international students. However, this reputation takes times to develop and become internationally known. According to faculty interviewee no.16, the case study university has this problem:

"In order to attract international students, particularly at research level you need a reputation, and that reputation has got to be developed over time and it is only developed with staff being known internationally and that takes time and ...their research for instance has got to become internationally known so that research students or postgraduate students will come to University of [X] because they know we have a good reputation in that subject area. So we have a problem in getting that."

-- Interviewee no.16 (Faculty group)
But on the other hand, the United Kingdom has a good international reputation in science and historical contacts. Although the case study university's reputation is not high, some science programmes (in Faculty C) are better developed than other programmes (such as law, health and education).

"In science research, the UK has got a good reputation for teaching science at that level... so there are a lot of historical contacts that have been made through that. So you will find maybe the postgraduate research in this faculty (Faculty C) and particularly in science is reasonably well developed, because it is got a history of it. It could be developed more. So it is a case what the historic position was. Some courses are going to be much more applicable to international development than others, so you will not be able to attract international students onto all programmes."

— Interviewee no.16 (Faculty group)

Promoting priority is another reason for the difference in international development among faculties. Both the Department 2 and corporate groups (see partially shared points) state that the more demanded programmes and certain primary regions (such as India, China, Middle East, Nigeria) are set as priority for promotion. Because its resource is limited, the university cannot seize every possible opportunity and spread itself too thin. However, it also emerges that the focused priority potentially eliminates certain faculties' international development. For instance, interviewee no.20 from Faculty D states that their niche programmes are always left out of the current international recruitment strategy:

"We are almost on that second stage really in their (Department 2) marketing strategy. They are going out there with Management with Business and tackling that area and then if it happens to work with it being Tourism or Hospitality or Leisure Management then it comes to us... so we are almost, in a way, secondary but that does not bother us too much in that at least they are targeting Management and at least there is that opportunity and we understand that you cannot be flying all over the place with this scatter gun approach. We have to have a focus, so, we are ok with that."

— Interviewee no.20 (Faculty group)
There is a mismatch between the university’s central international recruitment strategy and a faculty’s particular focus. Faculty D is keen to develop internationalization but the current international strategy does not fit this faculty. The university does not target a market for what Faculty D is good at. In terms of Faculty D’s niche courses, the university should start with particular products (for example, the niche programmes) to target potential customers (students) rather than focusing primarily on key markets, and then matching the market demands with Faculty D’s programmes. The priority of Department 2’s international recruitment strategy does not accommodate Faculty D’s niche programmes, thus the advantage of Faculty D’s unique selling point is eclipsed, as interview no.3 (Corporate group) says:

"[Faculty D], in the international prospectuses...I think travel and Tourism Management is in there and maybe Spa Management and that is it. There are only two of [Faculty D]’s courses in all the six publications aimed at the international market. Most of them are business or the technology ones. So there are two ways of looking at it and I think we have possibly looked at it the wrong way. We have looked at it as start with the countries, see what matches instead of saying start with the products and see where we could sell them. So we have not got that right either [laugh]."  

— Interviewee no.3 (Corporate group)

Good reputation of service is an unexpected reason addressed by a Department 2 interviewee. The university offers a good service to partnerships. According to the partners’ feedback, the partners’ satisfaction is a strong reason why those partners choose the case study university, since they will not be treated the same if they choose other universities, as interviewee no.14 (Department 2 group) says:

"...reputation of service, not reputation of University. Some partners, they have chosen us because of our reputation of service. They have learnt that in terms of international partnerships, that we have this one-stop-shop, and we have a very good service...we have developed quite a good reputation with central administration, at turning things round quite quickly, having people to talk to the partners and building relationships with the partners, good communication. Quite fast turnaround speeds where we can. And partners have said to us we have chosen you for that reason."

— Interviewee no.14 (Department 2 group)
The researcher believes that good service reputation can be a factor that contributes to the difference in the process of internationalization among faculties. However, this reason may be not for every partner because the observed data (see Q 6.1) in the case of the S1 Academy, China presents a different picture. The S1 Academy and its students were not treated well and communication and cooperation was weak. But the researcher understands that the S1 Academy’s experience cannot represent the case study university’s overall relationship status with its partners. It is safe to say that ‘good service to partnership’ is not applicable to the case of the S1 Academy. In fact, this reason is only identified by Department 2 interviewee; the other two groups do not mention it. The potential reasons why this point of ‘good service’ ties to Department 2 only are listed as follows. Firstly, interaction with partners is too detailed for the corporate’s job, and due to inefficient internal communication (see issue of communication, Q 6.1), the corporate may not have adequate feedback. Secondly, in terms of partnerships, faculties have opportunities to deal directly with foreign partners, but the faculty may already be overloaded (see issue of work load issue, Q 6.1), and therefore not have time to investigate partners’ feedback in terms of Department 2’s service (see discussion of the peak academic schedule issue, Q 6.1). The faculty is dissatisfied with Department 2’s current internal support to both students and faculty (see discussion of the issue of student support, and cooperation and coordination, Q 6.1), and may not show interest in Department 2’s external support to partners. Thirdly, in practice, Department 2 does not provide good service, at least not for every academic partner, because the observed data in the case of S1 Academy contradicts Department 2’s own comment of good service (see observed evidence to Q 6.1). Furthermore, Department 2 may promote their own department and aim to gain a better profile and reputation within the university through a marketing and advertisement effort. And finally, Department 2 may have a different standard or understanding of determining and evaluating what ‘good service’ is. Furthermore, there are no other partners that are involved in this research. Little other data is available for triangulation, thus this point is not qualified as a general comment.
Both the Department 2 and faculty groups consider resources in terms of labour and capital one of the reasons why the faculties' international status is different, while some interviewees in the corporate group do not think so. Human resource is typically mentioned at the implementational level by the faculty group. Work overload and peak schedules are big concerns for academics. The faculty needs more people and more time to handle workloads. The Department 2 group considers resources more in relation to investment. They mention that it is resource intensive to get the collaboration right and in order to build the relationship and keep it going, regular visits to the partner sites are vital. But because their resource is limited, they have to consider it carefully in investment and spending. International market is volatile and variable. It cannot guarantee success, and risks are always there. But some corporate interviewees think that resource is less of a reason because the university is not looking at huge investments, such as establishing an overseas branch campus. Resource has been examined in the corporate plan and allocated into each faculty’s business budget, which means that the university can buy in people when needed. Thus resource in terms of capital and staff should not be a reason that contributes to a lack of balance in the levels of internationalization across faculties. However, most interviewees do believe that resource is indeed a reason. Some interviewees point out that the whole university environment, including facilities, accommodations, labs, research basis, student placements, and student support, is not yet ready for internationalization.

Besides the lack of resource, the ability to develop existing resource into core competences and competitive advantages also impacts on the faculty’s level of internationalization. According to Hamel (1994), Sanchez (2001) and Mills, Platts, Bourne and Richards, (2002), competences are the skills and abilities by which resources are deployed effectively through an organization’s activities and processes. Converting resources (such as programmes) into competence through industrial collaboration can become a unique selling point. At the case study university, there is a positive view about resource: for example, working with industry in certain programmes attracts more international students. For example, in Faculty A, the programme of computer games has
established a long-term partnership with Microsoft videogame design services. The students have opportunities to practice their knowledge and skills, such as building game prototypes on a particular theme of Microsoft's XNA Game. And on the programmes of product design and illustration, Faculty B was approached by the Southern [---] Health Trust to help them with designing ward materials, such as a patients' hospital bed, through a joint semester-long project. Working with industrial companies highlights another potential area of international student recruitment for the university. It can provide more opportunities for students to gain practical experience. Working with a corporation can be arranged in different forms, such as formal placement, workshops, or joint project with external organizations. This experience can attract more international students because besides qualifications, students also have the opportunity to use their knowledge and participate in real projects. As interviewee no.5 (Corporate group) and interviewee no.19 (Faculty group) state:

"In this faculty (Faculty A) we do Computer Games programming and we have got industry standard facilities and we work with industry a lot, so students are attracted to that because they know they will get an excellent experience."

— Interviewee no.5 (Corporate group)

"We have some particular kind of events happening at the moment that might involve students in a particular project. For example, on the illustration course where we were approached by the Southern [---] Health Trust to go to a hospital and to help them with designing their ward materials, such as a patients' hospital bed...and they asked our students to interpret this in a visual form, to help people from lots of different ethnic backgrounds, who might be coming to the hospital. So the students got involved in that project, and that was something which everybody did for a whole semester."

— Interviewee no.19 (Faculty group)

Besides the previous discussed factors (such as the nature of programmes, level of international experience, reputation of good service, and resource allocation), one corporate interviewee (no.3) evaluates the reason why the Business School has more advantage of attracting more international students, approaching it from another point of
view in terms of where the business school comes from. S/he explains the reason why the Business School (under Faculty A) is ranked as the internationalization leader in the university because it is a business school and business is a ‘me too subject’ like everybody else’s (see primary data of interviewee no. 3). The main advantage of the Business School is that it was born in an international context and therefore business programmes are more likely to be internationalized. His/her explanation implies that the Business School does not have any special characteristics (for example, niche programmes or unique projects / research) if compared to other faculties (such as Faculties C and D):

"Business schools always like to think of themselves as being global business schools. Business is a global thing... Everybody thinks it is a global economy and so you have to be international whether you genuinely are or not. And again, I suppose you could argue that business is a ‘me too subject’ - It just means just like everybody else... In business, every university does business and the people believe that a university has to offer business to be called a university. So we have a business school but it is not a special business school, it is just a business school that offers business degrees. And it does not necessarily have a niche I suppose. We just deliver a business school ... they thought a business school has to be international. So that is where it came from.”

-- Interviewee no.3 (Corporate group)

Another issue affecting faculty internationalization is marketing positioning. For instance, Faculty D offers more further than higher education programmes. Faculty D is positioned to target mainly UK further education students, rather than international students. Since most international students come over to study for undergraduate or Masters programmes, further education (such as A-level) is less attractive to them. Thus Faculty D’s marketing positioning inevitably implies that its level of international development is below other faculties.

Faculty specific culture and staff attitude are consistent with culture issues (see Q 6.1). This can lead faculties to having different levels of internationalization, as interviewee no.11 (Department 2 group) says:
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"I mean there are different ways. Sometimes it happens naturally because you get somebody who is enthusiastic within the group, within the faculty, and their enthusiasm kind of spreads and therefore you get more interest and so it grows. You can expose them to training, cultural learners training or whatever, and try and do it that way. But really it is the internal culture..."

--- Interviewee no.11 (Department 2 group)

Both corporate and Department 2 stress that internationalization depends greatly on the faculty staff’s attitude and willingness. This comment is consistent with other scholars’ findings (Barney, 1986; Trice and Beyer, 1993; Hrebiniak, 2009): culture’s effect on performance is straightforward (see issue of organizational culture and resistance to change, Q 6.1; and Chapter 2, section 2.3.3.5.1). Faculty culture creates a propensity for individuals to act in certain ways in the institutional context. It can be reflected in the fact that some faculties (including the faculty senior management) are cooperative and enthusiastic about internationalization, while others may react with strong resistance or cooperate passively. But these culture issues may not be fully realized by the corporate and senior management. As Corporate interviewee no.4 says:

"They (deans) all know they have to grow and they all are being very cooperative in developing the strategies to try and achieve that. So I do not feel that at dean level I have to go and spend a lot of my energy persuading them to do this. I do not have to do that at all. They are all very open to it."

--- Interviewee no.4 (Corporate group)

The corporate comments that at the dean’s (senior management) level, every faculty is cooperative and active in action. But does it reflect the circumstance correctly? Interviewee no.3 (Corporate group) gives an opposite view:

"I do think there is quite a lot of resistance to anything new anyway. I do not think a lot of the academics here are that happy with change. They think ‘oh, what is going on?’...there’s a lot of resistance at all kinds of levels. I think some of the Deans really do not want to do international although they say ‘we are entirely committed to international growth’, of course, that they do because the Vice Chancellor is asking them if they are interested and they say ‘yes, we are committed to it’. But I think one or two of them do not want
Research findings show that the culture issue is a critical problem, especially at the faculty level and it must change. Staff development is necessary for the staff to understand the need for internationalization and feel responsible for the tasks; also there must be a mechanism to evaluate and monitor the faculty’s performance.

Some **external factors** (such as campus location, environment and government policy) can also explain why the degree of internationalization is different in each faculty. According to Faculty D’s interviewee no.20, campus location and transport (environment) are their big challenges. Faculty D is located in [---], 30 miles away from [---]. Transport is difficult; sometimes students from [---] are struggling to attend class at 9 a.m., because the earliest bus departs from [---] at 7:30 a.m. (the university bus service to Faculty D is not available from [---]), and it takes approximately two hours to reach [Faculty D’s town]. Furthermore, the town where Faculty D located is a historic spa town, with mostly middle-class white population. So international students may find it difficult to engage with the local community and settle down there. In addition to these external factors, Faculty D does have its own internal issue of **inconsistent senior management and self-governed faculty autonomy**, as interviewee no.3 (Corporate group) says:

"The problems have been internal. [Faculty D]’s leadership has been up and down. There have been, I think, three different leaders of [Faculty D] in four years. There have been three different Deans and a lot of turmoil internally and they are not very cooperative because they are far away...they are very autonomous."

--- Interviewee no.3 (Corporate group)

"Because one of the issues has always been that faculties have done their own thing. Because they did not feel that the international office centrally was strong enough or just because they are always like this, they have always got to be autonomous. They would go off and try and do deals with international people in
different places which got us into trouble ... when they would set up a deal ... who has agreed that? What are the quality checks in that? That is the kind of thing we got criticized for, and faculties still want to do really but we centrally do not want to let them do that because it could go wrong."

-- Interviewee no.3 (Corporate group)

Other faculties (such as Faculty B) are facing some governmental issues both inside and outside the United Kingdom. Most Faculty B international students are from the Middle East, especially Kuwait. The U.K. Border Agency imposes stricter regulations and requirements for Tier 4 student visas and English language proficiency levels. Some students with lower level of English are not qualified to gain a visa. And some political policy may also prevent students from coming over. For example, it will be difficult for Iraqi or Afghanistan students to come over to study arms manufacturing or military programmes because the U.K. Border Agency will not issue them visas. These factors are out of the scope that the university can control. Outside the United Kingdom, the change of governmental policy also directly affects faculty recruitment. For instance, international recruitment in Faculty B has reduced due to the changes of the Kuwait government policy. A similar case occurred with INT College, Israel whose 13-year successful partnership with the case study university has also ended (see previous discussion of external environment issue in Q 6.1). These changes force the university to look for other options. As Faculty B corporate interviewee no.7 says, they have to look at other markets and cannot rely on one international market:

"What we cannot do is just rely on one geographical area so, having established those numbers, what we are trying to do now is broaden the geographical areas out so we are not just entirely reliant on that one group. I mean we have had issues out in Kuwait and are currently in dispute with the authorities out there about recruiting students for next year and issuing the visas."

-- Interviewee no.7 (Corporate group)

There are several factors that contribute to the different levels of internationalization across the faculties. Internal factors, such as international experience, organizational culture, staff attitude and resource, can be improved and adjusted; external factors, like
governmental policy, campus location and international competition cannot be changed by the university. Internationalization cannot be equally adopted in all faculties. For certain programmes, internationalizing curriculum may result in losing U.K. home market. In addition, some interviewees stress that faculties should not be simply measured by internationalization because each faculty may have its own focus and priority:

"I do not think it is a question of which faculties are doing better because I do not think we should necessarily assume that a high level of internationalization is always better. I think the faculties have very different focus..."

-- Interviewee no.9 (Corporate group)

Thus, internationalization should not be viewed as a faculty-based standard. A higher level of internationalization in some cases may not be always better; for example, if students from one nation dominate classes, it may lead to the loss of student balance and poor study experience (see previous discussion of overcrowding or unbalanced groups, Q 6.2). When there is no value for money, students become a 'cash cow'. That is not what most international students expect. And if the university relies heavily on international income, it is dangerous for long-term development.

Q 7.3 How can you enhance and improve the internationalization within faculty? Does the University of [X] need a big organizational change to accommodate internationalization?

Evidence from primary data (Q 7.3 How to encourage internationalization within faculty?)

Q 7.3 discusses how to encourage internationalization within faculties. This question is both analytical and evaluative. One interviewee declined to answer this question (see Appendix 18, table 4.37, how to encourage internationalization within faculty). The summary of primary data is presented in table 4.38.
The interviewees point out several suggestions in order to encourage and promote internationalization within faculties. The commonly shared views include re-validating current programmes, seeking potential room and opportunity for certain programmes, changing faculty culture and academic attitude, launching staff development, and improving international student support. Department 2 stresses that the faculties should better use their existing resources, including home staff’s intelligence and background, and current foreign partners’ networks and knowledge of the local market. At the same time, the university should improve internal communication and cooperation among or within departments. The suggestion of the faculty group is regarding the job scope of Department 2. The faculty interviewees state that the overlap in responsibility and accountability between the faculty and Department 2 in terms of international initiatives should be clear. The root of international partnerships should always be within the faculty. Department 2 needs to focus on coordination, administration and internal support for the faculty and students. The corporate group points out that international performance at both the faculty and individual levels needs to be well monitored. Team and personal targets should be set and annual appraisal adopted for performance evaluation. International recruitment needs to find more alternative markets rather than relying too much on one market. Unlike other two departments, most corporate interviewees believe that the university has gone through a big organizational change to accommodate internationalization (such as re-structuring schools and departments), although there is still a lot to do. However, neither the faculty nor Department 2 think so. They suggest a fundamental organizational change to better accommodate internationalization within the university.

Table 4.38 Primary data of how to encourage internationalization within faculty? (Q 7.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T6, Q-7.3</th>
<th>Common points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| All Groups | • University corporate has set international recruitment as a priority and each faculty is required to commit to it.  
• Each faculty follows corporate strategy and focuses on their own approaches, targets new niches and opportunities (such as Faculty C emphasizes online off-campus study; while Faculty B targets on-campus education). |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Partially shared points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Re-validates programmes to ensure that particular curriculum is internationalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regular staff development (support) programmes (attitude, culture, international experience, and understanding).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Partially shared points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department 2-Corporate</th>
<th>Improve international student support (such as English language provision, preparatory / foundation courses, help students settle down and establish links with local communities and having a student advisor within each faculty).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department 2-Faculty</td>
<td>The university does need a big change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate-Faculty</td>
<td>Conduct internal research project on internationalization - how to best support international students and how to launch internationalization within certain faculties (such as Faculties C and D).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Group-specific points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate</th>
<th>Gradually introduce changes (including international initiatives, target, strategy, policy and evaluation) and gradually build up internal culture.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational structure change: Faculties C and D will appoint their own international officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set targets at different levels for senior leadership team and individual staff, and use annual appraisals review to evaluate staff international performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make sure that international implementation really gears up in the faculty through a coherent approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International recruitment needs to find more alternative markets rather than relying too much on one market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No need for a big change because university has gone through the changes (such as organizational structure change) and a lot has been done, but faculties need to do more.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department 2</th>
<th>Internal organizational structure has been changed (such as re-structure the International Student Centre). These organizational changes will bring all faculties together and gear them up with central support.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff's effort and contribution need to be fully recognized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The university needs to use employees' intelligence, expertise and background to explore international markets for faculties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The university has changed the ways (such as CRM and direct recruitment) to attract more international markets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty needs to have a mechanism to coordinate every fragmented element and enhance efficient communication and information sharing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Faculty      | Faculty needs to make the links of collaboration and take the root role, because faculty has the expertise of subjects. Department 2 needs to take an administrative and supporting role. |
Evidence from secondary data (Q 7.3 How to encourage internationalization within faculty? Does faculty need a big change to adopt that?): No evidence.

Evidence from other data (Q 7.3 How to encourage internationalization within faculty? Does faculty need a big change to adopt that?)

As an international student, the researcher's study experience at the case study university partially proves how the university encourages internationalization in terms of student support. A total of 20 interviewees (from three groups) participated in this research. All interviewees are employees at the case study university. Their help and efficient replies to the interview requests show their support for internationalization in actions. The [---] Business School strongly supported the researcher's doctoral research. The observed data shows positive evidence of how the university encourages internationalization in terms of international student support. The observed data for this question does not contradict or conflict with other observed data, such as the case of the S1 Academy, China (see Q 6.1) because of the following reasons. Firstly, an efficient reply to interview request does not mean that there is no problem in terms of HE internationalization. Some interviewees are keen to highlight issues and some are not; some respondents focus on problems of other departments and some mainly emphasize their own challenges. For example, according to a previous discussion, the faculty points out that the efficiency of the application process in Admissions is low (faculty interviewee no.19) and requires more and equivalent student support from the International Student Centre (faculty interviewee no.20). The observed data of Q 6.1 is highly consistent with the former view of low efficiency and lack of customer focus, and the observed data for this question (Q 7.3) is corresponding with the latter view that Faculty D's international students should have equal opportunity to access student support as other faculties (Faculty D interviewee no.20). As a student at Faculty A, the researcher's experience shows that she may have better support than those in Faculty D. Secondly, the focus of observation in two questions (Q 6.1 and Q 7.3) is different. The observed data in Q 6.1 concentrates on the issue of customer service and support in Admissions, especially for potential students and partners (such as the S1 Academy), while the observed data to Q 7.3 emphasizes the university's existing student support.
support across the three key departments. Thus a potential partner’s feedback cannot be used to represent the status of current student support at the case study university. However, the researcher’s experience in terms of student support (Q 7.3) does contradict other faculty’s view that the International Student Centre should have a clear role in terms of student support and work closely with faculties (according to Faculty B no.19 and Faculty D no.20 interviewees; see discussion of student support issue, Q 6.1). Potential reasons might be that the researcher is from a different faculty (Faculty A), or just a lucky individual. Thirdly, the standpoint of both observations (Q 6.1 and Q 7.3) is different. In Q 6.1, the researcher observes Admissions from a potential partner’s point of view because at that moment, the researcher represents the S1 Academy and also on behalf of the S1 Academy’s applicants, while in Q 7.3, the researcher represents herself as in international student only. Thus the positive support (in Q 7.3) she received during this research cannot represent the service that the S1 Academy received from Admissions. The results of the two observations do not interrelate directly. Finally, a weak customer focus by Admissions (see Q 6.1) may stem from individual department or staff only. The reason why the researcher highlights it is because the S1 Academy has not received appropriate customer focus and sufficient attention from the Admissions. In other words, Admissions does not do what they should do. But Admissions’ mistake does not affect or impact on other departments or individual interviewees’ support in this research. The researcher does not know whether the university needs a big change to accommodate internationalization, but in her case, she does witness the student support.

Analysis and summary (Q 7.3 How to encourage internationalization within faculty? Does faculty need a big change to adopt that?)

This question mainly addresses the faculty’s further planning and activities in order to improve and promote internationalization, which can be undertaken through the process of monitoring operations activity and dealing with any deviations from the plan; it usually involves elements of re-planning (Slack, Chambers and Johnston, 2007). Within the faculties, associated activity is reflected in re-validating programmes and looking for potential areas for internationalization. However, this planning may be constrained by the
nature of programmes (such as education, law and health programmes), thus these programmes may remain unchanged to fit the U.K. home market demand. Besides programme revalidation, stricter monitoring and evaluation will be applied to both faculty management and individuals (such as programme leaders and project leaders). As interviewee no.6 (corporate group) states, faculties will focus on monitoring international performance at the individual level and make sure that international implementation really works through a coherent approach:

"Some of it is using our annual appraisals, our annual performance reviews for staff, and some of it is the targets that we have in the business plan. There are the targets for the senior leadership team. There is targets for individual staff ... There are targets through curriculum development and identifying new niche and new opportunities. There are some very risky issues, but I think more and more staff are aware of what is happening with the Government, what is happening financially, and knowing that actually in terms of job security, things like international have got to grow. So although sometimes that is not over helpful motivation, it does motivate people because they want to keep their jobs."

-- Interviewee no.6 (Corporate group)

As mentioned above, the annual appraisal review is an approach to measure personal performance. This is corresponding with other scholars' views (Daft, 2003, Lines, 2004; Oreg, 2006) that once employees have been at work for some time, their performance should be appraised or evaluated. Some academics may feel stressed by this measurement. But it is considered to be an efficient way because everyone wants to secure their job.

In order to achieve efficient communication and cooperation, faculties need to create a mechanism (such as an online forum, for example) to coordinate every fragmented element of internationalization across different departments and enhance information sharing, as interviewee no.14 (Department 2 group) says:

"I think so (we need a significant change). And it needs to be more coordinated ...our faculty activity is very fragmented. There needs to be maybe a mechanism in the faculty where if someone gets an approach internationally... that there is a forum where that can come into the faculty. Maybe it is a sub-committee of
With respect to organizational structure changes, the case study university has already gone through it. It can be reflected in the establishment of Department 2 and re-allocation of the International Office. The establishment of Department 2 a few years ago was a big structural change in order to better facilitate internationalization. The recent re-allocation of the International Office into the International Student Centre aims to provide better student support and service.

The faculty can use the intelligence it has, including existing overseas partners / links and its own foreign staff. In other words, using the existing resources, such as partners and staff’s background and knowledge to seize more opportunities to develop internationalization for the faculty, is a sound option (see Department 2 group-specific points) because the university has already built trust with these partners and staff; their native language, local knowledge and personal contact / network can help faculties understand a particular market better and quicker. Internationalization can be achieved efficiently with lower risk, as interviewee no.14 says:

"I think we have used our intelligence... if they have got intelligence in the country, so we have used one of our partners have said, somebody in Botswana, they have been saying to us for a long time there is a market here for tourism, there is a market here for enterprise... using the intelligence of the country maybe shows you how you can tweak your courses."

-- Interviewee no.14 (Department 2 group)

The suggestion to use existing intelligent and links may be only suitable for some faculties that have been involved in internationalization and have overseas links available. However, for other faculties who have less international experience / links, the above suggestion is not applicable, as Department 2 interviewee (no.14) mentions:
"... having said that (using intelligence), you might not have any intelligence in the country and that is, for some of the faculties that do not have any courses internationally, that might be quite difficult because then it is a blank sheet of paper? Where do you go? Where do you sell courses? And then you might use people in the faculty you have got. You might use people with some kind of international background."

-- Interviewee no.14 (Department 2 group)

According to Bovey and Hede, (2001a, b, studying including 500 Australian organizations), and Prochaska and Levesque (2001, a Deloitte and Touche survey of 400 organizations), the ‘inability to manage change is the number one strategy-execution problem’. After ten years, the resistance to change still remains the biggest obstacle of implementation (Hrebiniak, 2009, Wharton-Gartner Survey and Wharton Executive Education Survey). With high consistency, the case study university is not an exception (see discussion of organizational culture and resistance to changes, Q 6.1). This obstacle also impedes the university’s international strategy implementation. All interviewees state that the principal changes include organizational culture, staff attitude, understanding and cooperating on most levels within the university. Department 2 states that there is a strong resistance at the faculty level and the nature of programmes is always used as excuse. Department 2 believes that no matter which programme, there is always room for something different and for widening people’s perspectives, including certain faculties (such as Faculty A) with higher levels of internationalization than other faculties:

"You will probably find the odd course that is UK, but they are usually professional courses ...But even then, what is not to stop them (students) doing comparisons? If you are training to be a nurse in the UK, why not just give them (students) some information on how it is different to if you were a nurse in China, because there are differences... there is sometimes cases where it is difficult to do, but more often than not it is the people, they say they cannot do it or they feel it is too fringe. The core activity is this and if I did that, it is just messing around the edges. But it is probably more to do with attitude...There is always room for something even if it is not assessed or just to try and widen people's perspectives, that there are different ways of doing things... and quite often you have got staff (such as staff from Faculty A, especially from business school) who think they are international and well they will be more international than
anybody else, but even they have got space to improve quite often. It is really down to sharing ideas and getting people onboard and having time to think about it...

-- Interviewee no.11 (Department 2 group)

On the other hand, the faculty comments that support from Department 2 is insufficient and must be increased, especially with the International Student Center. Some corporate interviewees understand the problems between Department 2 and the faculties, while some appear not to. Actually, in the corporate's eyes, internationalization is viable but still needs to catch up with the competition; Department 2 says that staff attitude must change because 'you cannot change curriculum without attitude changes' (according to Department 2 interviewee no.11); while the faculties are concerned about work overload and peak schedules in internationalization. Both the faculty and Department 2 agree that the university does need a big change to accommodate internationalization because the faculty and Department 2 are struggling to cope, while only a few corporate interviewees show concern about it. One potential reason may be inefficient feedback, so the corporate have not been fully informed about actual problems. Another reason may be that the corporate do not know how to change or what to change, in which order to change; they may choose to hold an observer's position for the consequent outcomes and to make further improvements or decisions.

It is obvious that staff development is necessary. All groups stress that attitude and culture must be changed. But how to change it? Where to start? Should staff deal directly with attitudes and culture? Can staff development really change personal attitudes? The answer is no. Hrebiniak (2009) suggests that, to change culture, it is not wise or effective to focus directly on culture (see discussion of how to change culture and reduce resistance, Chapter 2, section 2.3.3.5.2). To change culture, one should not focus on culture itself or the underlying defining aspect of culture: values, norms, and 'credos'. One should not try to change attitudes, hoping for a change in behaviour. The focus should be on using the key person's influence to affect others' behaviour and attitude (Smith, 2006; Self and Schraeder, 2008). Thus even though everyone says that
organizational culture needs to change, the university should emphasize the effect of performance by the senior management, such as using more active people, bringing new influences and incrementally making changes.

Market selection and portfolio management belongs to corporate responsibility. According to Hax and Majluf, (1992) and Faulkner (1998), market selection is a sub-strategy under the international strategy. Portfolio management concerns growth share (or Boston Consulting Group BCG matrix) and demonstrates the rationales that corporate might adopt for the management of a multi-business organization. In the institutional context, multi-business is reflected by multi-markets focused upon in the case study – the five key regions targeted in international recruitment. It indicates where to recruit overseas students. As a corporate interviewee (no.7) mentions, international recruitment needs to find more alternative markets, rather than relying on one market. Thus when one market moves down to ‘dog’ (dead), new markets must be able to replace the remaining positions (for example, ‘start’ and ‘cash cow’). And it should be continuous development because no market is guaranteed or permanently sustained as a ‘start’ or a ‘cash cow’.

International student support is what Department 2 must improve in order to better support and coordinate faculty’s international initiatives. Potential aspects include English language provision, introducing preparatory or foundation courses, appointing international student advisors within each faculty, enhancing ground support and providing relevant advice.

Clarifying responsibilities and accountability presumes that all individuals or each department knows what their roles and jobs are. Confusion often results from multiple points of responsibility or when many departments or individuals share responsibility. When many individuals and skills are brought to deal with a problem, the overarching accountability or responsibility often becomes muddled over time. Hence, everyone being responsible means that no one is accountable. There is confusion regarding responsibility between Department 2 and faculties in terms of international initiatives. Faculties state
that the role of Department 2 should be towards central administration, support and coordination. The root of academic collaboration should always be in the faculty, as interviewee no.19 (Faculty group) says:

"...the faculties have to make the links, because if they are all centralized, it is very difficult for a centralized, non-academic department (Department 2) to understand what the needs might be. So it has to be a partnership really, and the branches have to be, in the sense the roots of the plant have to be the faculty, and then the centre (Department 2) also needs to sort of take a very clear administrative role within that. Because faculties know more about the particular programmes and students would like to hear from them."

-- Interviewee no.19 (Faculty group)

It is consistent with the conflict issues (see discussion of cooperation and coordination, Q 6.1) raised by another faculty interviewee (no.17) mainly about ‘who (Department 2 or faculty) should go for recruitment abroad’. In other words, the faculty suggests that international partnership and collaboration should be more faculty-driven rather than Department 2-given. That is because faculty academics are more knowledgeable about their subjects. And normally after a partnership is approved, more implemental work will be handed over to the faculty. Thus it is necessary for academics to oversee the collaboration from the beginning. And that kind of overlapping responsibility is not a vital issue because this way everyone is responsible for international collaboration. But whether it can achieve efficient outcome is questioned, as discussed before (see discussion of cooperation and coordination – issue of responsibility and accountability, Q 6.1). Unless Department 2 re-adjusts its work scope and emphasizes its role as an internal coordinator, the muddled responsibility between Department 2 and faculty will be never clear. Department 2 itself does not have real implemental functions to fully deliver any partnership collaboration (such as teaching, marking, assessment and moderation), but faculty can. Thus if Department 2 still claims to be responsible for academic collaboration, there is not much that they would be accountable for. This is worthy of the management’s attention.
Chapter Five Construction of Dynamic Framework

5.0 Overview
This chapter constructs a dynamic framework based on data analysis. The dynamic framework is designed for HE internationalization in terms of international recruitment and academic collaboration. This section addresses the construction of the dynamic framework and explains how this framework guides HE internationalization through a number of market entry strategies and programme delivery methods. It mainly demonstrates different modes of market entry for HE internationalization, associated programme delivery methods and potential areas for further development. This chapter is structured as follows: first, the framework is constructed horizontally in relations to the theories on international strategy (see discussion of theories on international strategy, in Chapter 2, section 2.1), and vertically in relations to the development stage of HE internationalization (see discussion of internationalization of higher education, in Chapter 2, section 2.5); this is followed by a discussion of the content of the framework, which bridges the research findings with relevant literature. Next, comparison and evaluation of the dynamic framework with other HE international models (see discussion of models of HE internationalization, Chapter 2, section 2.6.2) are presented.

Dynamic Framework
This dynamic framework is designed for HE internationalization in terms of international recruitment and collaboration. This research uses literature on commercial internationalization to interpret HE internationalization; therefore the dynamic framework is based upon theories on internationalization of both higher education and commercialization. However, not every business theory or notion is compatible with education. Education reveals its own unique features during the process of internationalization. Thus only the applicable commercial approaches are adopted. These commercial approaches are consistent with researching findings. The mismatched content
between research findings and literature represents unique contributions of this research, mainly through primary data. The dynamic framework is shown in figure 5.1.

Figure 5.1 Education-specific market entry dynamic framework

5.1 Structure of framework – horizontal axis

The dynamic framework is a matrix including nine grids and two axes. The horizontal axis presents theories on international approach from the existing literature on commercial internationalization, and their characteristics match the primary data. Literature discusses six most recognized theories on international approaches (see discussion of theories on international strategy, Chapter 2, section 2.1): the Uppsala school approach (see Chapter 2, section 2.1.1), transactional cost analysis approach (TCA, see Chapter 2, section 2.1.2), OLI approach (see Chapter 2, section 2.1.3), agency approach (see Chapter 2, section 2.1.4), industrial network approach (see Chapter 2, section 2.1.5), and resource-based approach (see Chapter 2, section 2.1.6). Of these, four approaches are applicable to HE internationalization. The Uppsala school approach and
industrial network approach are eliminated (see discussion of eliminated group, section 5.1.2) from the analysis of HE internationalization. The following section categorizes the theories on international approaches into the applicable group (TCA, agency approach, resource-based approach, and OLI approach), and the eliminated group (the Uppsala school approach and industrial network approach).

5.1.1 Applicable group

Transactional cost analysis (TCA)
TCA can be reflected in international student recruitment that can be achieved through agents, overseas partners and a satellite campus (see Chapter 2, section 2.1.2). Most institutions (including the case study university) choose external strategies (through agents and partners) because the associated cost and risk is much lower than that of internal expansion by establishing their own branch campuses (see Q 3.2 – Q 3.5, Chapter 4).

Agency approach
Agent recruitment (the agency approach) enhances international student mobility (see discussion of student mobility, Chapter 2, section 2.6.1.1). This is a typical circumstance of the home stage of HE international development (as discussed later, the structure of dynamic framework – the vertical axis, section 5.2). The answers to Q 2.1 show that agent recruitment is one of the main recruitment strategies at the case study university. In certain markets, such as Africa and Middle East, most students are recruited by agents. Some agents (also called superagents41) even have their own regional offices across certain areas. Thus, some Department 2 interviewees suggest that if the university builds a strong bond with these superagents, a study centre can be set up as a potential area of HE internationalization (see discussion of potential areas, section 5.3.2). Due to low

---

41 According to corporate interviewee no.4, superagents are the agents who have their own branch offices in a particular region.
loyalty, faculty interviewees prefer academic collaboration because it can guarantee the number of recruited international students and establish long-term partnerships (see Q 3.5, Chapter 4).

Resource-based approach
The resource-based approach is chosen to develop dynamic capabilities (see Chapter 2, section 2.1.6). This approach holds up well in HE internationalization, especially in academic collaboration. Compatible resources not only serve as a prerequisite to collaboration, but also create new sustainable resources for both partners. At the case study university, the resource-based approach is typically applicable to academic collaboration (see Q 3.1 - Q 3.5, Chapter 4), international recruitment strategy (see Q 2.1), progression arrangement (see Q 2.2), and programme delivery methods (see Q 3.3 - Q 3.4 and Q 4.1). Different collaborations (see Q 3.1) are based on compatible and complimentary resources between the case study university and foreign partners. The answer to Q 3.2 (*Why does the University of [X] adopt these collaborative methods?*) shows that the reason why the case study university adopts different ways of collaboration is that the partner’s educational ethos fits the university’s ethos. The accountability, responsibility, resources and associated involvement are manageable in these ways.

OLI approach
The OLI (ownership, location, internalization, see Chapter 2, section 2.1.3) approach encourages internationalization through internal expansion, such as establishing own overseas subsidiaries and branches. Australian authors Mazzarol, Soutar and Seng (2003) identify this development as the ‘third-wave’ in HE internationalization (see discussion of Mazzarol, Soutar and Seng’s ‘three waves’ model, Chapter 2, section 2.6.2.2). However, the overseas branch campus is not recommended in the case study. No interviewee suggests that the overseas branch campus is the right move for the case study.
university. The associated reasons include cost, risk, uncertainty of environment, and a volatile international market (see Q 5.1, Chapter 4).

5.1.2 Eliminated group

Two international approaches are eliminated from the analysis of HE internationalization: the Uppsala school approach (see Chapter 2, section 2.1.1) and the industrial network approach (see Chapter 2, section 2.1.5).

Uppsala school approach

The Uppsala school approach is not compatible with HE internationalization because HE internationalization is less constrained by the geographic distance, cultural differences and previous experience (see Chapter 2, section 2.1). Unlike commercial internationalization, universities can simultaneously adopt multiple or mixed market entry strategies (see Q 3.1, Chapter 4). The flexibility and characteristics of HE international development are beyond the principle of the Uppsala school approach and therefore this approach is eliminated from the analysis (see Q 4.1, Chapter 4).

Industrial network approach

Industrial network approach (see section 2.1.5, Chapter 2) is not applicable to HE internationalization, either. Although academic collaboration seems to build up an academic network, both institutions are completely independent of each other. They do not need collaborations to continue their institutional functions; they can withdraw from the partnership at any time, and their priorities are always within the original sites. Thus, the industrial network approach does not properly fit HE internationalization.

Although four international approaches (TCA, agency approach, OLI, and resource-based approach) are compatible with HE internationalization, each approach can only explain a certain phase rather than the full picture of HE internationalization. The development of HE internationalization is not a horizontal linear process (see the horizontal axis), but a
dynamic tendency. Thus, these compatible international approaches are arranged in different phases consistent with the different stages of HE internationalization (see the vertical axis).

5.2 Structure of dynamic framework – vertical axis

The vertical axis addresses the development of HE internationalization. The analysis of primary data (see Q 1.3, Chapter 4, Case Study) has identified three stages of HE international development: the home stage, the partnership stage and the overseas campus stage. The analysis of HE international development stages will be compared with the related literature (see discussion of models of HE internationalization, Chapter 2, section 2.6.1). Since the case study university does not have an overseas branch campus (see Q 5.1), only the home stage and the partnership stage will be discussed in this research. The overseas campus stage remains the area for further research (see discussion of further research, Chapter 6, section 6.4). According to the answers to Q 1.3 (What are the international development of the University of [X]?), international development at the case study university can be routed into two stages: the home stage and the partnership stage.

Firstly, the home stage represents recruiting foreign students to come over to the United Kingdom. Foreign students will join the home institution’s academic schedule and study in the traditional on-campus environment. A typical characteristic at this stage is international student mobility (see discussion of student mobility, Chapter 2, section 2.6.1.1).

At the early stage of international development, most international students are recruited through agents. Agent recruitment has become a common strategy, which is consistent with the home stage in the vertical axis. The home stage does not require large investment because agents work on commission. There is no higher level of international involvement, such as collaboration, teaching, moderation or site visiting. The main
department involved in this process is Department 2 that directly handles agent recruitment. Faculties are less involved at this stage because there is no need for direct academic and professional contact. The information transferred among the students, agents and the case study university tends towards a marketing perspective in terms of international recruitment (for example, application requirement, fees, commission, length of study, programme flyers, campus environment, accommodation, intake date, and currency rate). Further information regarding partnership, collaboration, quality enhancement, validation approval procedure, curriculum and syllabus, is not required at this stage.

Secondly, the partnership stage moves the case study university's international development forward through an alliance or coalition stage, focusing on establishing a long-term stable academic partnership. Through collaboration, an outlet is provided for local students to study for the case study university’s qualification without leaving their own countries. There are different collaborative ways to conduct internationalization and associated programme delivery methods at this stage (see discussion of grid 5, section 5.3.1). Unlike the home stage, international activities at the partnership stage require high levels of cooperation from the faculty and intergraded coordination from Department 2. The corporate is also involved in terms of quality assurance and approving partners. The academic relationship is based on shared resources. Partners are required to provide hands-on programme delivery, appropriate facilities and environment. Students do not have to come over to the United Kingdom; instead, they have the option to complete the whole programme locally or take part in a top-up progression and have some overseas experiences.

At the case study university, although Department 2 is mainly responsible for international collaboration, the faculty plays a more important role at this stage because faculties are the front line operators. The fact is that, although Department 2 states that it is primarily in charge of internationalization, international initiatives will not be viable
without cooperation from the faculties. The faculty’s effort is vital for implementation. Thus, it is suggested that at the partnership stage, the faculty should move to more hands-on activities, and Department 2 should focus on coordination matters, such as administration, staff and student support and processing applications. Compared to the home stage, more internal issues are involved, more responsibilities are required from the home university (such as Corporate, Department 2 and Faculties) and its foreign partners. The partnership stage requires integrated internal cooperation and coordination, sometimes even organizational changes. This could lead to more internal conflicts, challenges and issues among different key departments because the partnership stage can place significant pressure on the institution’s resources and staff (see Q 6.1, Chapter 4). Furthermore, quality assurance at this stage can be difficult to maintain as the university needs to be run jointly by the partners (Mazzarol and Hosie, 1996); also, maintaining an equivalent standard in the host institution can be a challenge because all overseas partners have to follow the home institution’s standards. According to research findings, most challenges and issues are derived internally from the case study university, rather than from external environment (see Q 6.1 - Q 6.3, and Q 7.2, Chapter 4).

5.3 Content of dynamic framework

The content of the dynamic framework is presented by a nine-grid matrix (see figure 5.1, section 5.1). Previous sections have discussed the structure of the dynamic framework (both horizontal and vertical axes). This section addresses the content of each grid in terms of the mode of entry, programme delivery and potential areas of HE internationalization. Table 5.1 shows the linkage among the interview questions, literature and position of each grid of the framework.
As figure 5.1 shows, international activities at the case study university are placed mainly in grids 1 and 5. Potential areas include grids 2 and 4. Grid 9 is the field for further research (see discussion of further research, Chapter 6, section 6.4). Since the overseas branch campus is out of scope of this research, the remaining grids (3, 6-8) are left blank because they relate to the overseas branch campus stage. The next section focuses on the main framework content: market entry strategy and programme delivery method.

### 5.3.1 Market entry and programme delivery methods (grids 1 and 5)

Grids 1 and 5 are the key areas of the dynamic framework. They are separated by the upper part and lower part. The upper part indicates market entry modes for HE internationalization; the lower part represents associated programme delivery methods.

#### Grid 1

Grid 1 is the early phase of HE internationalization, where most international students are either recruited through agents or applying directly to the case study university (including exchange students). It combines both the agency approach and the home stage. Export

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grid No.</th>
<th>Interview Questions</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part A</td>
<td>Grid 1</td>
<td>Q 1.3, Q 2.1, Q 2.2, Q 3.1, Q 4.1</td>
<td>2.1.2, 2.1.4, 2.6.1.a, 2.6.2.1, 2.6.2.2, 2.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grid 2</td>
<td>Q 7.2</td>
<td>2.6.2.1, 2.6.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grid 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6.2.1, 2.6.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grid 4</td>
<td>Q 2.2, Q 3.5</td>
<td>2.1.2, 2.1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grid 5</td>
<td>Q 1.3, Q 2.1, Q 2.2, Q 3.1, Q 3.3, Q 3.4, Q 3.5, Q 4.1</td>
<td>2.1.2, 2.1.6, 2.2.2, 2.6.2.1, 2.6.2.2, 2.6.2.3, 2.6.1 (b, d, e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grid 6</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grid 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.2, 2.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grid 8</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>blank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grid 9</td>
<td>Q 5.1</td>
<td>2.1.2, 2.1.3, 2.2.3, 2.6.1.e, 2.6.2.1, 2.6.2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and credit transfer are the two main modes of entry. Export is normally used in business and trading, where products are exported to be sold in foreign countries. Education is a kind of 'soft service' (Erramilli and Rao, 1990), where products (programmes) cannot be separated from customers (students). Thus instead of exporting programmes abroad, HE internationalization 'imports' students over to study at the home institution. The process of 'sale' and 'consumption' is completed in the United Kingdom, but it is an export business that is reflected by student mobility (see discussion of student mobility, Chapter 2, section 2.6.1.1).

Compared to grid 5 (as discussed later), there is no partnership involved in grid 1. The university recognizes students' credit based on individual cases, while the process of recognition is different for those students who come from the university's partners. Some students choose to complete the whole programme at the case study university. Some students choose credit transfer, for example through ERASMUS and SCORATES programmes, to take some subjects or one semester at the case study university. The case study university recognizes credits from their previous study as they are equivalent to its own programmes, and new credits will be given to students when they complete their study at the university. No matter which type of study is adopted, all foreign students join the regular academic schedule in a traditional face-to-face on-campus study model at the home institution, using the same resources as British students do. All teaching staff are based on the home campus, and students are the only mobile group. Compared to collaboration (see grid 5), student mobility does not put much pressure on the faculty. There are fewer issues at this grid and the proportion of overlap among the three key departments is much larger than in grid 5 (as discussed later, see section 6.2.2, figure 6.3). The only problem is that when students from one nation dominate a class, lecturers need to separate them to ensure an equitable study experience. Since the case study university does not have a large number of international students, overcrowding or group imbalance is not an issue (see Q 6.2, Chapter 4). However, student mobility can put pressure on student support, as the answers to Q 6.1 (issue of student support, see Chapter 4) show
that the faculty group is not satisfied with current student support from the International Student Centre. Getting international students to settle down and become integrated into the local community is a challenge.

**Grid 5**

International activities in grid 5 emphasize the partnership that combines both the partnership stage and resource-based approach. Unlike agent recruitment, here student recruitment is done mainly through partnerships. In this phase, although most international students choose to complete their studies locally, partnership and collaboration provide students with the opportunities to enrich their overseas study experience; for example, partners’ students can come to the case study university’s home campus to complete their top-up or articulated programmes. In addition to recruitment, the role of partners also involves teaching (see Q 3.3 – Q 3.5, Chapter 4). Some partners teach the case study university’s syllabus; others teach their own programmes. That is because different partners have different resources (for example, different programmes, staff experience, and availability of facilities); thus the partner’s educational ethos fits the case study university’s ethos in different aspects. Relevant management and business models may be different, too (for example, franchise, articulation, alliance, validation; see Q 3.1 and Q 3.2, Chapter 4). Partners’ preferences and local government’s regulations may also affect the ways of collaboration. Most foreign partners prefer U.K. lecturers to deliver programmes face-to-face to local students. The Israeli government, for example, requires at least 30% of the programmes to be delivered by U.K. lecturers (see Q 3.2, Chapter 4). However, this is the most expensive way to do it. According to answers to Q 3.4, the Department 2 group points out that the more hands-on way (for example, home academics teaching abroad) is more expensive; and the more hands-off way is riskier. Thus both partners have to find alternative arrangements to balance these two ways. The faculty manages to fly out academics regularly and do some traditional teaching intensively, and local lecturers are mainly responsible for teaching, assessing and local support, while the home university remains the authority for grading. Current online
distance technology, such as Wimba classroom or internet conferences, not only encourages interaction between the home university and overseas partners, but also increases the flexibility of programme delivery and the extent of international market expansion.

The upper part of grid 5 indicates the available modes of entry for HE internationalization. They can be separated into two groups: the business-based entry mode (such as franchise and alliance), and the education-based entry mode (such as articulation, validation, top-up, and E-learning). According to literature, all the modes of entry are from the business background, especially manufacturing (see discussion of mode of entry, Chapter 2, section 2.2). Besides export (see grid 1), only franchise and alliance are compatible with education (see Q 3.1; and discussion of mode of entry, Chapter 2, section 2.2). The answers to Q 3.1 confirm that joint venture and acquisition are eliminated in the case study. Other modes of entry, such as licensing, contract manufacturing and management contracting, are typically manufacture-based and therefore not applicable to HE internationalization.

The case study university adopts franchise as a formal form of collaboration and alliance as an informal way; this includes student exchange, joint research, joint projects and short-term seminars. A broad definition of alliance is any form of information or resource exchange (Yoshino and Rangan, 1995). As Department 2 interviewees state, a partnership normally starts with a progression arrangement, which is an informal partnership (alliance). Then after a few years, mutual trust is built up and the partners are able to increase their involvement in collaboration, such as teaching and marking; then the relationship moves to franchise, where partners deliver the case study university’s programmes on their own. An alliance starts collaboration with an informal arrangement and reduces potential risks for the home university. It provides an opportunity to evaluate the partners’ capability and also tests the quality of their students. Positive feedback encourages the home university to update the existing partnership to a formal franchise.
collaboration. A typical example is the BA College, Botswana (see Appendices 2 and 5). The modes of entry of the education-based group are suitable for HE internationalization. The VAD School, Greece is a good example of validation. The VAD School is responsible for programme design, teaching (in Greek) and assessment, and the case study university is responsible for validating and ensuring that the quality of the VAD School’s programmes (both undergraduate and Master studies) is equivalent to its own standards audited by Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) in the United Kingdom. The VAD School’s graduates will be awarded the case study university’s qualifications. The partnership with the W.E Council, Malaysia is another example of validation, where the case study university accredits the W.E Council’s programmes as equivalent to its own standard, and awards the W.E Council’s graduates its own qualifications (see Appendix 2).

Top-up (advanced standing) and articulation are other education-based modes of entry. The SHM School, Switzerland was example of top-up (advanced standing). The SHM School runs its own Diploma programmes in International Hospitality Management. This programme is articulated by the case study university as giving advanced standing against students’ work at levels four and five of its own undergraduate programmes. The students are awarded a top-up degree consisting of six taught modules at level six, each valued at 15 credits, and an Independent Study module (30 credits). The articulation example is the BA College, Botswana. The case study university runs Masters programmes (MSc Strategic Management, MSc Strategic Financial Management and Master of Business Administration) as off-campus delivery at the BA College and allows the holders of CIMA and ACCA accreditations to articulate to MBA and MSc Strategic Financial Management respectively. These programmes are administered by the BA College. Top-up (advanced standing) and articulation are quite similar education-based modes of entry. Unlike credit transfer (see grid 1), these modes allow automatic qualification recognition based on the institutions’ mutual agreement. Partners’ graduates can top up directly or articulate to the home university’s programmes without individual examinations (such as
interviews, presentations and English language tests). Compared to other modes of entry (alliance and credit transfer), these entry strategies put less pressure on international students by fully recognizing their previous qualifications, and the length of study is guaranteed (see discussion of recognition of foreign qualifications, Chapter 2, section 2.7.4; and discussion of recognition of credits and length of study abroad, Chapter 2, section 2.7.5). The difference is that with top-up (advanced standing), partners’ students (such as the SHM School, Switzerland) do not have to come to the case study university’s home campus, but can complete their programmes over the internet. Articulation (such as the BA College, Botswana and MM Institute, Malawi) is more flexible: the students can come to the U.K. or the home university’s academics can teach abroad. Due to certain factors (for example, economy, distance, jobs), most African partners of the case study university prefer home academics delivering programmes locally.

In addition, information communication technology (ICT) is widely adopted by online and distance learning (E-learning). The online Psychology programme is a good example from Faculty C at the case study university. The whole programme (undergraduate and postgraduate) is taught through Wimba classroom. Students do not have to come over to the United Kingdom, but can study online. Interaction can be achieved through ICT. However, no literature categorizes E-learning as a mode of entry for commercial internationalization and HE internationalization. Yet this is a mode of entry that guides the organization to enter foreign markets. There is a gap in current literature on this subject; similarly, online distance learning (E-learning) is not identified as a formal entry strategy in education.

Unlike business or manufacturing industry, HE internationalization can simultaneously adopt multiple modes of entry (both business-based and education-based) and switch from one to another if necessary. For example, the partnership with the MM Institute, Malawi started with an informal progression arrangement (alliance); after a long partnership, some programmes (especially the undergraduate programmes) were recently
upgraded to a franchise. The whole syllabus was franchised for the MM Institute and the local lecturers are fully responsible for teaching and assessing the modules. The Masters programmes remain the same, but allow students with certain qualifications (such as ACCA or CIMA) to top up to Masters qualifications. Faculty academics of the home university fly to Malawi annually for blend-block intensive teaching, which normally takes up to two weeks. The rest of the study term, the students study online with supervision from the local lecturers. The flexibility and variety of HE internationalization leads to multiple forms of programme delivery methods (see lower part, grid 5, figure 5.1).

Programme delivery options depend on and correlate to the mode of entry adopted. It can be a single delivery method. For example, partners deliver their own syllabus (with validation); or partners deliver the case study university’s syllabus (with franchise). If the relationship is based on alliance with progression arrangements, then the programme delivery methods can be a combination of the ‘flying faculty’ (home staff teaching abroad), hybrid teaching and online study. Sometimes, the faculty may employ part-time or sessional staff to deliver programmes. According to Department 2 interviewee no.10, the hands-on way (home staff teaching abroad) is more expensive, but lower risk; while, the hands-off way (partner’s lecturers delivering programmes) is less expensive, but higher risk. A faculty interviewee (no.17) states that the hands-on ways put more pressure on the academic staff, as academics have to manage their home institution teaching as well. However, besides the above issues (risk, cost and faculty pressure), programme delivery methods are determined by the mode of entry. If the university adopts more than one market entry strategy, the associated programme delivery methods will be divergent. This can help the university balance the risk and cost in the hands-on and hands-off programme delivery methods.

At this stage, more responsibilities, involvement and commitment are required on the partners’ side; more risks, challenges and issues are emerging at the home institution (see
Q 6.1, Chapter 4). As was said previously, at the case study university, the Department 2 is mainly responsible for internationalization. And as the front line, faculties are highly involved, not only in teaching and marking, but also in quality assurance, moderation, assessment, arrangement of staff and schedules, and handling work overload. Faculties are required to incorporate these activities into their daily work. During peak time, complications and priority clashes may arise. Efficient communication and understanding may become difficult to achieve. Generally speaking, the organizational culture friction between the Department 2 and faculty is becoming evident. A higher level of cooperation and coordination across the key departments (Corporate, Department 2 and Faculty), resource allocation, operation process and change can put significant pressure on the faculty and Department 2 (see Q 6.1). Although there are more available modes of entry and more programme delivery options in grid 5 than in grid 1, the proportion of overlap is decreasing, which means less internal integration. This is because the extent of internationalization is increasing and in addition to student mobility, it now also includes partnerships. Thus, one-way recruitment becomes a two-way interaction. More staff is engaged, and more responsibilities and cooperation are required across different key departments within the university. However, grids 1 and 5 are not the only options; other potential areas of HE internationalization are also available.

5.3.2 Potential areas (grids 2 and 4)
Across grids 1 and 5, the upper parts indicate modes of entry; the lower parts represent associated programme delivery options. The difference between grids 1 and 5 is resource. The resource in grid 5 is decentralized; both partners are sharing their resources. Thus, collaboration is a resource-based partnership. But the resource in grid 1 is centralized at the home institution and only information is transferred and shared between the university and agents. But with superagents, the agents themselves can be seen as a resource (see figure 5.1, potential area 1, grid 4). In addition, the other potential area is industry-linked collaboration. According to corporate interviewee no.5 (see Q 7.2), working with industry can add credit to potential HE international development and
attract more international students (see figure 5.1, potential area 2, grid 2). Potential areas are a bonus of this research because they are not directly included in any interview question, but derived from the answers to Q 3.5 (the differences between partners and agents) and Q 7.2 (the difference in the levels of internationalization among faculties).

Potential area 1: Study Centre (grid 4)
Department 2 interviewees (no.10 and no.14) bring up the initial idea of a study centre, which is achievable by building a strong relationship with superagents. A study centre works physically as a facilitator, providing on-line facilities, group discussions, seminars and local student support. Programmes are delivered mainly over the internet. If there is a large cohort of students, a blended block intensive teaching can be arranged. The study centre can take different forms. It could be a physical resource, like a computer centre or a local student support centre. The study centre is a resource-based approach that considers the superagent’s resource and the superagent itself as a compatible resource for the home university. According to Department 2 interviewees’ answers (no.10 and no.14, see Q 2.2 and Q 3.5, Chapter 4), the university can treat superagents as partners and provide more training for them.

The difference between academic collaboration and a study centre is the level of partners’ involvement. Collaboration is a formal relationship based more on intangible shared resource (especially human resources); partners are fully or partially involved in the programme delivery. Collaborative partners adopt the traditional face-to-face teaching model and have the authority to award their own qualifications. However, the study centre partners play the role of facilitators or coordinators. Partners are responsible for providing basic online facilities and gathering students at the study centre where the online interaction, for example Wimba classroom or internet conference, can be launched. Local student support is also available at the study centre. This kind of a study centre is also resource-based, but primarily tangible resource-based rather than knowledge-based or intangible resource-based (such as human resource) because no academics are
permanently present there. The study centre starts with a small number of students and intends to use every opportunity for recruitment. If the study centre is really successful, it can be updated to a formal partnership. The main contribution of the study centre is to increase off-shore recruitment in a short term. However, the issue of technology (at the receiver’s side) can be a challenge. For example, students from African countries may have difficulty accessing the internet.

Potential area 2: Industry-related collaboration (grid 2)
Another potential area (identified by the faculty and corporate interviewees) is to work with industrial companies and provide more opportunities for students to gain practical experience. It can be arranged in different forms, such as formal placements, workshops, or joint projects with external organizations. This experience can attract more international students because besides qualification, students also have opportunities to use their knowledge and participate in real projects. Furthermore, this kind of experience can assist students in job hunting, because employers are more likely to employ someone with relevant experience. It could be said that the field experience may even be more valuable than the qualification itself; thus this area is more likely to be developed into a unique selling point from the marketing point of view.

Currently, at the case study university, working with industry is launched in few subject areas, for example, the programme of Computer Games (in Faculty A) and programme of Art, Design and Illustration (in Faculty B). Compared to a study centre, field experience should attract more international students if more programmes are linked with industries. It could then become a unique selling point. Although working with industry or corporations can increase the university’s international reputation, this potential area may be less attractive for the students who choose to study a foreign qualification without leaving their own countries. That is because working with industry is mainly a central-based approach where most partner corporations are located within the home institution’s
country; since the students engaged in the off-campus study will not study abroad, this potential area becomes less interesting for them.

Up to now, this research has discussed both engaged grids (1 and 5) and potential grids (2 and 4). The dynamic direction is represented by the red arrow starting in grid 1 (the left bottom corner) and moving to grid 9. The colour of the red arrow fades as it reaches grid 9, indicating that this area is out of scope of this research, since the case study university does not have an overseas branch campus. This area will be considered for further research. Further research will also address the remaining blank grids (3, 6, 7 and 8), as they are associated with both satellite campuses and OLI. But at this stage, these sections remain blank.

5.4 Comparison and evaluation of dynamic framework
This section compares the dynamic framework with the three related HE internationalization models (see discussion of models of HE internationalization, Chapter 2, section 2.6.2), and the framework is further evaluated.

5.4.1 LaRosa, Joseph and Javalg’s (2009) framework
LaRosa, Joseph and Javalg (2009) offer a framework for business schools entering foreign markets (see Chapter 2, section 2.6.2.1). This framework shows interactive forces of market entry and delivery choice. It focuses on a foreign country’s cultural considerations in shaping the students’ learning styles and the appropriate teaching methods that might fit the local learning styles.

First, LaRosa, Joseph and Javalg’s model explains the market entry strategy and programme delivery methods as ‘market entry mode / delivery choice’. They merge the two notions (market entry mode / delivery choice) together and deliver a message that programme delivery (‘delivery choice’) is the same as market entry mode (see discussion of mode of entry, Chapter 2, section 2.6.2.1). However, this dynamic framework argues
that mode of entry is a market entry strategy, and programme delivery is an operational activity to implement the market entry strategy. Besides the existing four options mentioned in LaRosa, Joseph and Javalg’s model, more entry strategies and programme delivery options are included in the dynamic framework.

Second, the middle part of LaRosa, Joseph and Javalg’s model emphasises external environment (see Chapter 2, section 2.6.2.1), and features HE internationalization as an environment-driven activity (such as the learning and teaching style in foreign country). This contradicts the findings of this research. This research shows that HE internationalization is a matter of integration because most critical issues are rooted internally, and therefore internal factors primarily determine the success of HE internationalization.

Finally, although LaRosa, Joseph and Javalg’s framework incorporates the works of three highly respected scholars - Czinkota’s (2006) four types of international delivery modes, Hofstede’s (1983) cultural dimensions, and Kolb’s (1999) experiential learning model - it lacks empirical evidence. Up to now, there has been no criticism of this framework. The potential reason can be that this framework was only identified in 2009 and is therefore still waiting to be tested. Furthermore, this framework is neither unique nor specific to HE internationalization (see Chapter 2, section 2.6.2.1), for example, its third section addresses common strategic concerns of international marketing. This can be accounted as a reason why no one has adopted this framework in field operation of HE internationalization.

5.4.2 Mazzarol, Soutar and Seng’s (2003) ‘Three-waves’ model

Mazzarol, Soutar and Seng (2003) categorize the development of HE internationalization into ‘three waves’ (see Chapter 2, section 2.6.2.2). The ‘first wave’ involves students travelling to a host nation to study at a chosen institution. The ‘second wave’ describes an institution moving into international markets through an alliance or coalition called
‘twinning programmes’. The ‘third wave’ represents opening overseas branch campuses. Mazzarol, Soutar and Seng’s first two waves are consistent with the first two stages of HE internationalization in the dynamic framework (home and partnership; see the vertical axis, figure 5.1). The difference emerges in the ‘third wave’, where the research findings do not recommend the overseas branch campus (‘third wave’) as the right move for most institutions. The reasons include inconsistent government support, high investment and risks, commercialization, and unpredictable international environment (see Chapter 2, section 2.6.2.2; and Q 5.1, Chapter 4). The feedback of research debriefing in the ‘Vice Chancellor’s 2010 Teaching and Learning International Conference’ confirmed the above concern, as professor John C. Wood, executive general manager of university programme division, Navitas, argued that the overseas branch campuses did not indicate a correct direction of HE internationalization or, at least, were not suitable for most Australian universities.

Next, Mazzarol, Soutar and Seng’s model presents HE internationalization with a linear tendency by moving from one wave to another. However, research findings show that HE internationalization follows a dynamic direction and partially overlaps with commercial internationalization. Instead of an abstract concept (such as the ‘three waves’ model), the dynamic framework provides a number of empirical market entry strategies and programme delivery options.

Finally, a potential wave (E-wave / E-learning) is missing from Mazzarol, Soutar and Seng’s discussion (see Chapter 2, section 2.6.2.2). No literature formally identifies E-wave (E-learning) as an entry strategy for HE internationalization; however, the dynamic framework recognizes the contribution of E-learning and adds it to the modes of entry.

42 Conversation at workshop of international conference organized by the University of Plymouth, Title: ‘Vice Chancellor’s 2010 Teaching and Learning International Conference’, Date: 30th June, 2010, Plymouth, United Kingdom.
5.4.3 Trim's (2003) conceptual framework for audit, evaluating and managing a partnership arrangement

Trim's (2003) conceptual model is a stakeholder-based framework for international education partnership management and income generation (see Chapter 2, section 2.6.2.3). However, the commercial purpose setting, extreme market focus (stakeholders and external environment), and related operational design (empowering a single department) of this framework constrain its application and credibility.

First, a wide range of stakeholders (from students to bankers, auditors and general public) stretches this model too thinly to meet each stakeholder group's expectations (see Chapter 2, section 2.6.2.3). The validity of the model will be reduced if too many parties are involved.

Second, Trim's model puts too much emphasis on meeting market demands (such as the partner's requirements), and therefore overlooks the internal and foundational effort of internationalization by the faculties and other key departments. HE internationalization is not only about partnership management, but other aspects of HE international development, such as student recruitment, programme delivery, market entry strategy and potential development areas. Trim's model has the same drawback as Mazzarol, Soutar and Seng's (2003) model because it presents only a facet of the full picture of HE internationalization. Furthermore, too many abstract steps (for example, 'international / global market strategy', 'market development' and 'new market establishment') make this model difficult to implement in practice.

Third, Trim states that HE internationalization is primarily driven by international market. His model focuses on external environment, designing new products and services, and market analysis, but overlooks the internal issues of integration within an institution, such as resource allocation, communication, student support, operational process, and organizational culture. This study shows that HE internationalization is primarily an
internal matter. Internationalization is just an ‘outfit’ or surface phenomena; the internal cohesion is the core trigger of success.

Furthermore, commercialization can steer education away from its main purpose and social responsibility (Smout, 2003). However, income generation was set as a key purpose of establishing international collaboration by Trim’s model (see Chapter 2, section 2.6.2.3). With this model, HE internationalization is more likely to become a money-making machine.

Finally, Trim’s model empowers a department called ‘the centre of entrepreneurship’ with full authority of the whole internationalization process. However, a single non-academic department cannot control all the international initiatives. At the case study university, internationalization is undertaken by the three key departments (Corporate, Department 2 and Faculty), and even though, there are still many implementational issues and problems at the university. HE internationalization is not a one-step initiative that can be handled by a single department. HE internationalization does need high levels of integrated cooperation within the university, especially from strategy making to strategy implementation. Solving the implementation issues raised in the process of internationalization (see Q 6.1, Chapter 4) is also vital to the success of international initiatives. By the same token, the researcher does not believe that a single department (‘centre of entrepreneurship’) can manage HE internationalization efficiently.

5.4.4 Evaluation of the dynamic framework
The dynamic framework demonstrates the modes of entry and associated programme delivery options in different phases of HE international development. Three key departments (Corporate, Department 2 and Faculty) are involved in this research. Internal integration plays a significant role in the success of HE internationalization. The limitations of the application of this framework to the operation of an overseas branch campus and international activities at the foreign partner’s site are the main drawback of
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the dynamic framework. The effect of internationalization as a prior condition at the home university also affects the application of this framework.

First, this framework is designed for HE internationalization in terms of international recruitment (home stage) and academic collaboration (partnership stage). The status of an overseas satellite campus is out of scope of this research.

Next, the prerequisite of this model is that internationalization has to be one of the central missions or foci for the university. If an institution is not interested in internationalization, then this model is not applicable. For those universities that are more willing to embrace internationalization, the dynamic framework provides an empirical guidance; however, this framework cannot be used as a rescue or back-up solution for an institution’s decline on the home market. If an institution is struggling to recruit home students, turning to international expansion is not an appropriate alternative because research findings show that the internal factors (intra-university integration) primarily affect HE internationalization. Randomly going for internationalization may result in the institution facing more challenges, risks and even collapse.

Finally, only one party can be represented in this framework: either the home institution or a partner institution. This framework is not designed to interpret both parties simultaneously. In addition, the role of Department 2 can be transferred into the marketing department or any department responsible for international recruitment and initiatives.
Chapter Six Conclusion and Recommendations

6.0 Conclusion

The market entry dynamic framework is the main contribution of this research. Research findings indicate that most issues of HE internationalization come from the university’s internal culture, rather than from the external environment. HE internationalization is about the university’s internal integration. This chapter consists of three sections: conclusion, recommendations and further research. The conclusion presents chapter summaries. Research contributions are discussed from three perspectives: theoretical contribution, practical contribution, and faculty-specific contribution. Firstly, the theoretical contribution concentrates on the structure, content and application of the dynamic framework. Next, the practical contribution focuses on the critical implementation issues of HE internationalization. And finally, the faculty-specific contribution addresses the difference in the process of internationalization across different faculties. Recommendations are divided into general and group-specific. Further research addresses testing generalizability of the dynamic framework and investigating the operation of an overseas branch campus.

Figure 6.1 Education-specific market entry dynamic framework (same as figure 5.1, see Chapter 5)
6.1 Chapter summary

This research is a qualitative analysis with the focus on a single case study. As a participant observer, the researcher critically evaluates how the case study university undertakes internationalization, and identifies critical implementation issues of HE internationalization.

The overall aim of this research is to construct an education-specific market entry dynamic framework to explain international market expansion for HE institutions; four specific objectives of this research are involved in this project. The first objective is to critically review relevant literature on strategy implementation and identify the key implementation issues of HE internationalization; the second objective is to evaluate how the case study university undertakes internationalization in terms of international recruitment and academic collaboration; followed by the third objective, which is to highlight the faculty-specific factors that affect the level of internationalization across faculties at the case study university; and finally, an education-specific market entry dynamic framework for HE internationalization is developed to meet the last objective of this research. Six research themes are emerging during the process of primary data collection and observation. They are:

Theme 1: Internationalization strategy and understanding
Theme 2: International recruitment strategy
Theme 3: Academic collaboration (3A) and programme delivery (3B)
Theme 4: Overseas branch campus
Theme 5: Problems, issues and challenges of HE internationalization
Theme 6: Internationalization of faculties

Literature review (Chapter 2) provides the theoretical underpinning of this thesis. The main body of literature includes perspectives on commercial and HE internationalization. The literature on commercial internationalization examines a number of theories of international approach, mode of entry, strategy implementation and obstacles, choice of
international market; the literature on HE internationalization addresses internationalization of HE, models and forms of HE internationalization, and challenges and risks of HE internationalization. This research uses the literature on commercial internationalization to interpret HE internationalization, and finds that there is a gap between commercial internationalization and HE internationalization, although they are interrelated. Current literature on commercial internationalization and HE internationalization cannot fully explain the observed circumstance at the case study university; thus an education-specific market entry framework is proposed to fill this gap.

**Research methodology (Chapter 3)** selects and justifies the overall approach to the research process, from the theoretical underpinning to data collection and analysis. This research adopts the interpretivist philosophy and inductive approach. Research strategies include participant observation, ethnography, case studies, theoretical or descriptive framework and triangulation. A post-1992 university is chosen as a case study. The total of 20 interviewees from three key departments (Corporate, Department 2 and Faculty) were selected and 22 interviews were conducted; all audio records were saved and transcribed. Semi-structured interview was selected as the main primary data collection method. Other types of data collection include observation (including the case of SI Academy, China and the researcher's own overseas study experience), and secondary data (such as the university website, collaboration announcements, reports and documents). The chosen data analysis strategies consist of content analysis, categorization of meaning, critical discourse analysis (CDA), and colour coding. Content analysis helped examine a large volume of data with relative ease in a systematic fashion. Colour coding of transcripts was used to identify the most frequently mentioned issues and to develop sub-themes. Categorization of meaning helped reduce data and identify patterns. The total of 329 pages of interview transcripts were summarized into key points. Then, with CDA, the denotative meaning was recognized and the underlying connotative meaning of interviewees' subjective views was examined. Finally, the result of documentary data analysis was used to triangulate with primary and observed data.
focus group technique was adopted as a way to better understand why different departments feel the way they do in terms of HE internationalization. A comparative analysis of the answers from each group revealed an overlapping pattern structure. The pattern comprises three main categories and seven sub-groups: the common points (all groups agreed), partially shared points (agreed by two groups), and group-specific points (agreed by one group), and indicates the degree of integration within the university. The common points imply the highest level of internal cohesion in terms of HE internationalization; while the group-specific points present the lowest.

Case study (Chapter 4) addresses primary research at the case study university (data presentation and analysis). Based on the positions and job responsibilities, the interviewees were separated into three groups (Corporate, Department 2 and Faculty). Each interview question was labeled as informative, analytical or evaluative based on the nature of question. Labeling interview questions revealed an incremental degree of cognitive involvement. Three sources of data collection (primary data, documentary / secondary data, and observed data) encouraged data triangulation and increased research reliability. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) and content analysis were adopted to construct and reproduce the circumstance of HE internationalization at the case study university rather than simply revealing the circumstance as a phenomenon because not every answer contained denotative meaning and the underlying connotative meaning needed to be interpreted in order to accurately represent the interviewees’ subjective views of HE internationalization.

Construction of the dynamic framework (Chapter 5) develops the education-specific market entry dynamic framework. This framework explains the relationship between commercial internationalization and HE internationalization and fills the knowledge gap identified in Chapter 2. The dynamic framework examines the different modes of market entry for HE internationalization, the associated programme delivery methods and potential areas for further development. The dynamic framework shows a matrix of nine
grids and two axes. The horizontal axis presents the theories of international approach, whose characteristics are compatible with HE internationalization. The vertical axis addresses the development of HE internationalization including three stages: home, partnership and overseas campus. Grids 1 and 5 are the main content of the dynamic framework, which provides a number of education-specific modes of entry (business-based modes: export, franchise and alliance, and education-based modes: articulation, credit transfer, validation, top-up and E-learning), and associated programme delivery methods (home staff teaching abroad, partners delivering home syllabus, partner delivering their own syllabus, E-learning, traditional on-campus delivery, and hybrid teaching). Grids 2 and 4 indicate two potential areas of HE international development (study centre and industry-related collaboration). Since the case study university does not have an overseas branch campus, grid 9 remains as an area of further research.

6.2 Contribution to knowledge
The dynamic framework is the main contribution of this research. It is a bespoke model that guides institutions’ internationalization in terms of international recruitment and academic collaboration. Research contribution primarily meets research objectives and consists of theoretical contribution, practical contribution, and faculty-specific contribution. The theoretical contribution (the dynamic framework) focuses on the theories of international approach (the horizontal axis), stages of HE internationalization development (the vertical axis), modes of entry, programme delivery methods, and potential areas of further development. The practical contribution identifies critical implementation issues of HE internationalization at the case study university. The faculty-specific contribution discusses the difference in process of HE internationalization across four faculties (Faculties A, B, C, D), and explains why the level of internationalization is different among the faculties. The linkage between research contributions and literature review is shown in figure 6.2. The central rectangle represents research contributions that fill the knowledge gap (see figure 2.1, Chapter 2) between commercial internationalization and HE internationalization.
6.2.1 Theoretical contribution

The reason the researcher categorizes the dynamic framework as a theoretical contribution is that the dynamic framework is a new conceptual model pending further tests of generalizability through quantitative studies. The theoretical contribution meets the following research objectives: to critically evaluate how the case study university undertakes internationalization in terms of international recruitment and academic collaboration; and to develop an education-specific market entry dynamic framework for HE internationalization.

6.2.1.1 Framework structure

The dynamic framework has two axes: horizontal and vertical. The horizontal axis presents the theories of international approach applicable to HE internationalization: transactional cost analysis (TCA), the agency approach, the resource-based approach and the OLI approach. Although these approaches are consistent with HE internationalization, none of them can explain the full picture of HE internationalization. Thus, they are arranged horizontally in different phases corresponding to the stages of HE...
internationalization development (see the vertical axis). Three stages are addressed in the HE internationalization development: home, partnership and overseas campus. The dynamic framework is constructed based on the combination of both vertical and horizontal axes.

6.2.1.2 Framework content

Grids 1 and 5 are the main content of this framework. They present a number of education-specific modes of entry that consist of the business-based modes of entry (export, franchise and alliance) and the education-based modes of entry (articulation, validation, credit transfer, top-up, and E-learning). The choice of programme delivery depends on the entry strategy adopted.

Grid 1 combines the features of the agency approach and the home stage of HE internationalization. Compared to grid 5 (as discussed below), international initiatives in grid 1 bear lower risk and less cost because the university does not need to invest into agents in foreign markets. Foreign students join the home academic schedule and most resources are managed centrally at the home site, thus the integration among the three key departments is viable as the related international activities do not distract or overload the departments too much. However, when students from one nation dominate a class, the issue of overcrowding or unbalanced groups may occur (see Q 6.2, Chapter 4). This circumstance can further challenge student support and study experience. In this grid, the students recruited are usually treated as individual applicants. Their previous qualifications and credits may not be fully recognized by the home university.

Grid 5 combines the features of the resource-based approach and the partnership stage of HE internationalization. This grid encourages international academic collaboration, knowledge dissemination, and staff interaction. On the one hand, it helps establish reliable partnerships and assists foreign institutions in improving their academic standards; on the other hand, it provides opportunities for the home university to better
understand overseas markets and enter them more efficiently. Grid 5 has a smaller proportion of overlap than grid 1. This is because the extent and complexity of HE internationalization in grid 5 is much higher than in grid 1. More departments and more people are involved. Working with overseas partners is more challenging than dealing with agents because more issues need to be carefully considered. The main challenge of grid 5 is the university's internal integration, which is noted as the implementational issues of HE internationalization (such as resource, communication, operational process, motivation and incentives, cooperation, organizational culture, and resistance to change - see Q 6.1, Chapter 4). Faculties also face different dilemmas and difficulties (such as the level of international experience, the nature of programmes, promotion priority, and market demand - see Q 7.2, Chapter 4). Compared to grid 1, grid 5 takes longer for the home university to achieve a positive return on investment (ROI). In terms of quality assurance, home universities have to bear more responsibilities to make sure that the host institutions achieve an equivalent academic standard.

Grids 2 and 4 present two potential areas for further HE international development at the case study university: industry-related collaboration (grid 2), and study centre (grid 4).

Industry-related collaboration (grid 2) allows the university to work with businesses and provides more opportunities for students to gain practical experience through placement, workshops, or joint projects. Graduates with practical experience have more competitive advantage when job hunting. Although industry-related collaboration can enrich students' study experience, it is less attractive to the partners' students who choose to study locally without leaving their home countries. Also, not every programme can include collaboration with industries. Due to particular regulations, some programmes (such as law, nursing and education) have few placement opportunities for international students.

The study centre (grid 4) enables the university to share superagents' resources and works physically as a facilitator / coordinator, providing on-line facilities and local
student support. When there is a viable cohort of students, some programmes can be launched over the internet. The advantage of the study centre is to seize recruitment opportunities starting with a small number of students. International recruitment targets are more likely to be achieved in a short term, compared to the establishment of a partnership (grid 5). The weakness of the study centre lies in information asymmetry, whereby superagents (facilitators / coordinators) will have the opportunity to access the home university’s core competence (such as syllabus and curriculum). Other competitor universities may also access the home university’s resources through the same agents. Although these superagents are seen as ‘loyal’ agents or potential partners, they will not bear any risk for any home university because they work on commission and there are always other options available (such as a better deal). The home university may also find it difficult to monitor the local service and student support provided by these agents.

Since the case study university does not have an overseas branch campus, the investigation of the overseas branch campus (grid 9) is left for further research (see section 6.4). Other grids (3, 6, 7, 8) are not fully explored because they are also outside the scope of this research. These grids are more likely to be investigated in conjunction with the theme of the overseas branch campus, where the related market entry strategy will be greenfield (see mode of entry, Chapter 2, section 2.2). Since the overseas subsidiaries are wholly owned by the home university, the associated programme delivery methods should be on-campus traditional delivery using own staff employed at either the home campus site or the overseas branch site. In respect to the implementation issues of HE internationalization, more external challenges are expected as these grids are closely linked with the hierarchical expansion in foreign markets. The issues raised in this research may still be transferable to the overseas campus stage. However, the aforementioned points are based on the researcher’s assumptions and current understanding of HE internationalization; other models or issues may rise during the investigation of the overseas branch campus model.
6.2.1.3 Application of the dynamic framework

This research establishes a brand new dynamic framework (9-grid and 2 axes) to guide institutions' HE internationalization in terms of international recruitment and academic collaboration by providing education-specific market entry strategies and programme delivery methods. In terms of the theories of international approach (the horizontal axis), both the agency approach and resource-based approach are active, and the OLI approach is eliminated. In terms of the HE international development stage (the vertical axis), both the home stage and partnership stage are engaged, and the overseas campus stage is excluded. In respect to the matrix positions, grids 1, 2, 4, 5 are applicable, whilst other grids (3, 6, 7-9) are the areas for further research. The following section discusses the application of this dynamic framework.

First, universities need to choose a stance from which their international initiatives can be launched, such as in grid 1 or 5 or both. If grid 1 is adopted, then using agents is the main international recruitment strategy (see Q 1.3, Chapter 4). Student mobility will be a typical circumstance of this grid. International students come over to the home universities' campus and study abroad. However, if grid 5 is adopted, then foreign partners play the primary role in international recruitment (see Q 1.3, Q 2.1 and Q 3.3 - Q 3.5, Chapter 4). The partners' students can graduate with the home university's qualification and continue their study either at the home university's original site or in their own countries with local partners. Some partners are also involved in programme delivery, local market development and advertisement (see Q 3.3, Chapter 4). The case study university is simultaneously involved in grids 1 and 5.

Next, based on the stance adopted, the home universities can choose any education-specific market entry strategy (the upper part of grids 1 and 5; see figure 6.1), in which both business-based modes of entry and education-based modes of entry are available options (see Q 3.1 and Q 3.2, Chapter 4; and discussion of market entry and programme delivery methods, grids 1 and 5, Chapter 5, section 5.3.1). Unlike commercial
internationalization, the home university can choose more than one market entry strategy based on its particular situation. For example, the case study university employs validation in the partnerships with the VAD School, Greece, and the W.E Council, Malaysia; at the same time, it adopts franchise with the BA College, Botswana, top up with the SHM School, Switzerland, and alliance with the D.C College and G College, China. Three modes of entry (articulation, franchise and alliance) are involved in the partnership between the home university and the MM Institute, Malawi at different development phases.

Since the entry strategies are confirmed, the next step is to choose the associated programme delivery methods (the lower part of grids 1 and 5, see figure 6.1). For example, if franchise is adopted as a market entry strategy, then the programme delivery method will be ‘partners delivering the home university’s syllabus’; if validation is chosen as a mode of entry, then the programme delivery method will be ‘partners delivering their syllabus accredited by the home university’. If E-learning is chosen, the programmes will be mainly delivered over the internet; and if export is employed, the programme delivery method will be traditional on-campus delivery because international students will study abroad in the home university’s country (see Q 4.1, Chapter 4; also see the discussion of market entry and programme delivery methods, grids 1 and 5, Chapter 5, section 5.3.1). The hands-on way (home staff teaching abroad) is more expensive, but lower risk; the hands-off way (partners’ lecturers delivering programmes) is less expensive but higher risk. In order to balance that, the university can mix programme delivery methods during internationalization.

Up to the previous step, the home university should be able to enter and conduct HE internationalization in foreign markets. If international initiatives are successful the home university can start seeking potential areas for further development of HE internationalization through either industry-related collaboration (grid 2) or a study centre (grid 4). There is no particular procedure in terms of seeking potential areas of further
development of HE internationalization. The home university can choose both grids (2 and 4), adopt one, or neither. Certain programmes at the case study university have collaborated with industries and thus have become more attractive to international students. Consequently, the faculties offering these kinds of industry-linked programmes are more likely to have higher degree of internationalization compared to other faculties (see Q 7.1 and Q 7.2, Chapter 4). Currently, the case study university does not have a study centre, although some interviewees suggest it as a potential area for further development (see Q 3.5 and Q 2.2, Chapter 4).

Since the investigation of the overseas branch campus is not included in this research, this dynamic framework cannot provide empirical guidance for the institutions who wish to enter a foreign market through establishing their own overseas branch campus (see discussion of limitation of dynamic framework, Chapter 5, section 5.4.4). Besides the dynamic framework, this research also highlights a number of implementation issues that impede the execution of the university’s international strategy. These critical factors are considered as the practical contribution of this research.

6.2.2 Practical contribution

The practical contribution results from a critical review of relevant literature and the identification of the key implementation issues of HE internationalization. Research findings indicate that most issues of HE internationalization are rooted internally. These issues arise from the overlapping pattern among the three key departments and include resource allocation, communication, cooperation and coordination, motivation and incentive, organizational culture, resistance to change, operational process, student support and external factors. Most factors have been addressed by the literature on the obstacles to strategy implementation (see discussion of strategy implementation and obstacles, Chapter 2, section 2.3). Thus, these factors, with the exception of student support are neither new nor unique to education.
Three statuses demonstrate an incremental level of internal integration in terms of internationalization at the case study university (see figure 6.3). When these three circles are completely independent, there is no overlap among them. This is the worst situation where internationalization has the lowest chance of success because there is no interrelation among these key departments and no linkage between strategy formulation and strategy implementation. Thus, in this situation, international initiatives are most likely to fail. The circumstance at the case study university is best represented by the second status, where there is some degree of overlap among the key departments. The third status is an ideal situation where the three departments work as one with the highest level of integration. However, this phase is difficult to achieve in practice because it involves three different departments with their own responsibilities and priorities that cannot be fully replaced by the other two, so there will always be a certain level of mismatch in terms of the specific subjective views of internationalization. The degree of overlap depends on how many points are fully agreed upon or partially shared among the three groups. The more overlapping points mean the higher level of integration and potentially higher possibilities for success of HE internationalization. Thus, the overall aim is to achieve the highest proportion of overlap among the key departments. The relationship of three circles can help each key department understand how their effort can contribute to HE internationalization and the consequences of weak internal integration.

Figure 6.3 Implementation issues of HE internationalization

**Issues:**
- Communication
- Operational process
- Resources allocation
- Organizational culture
- Resistance to change
- External factors
- Student support
- Cooperation and coordination
- Motivation and incentive
Resource allocation

Every interview group knows how important resource is. But the corporate group considers resource less of an issue because they have already planned for it in the business budget. Therefore, buying in new staff is not difficult if the cost of doing so is included in the budget. However, according to the Department 2 group, resource in terms of capital is a problem. Department 2 needs more money for international initiatives. Resource in terms of staff puts more pressure on the faculty academics, who then talk about having to deal with work overload and peak schedules. The faculties say that they need more people, but the corporate group does not quite agree with that because it believes that sufficient resource has already been given.

Communication

Although all interview groups understand the role of communication, it is still a critical issue on most levels at the university. Ineffective communication exists not only between Department 2 and the faculties, but also within Department 2 itself. The Department 2 interviewees point out that there is lack of staff development and regular programme updating in Department 2 to help them better understand current programmes. Sometimes, they find it difficult to promote certain programmes that are out of the scope of their understanding. A key Department 2 interviewee comments that s/he does not know Faculty D’s international development at all (see Q 6.1, Department 2 interviewee no.10), even though Department 2 is the central department mainly dealing with international initiative. If Department 2 does not have the necessary knowledge, then how can it help the faculties become internationalized? Some faculty members state that they do not know where international expertise and support are within the university (according to faculty interviewee no.16 and corporate interviewee no.6). Other faculties who claim to have good communication with Department 2 also face some difficulties, for example, the argument about who (Department 2 or the faculty) should go for international recruitment abroad; clashes between the faculty’s own purpose and Department 2’s central planning in terms of international initiatives (see Q 6.1, faculty interviewee,
Research findings show that external communication with potential students and partners in Department 2 (such as Admissions) is also weak (see observed evidence to Q 6.1, Chapter 4). However, the corporate group does not realize that this is a serious problem. They comment that at their level, each faculty is cooperative and active in internationalization (according to corporate interviewee no.4, see Q 7.2, Chapter 4). They do not have to force the faculties to participate in internationalization. And, Department 2 does not realize how ineffective communication is, even within their own department (according to Department 2 interviewee no.13, see Q 6.1). Actually, communication itself is not a problem because communication is just an information exchange process from the sender to the receiver. The real problem is the quality of communication. In other words, there is no standard for measuring the efficiency of communication: for example, an immediate reply (in face-to-face communication), while quick, may not contain correct answers. Communication alone does not guarantee understanding and action. In a hierarchical organizational structure, information is normally released from the top management. The lower operational level staff are normally told what needs to be done, rather than why they need to do it, and have to work out on their own how to do it. When communication is weak, the faculties get less information, the level of uncertainty increases, cooperation becomes reluctant and finally results in resistance to participation in internationalization.

Operational process

The issues with the operational process are mainly rooted within the faculty. These issues within the operational process include loading, sequencing, scheduling and the paradox of programme revalidation. These issues can negatively affect the faculties’ daily activities and frustrate academics’ enthusiasm for internationalization.

Loading is highlighted by the academics as a challenge because internationalization keeps clashing with their teaching at the home institution. Work overload is their main
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problem. This factor is corresponding to the previous issue of the lack of resource in terms of staff.

Scheduling is another major problem for the faculty because collaboration overextends academic schedules. It can clash with the home university’s teaching schedule, staff’s annual leave and individual holidays. As interviewee (faculty interviewee no.17) states, “staff have nowhere to take holiday”.

In terms of sequencing, Department 2 believes (Department 2 interviewee no.14) that it is unfair if academic staff always put international activities at the bottom of their list of priorities because international students should be treated equally to home students, even though they may be far away. Sometimes, the faculties’ version of sequencing puts pressure on the Department 2 staff, especially the coordinators or project leaders, because they feel uneasy in explaining the faculties’ response to the collaborative partners. It may affect trust and communication when establishing a partnership.

During internationalization, some faculties (such as Faculty C) face the dilemma of standardizing the existing curriculum and adopting foreign markets’ demands and designing new programmes because certain Anglo-centric programmes (for example, education, nursing and law) are bespoke for those who will teach or serve in the United Kingdom. Thus there is little room for these types of programmes (see Q 7.2, Chapter 4) to become internationalized.

Cooperation and coordination

The current level of cooperation and coordination at the case study university is insufficient. There is lack of understanding and interaction among the key departments, especially between Department 2 and the faculty. The overarching responsibilities and accountability between Department 2-driven and faculty-driven international initiatives do not enhance the positive effect of international initiatives (see discussion of
cooperation and coordination, Q 6.1, Chapter 4). The faculties argue that the root of internationalization, especially partnerships, must be within the faculty who has expertise in particular subjects, while Department 2 claims that it is the central department and therefore mainly responsible for internationalization. Actually, Department 2’s goal can only be achieved if Department 2 reduces its central responsibility to the role of an internal coordinator because unlike the faculties, Department 2 does not have full implementation functions to empirically deliver international initiatives, especially collaborations and partnerships. Department 2 has to rely on the faculties’ cooperation to move its international planning forward. If Department 2 does not re-adjust its work scope and concentration this issue will not be resolved because there is still uncertainty regarding responsibility and accountability. And the resistance to participating and cooperating in internationalization at the faculty level will not be solved fundamentally, either. The faculties stress that Department 2 should support them more (see Chapter 4, Q 6.1, faculty interviewees no.16 and no.20), the role of International Office needs to be clear and the efficiency of application process in Admissions also needs to improve (faculty interviewee no.19), while Department 2 states that there is strong resistance to participating in internationalization at the faculty level (Department 2 interviewees no.10, no.13 and no.14). These conflicts affect the outcomes of cooperation and coordination among the key departments, which results in the failure of strategy implementation. The current atmosphere suggests an unhealthy institutional context, where there is a discord among the key departments. Furthermore, the negative effect of this issue is evident within a single department, as a Department 2 interviewee (no.13) stresses: low efficiency in terms of preparing contracts for agents and agreements for partners can frustrate Department 2’s own staff’s enthusiasm regarding internationalization.

Organizational culture and resistance to change
At the case study university, one of the organizational culture issues stems from the culture clash among the departments and resistance to change in terms of HE internationalization, especially between Department 2 and the faculty. The culture of
Department 2 is more forceful in promoting internationalization because establishing partnerships and recruiting students is their main job. Academics are not used to participating in international activities because they see teaching as their main responsibility. However, both the corporate and Department 2 consider international initiatives to be an integral part of the faculty’s job. Since Department 2 keeps passing international initiatives to the faculties for implementation and the faculties feel forced to participate in internationalization and as a result having to deal with work overload and peak schedules. Some academics are less motivated because sometimes their effort may not be fully recognized by the senior management. Allowance delays and inefficient incentives can also frustrate individuals’ enthusiasm for internationalization and lead to passive cooperation. When internationalization is seen as additional work there is reluctance to participate or resistance to change. This research shows that this resistance is primarily individual. Sometimes, people resist changes simply because change represents uncertainty (Visagie and Botha, 1998), and they fear the pressure of dealing with uncertainty (Karim and Kathawala, 2005). When the academics are stressed and forced to participate in internationalization, they may take their own frustrations out on partner institutions (Department 2 interviewee no.14, see Q 6.1, Chapter 4). Some academics might even resist changes because they are concerned about their own personal failure (Mink, 1992) or potential threats to their reputation (Giangreco and Peccei, 2005), such as ‘what am I going to do if the partners’ qualifications are higher than mine?’ (Department 2 interviewee no.14), because some home faculty academics may feel uncomfortable teaching those partners who have higher qualification than themselves, during academic collaborations.

Although the Department 2 interviewees stress that the faculty academics must change their attitude, it is difficult to achieve in a short time because organizational culture is soft, difficult to change, with a historical basis, and socially constructed (see discussion of how to change culture and reduce resistance, Chapter 2, section 2.3.3.5.2). Changing attitude should not start with the attitude itself, but with performance, behaviour,
incentives, people or organizational structure because consequent influence can efficiently affect people’s mindset and, as a result, organizational culture (Hrebiniak, 2009). Thus, the university needs to adopt a top-down management behaviour (such as from deans and managers) and leadership influence through which the academics can perceive and appreciate the ways and style the leaders work. The top-down management behaviour includes the way the senior management treats or evaluates staff’s performance and contributions to the university in terms of HE internationalization, how much risk and error can be tolerated, the emphasis placed on ethics or fairness in transactions, and decision making during internationalization.

Motivation and incentive
Motivation and incentive can build staff’s skills and self-confidence (see Chapter 2, section 2.3.3.4). However, only few interviewees say that they are passionate about internationalization. Most faculty interviewees are less motivated and consider internationalization as extrinsic and outside their areas of interest. In this research, the issue of motivation and incentive is reflected in that the staff’s efforts of internationalization are not fully recognized; there are delays in the staff getting reimbursed for the expense incurred abroad; there is little internal support for the faculty academics (see discussion of motivation and incentive, Chapter 4, Q 6.1). Incentive (such as allowance) is a way to show the management’s appreciation of the staff’s contribution. However, based on previous experience, both the corporate and Department 2 conclude that the root of resistance to change is not money and therefore monetary incentive should not be given because internationalization is part of the faculty’s job. Yet, allowance seems to be important to faculty individuals, since they keep mentioning it as an issue. It is obvious that there is a mismatch between what is asked for and what is given. This mindset conflict can negatively affect the staff’s daily work and frustrate their enthusiasm for internationalization.
Student support
Unlike the above concerns, the issue of student support is a specific criterion for HE internationalization. Good student service can strengthen the university's international reputation through the word of mouth, thus enhancing direct recruitment. However, the current student service provided by Department 2 did not achieve the expected outcome for both the faculty and potential partner (S1 Academy, China). The two departments under Department 2 involved with this issue are the International Student Centre and Admissions. The level of international student support is not equivalent across the faculties. Faculty D interviewees point out that international students in Faculty D should have equal access to student support and same experience as the students in other faculties (see Q 6.1, Chapter 4). Some faculties (such as Faculties B and C) have concerns over student service in terms of English language provision, student settlement, local community connection, study environment and accommodation. Low efficiency of processing international applications in Admissions (highlighted by the faculty group) is another aspect of student support problems. The faculties state that Admissions takes a long time to inform programme leaders and give feedback to the applicants (faculty interviewee no.19, see Q 6.1, Chapter 4), which may result in the faculty losing potential international students, which has already happened to the S1 Academy's students (see observed evidence to Q 6.1, Chapter 4). But Department 2, especially the International Student Centre and Admissions, may not fully realize it because no Department 2 interviewees mention this issue or they are not willing to highlight this point to criticize themselves.

External environment
Research findings show that the external environment is considered one of the critical factors in terms of HE internationalization; this includes governmental policy (such as U.K. Boarder Agency visa regulations and English language requirements), overseas environment (such as the health and safety situation in African states, diseases such as SARS and swine flu), international competition (such as league tables and international
reputation), volatile and variable international environment, campus location (in the case of Faculty D), and level of technology (such as access to the internet in some African countries). These external factors mostly match those discussed in the literature on the choice of international market (see Chapter 2, section 2.4). In the case study university, the external factors are typically reflected by the governmental restriction and international competition (see discussion of external issues: governmental policy and international competition, Chapter 2, section 2.7.2). Other universities may face similar challenges because external environment is out of the university’s control. However, research findings show that HE internationalization is about how to cope with the university’s internal issues. The impact of external challenges do not primarily affect HE internationalization. There is a significant difference in the development of internationalization among different universities (for example, some institutions have established their own overseas branch campuses; others have not), but the external environment faced by all universities is the same. Thus, external factors are not the main concern for HE internationalization. And the existing literature may focus too much on the environment (see section 2.4, Chapter 2), and overlook the organization’s internal issues, which may be of greater importance for internationalization.

The reason why the researcher categorizes implementation issues as the practical contribution is that these implementation issues are derived from an empirical investigation of internationalization at the case study university. These critical factors are practical and real to the case study university. Previous scholars’ research has identified similar issues and confirmed the empirical value of these critical implementation factors in practice. Although the researcher is not the initial discoverer of these factors in business, her investigation and interpretation indicates that these factors are also applicable, credible and transferrable to HE internationalization in terms of the HE international strategy implementation. This contribution presents particular forms of these critical factors within an institutional context. Research findings indicate that most issues are rooted internally. The university’s internal integration, capability and willingness are
vital to HE internationalization. This implies that HE internationalization is primarily the matter of 'internalization', rather than 'externalization', although most existing literature concentrates on the external environment (such as economy, competition, governmental policy, and culture). These implementational issues highlight the areas where the university needs to improve. Currently, there is no model to evaluate HE internationalization from an internal perspective. Instead of going through numerous 'unfit' business models, the practical contribution provides a particular institutional evaluation stance to address the issues that other universities may face during HE internationalization. However, even though everyone fully understands these implementational issues, the level of internationalization may still remain different across the faculties. This can be explained by the following faculty-specific factors.

6.2.3 Faculty-specific factors
Faculty-specific factors explain the reasons why international development is different among the faculties, and highlight the issues and challenges of HE internationalization from a faculty's standpoint. This contribution is derived mainly from Q 7.2 (Why do you think the level of internationalization in each faculty is different?), and meets research objective (c) 'to highlight the particular factors that affect the level of internationalization across faculties at the case stud university'.

The identified faculty-specific factors include faculty priority, the nature of programmes, market demand and promotion priority, lack of international experience and expertise, marketing positioning, faculty autonomy and inconsistent management, faculty culture and staff attitude, collaboration with industries, and the 'me too subject' phenomena. Theses factors not only explain the difference in the process of internationalization across faculties, but also imply that HE internationalization cannot be conducted the same way in each faculty. Internationalization should be considered a part of each faculty's particular focus. The above factors can help faculties evaluate and improve their...
international performance through a better understanding of their own issues regarding HE internationalization. In addition, this contribution implies that higher levels of internationalization may not always be better for faculties. The faculty’s success should not be simply measured by the degree of internationalization of its programmes. Internationalization should not be used as an indicator of excellence for institutions (Harris, 2008).

Faculty priority
Faculty priority indicates whether faculties view internationalization as their priority; whether internationalization can be placed at the top of faculty’s agenda; and how the faculties perceive the message of internationalization. The faculty reaction can be summarized as positive (such as Faculties A and B), negative (such as Faculty C) and slow (Faculty D). The faculty’s reaction partially reflects the faculty’s senior management’s view in terms of HE internationalization.

Nature of programmes
The characteristics of the programme make certain programmes more open to being internationalized. All interviewees agree that business and IT programmes are more transportable to other countries. Others programmes, such as law, education and health, have little room for internationalization because it is difficult to arrange placements for international students. And some programmes seem to be bespoke for British students. For example, undergraduate education programmes are particularly designed for the U.K. students who will teach in the United Kingdom (according to corporate interviewee no.6). Furthermore, different countries have different understandings of the nature of programmes and this can affect international recruitment. For example, Beauty and Spa, Leisure Management and Hairdressing Management may not been seen as ‘serious’ programmes in some countries. Thus governments in these countries will not sponsor or fund their students studying these kinds of programmes. National culture and religion can also affect international recruitment; for example, it is difficult to get a Muslim student to...
Market demand and promote priority

Unlike commercial internationalization, the effect of global homogeneous customer demand (see discussion of international expansion: standardization and adaptation, Chapter 2, section 2.4.3) is not as obvious in HE internationalization. Some programmes are more in demand around the world and therefore the faculties offering these programmes are more likely to have more international students. In addition, currently, the case study university has promoted priority in five key regions (such as India, China, Middle East, Nigeria, see Q 2.1, Chapter 4). However, not every faculty benefits from the central recruitment priority. For example, Faculty D is struggling to get its message out because the current international recruitment strategy does not properly fit Faculty D’s niche or major programmes (see Q 7.2, Chapter 4). The current international recruitment strategy primarily starts with a particular country and then matches each faculty’s programmes to local needs rather than starting with particular niche programmes such as Beauty and Spa, Outdoor Activities and Sport Management, Hospitality and Hotel Management. Thus Faculty D appears to be left out of internationalization by Department 2. However, Department 2’s explanation of the mismatch between Faculty D’s programmes and the focus of international recruitment is that Faculty D’s niche programmes are too unique for international demand. Due to limited resources, the university cannot seize every possible opportunity for international recruitment. There is a mismatch between the central international recruitment strategy and the faculty’s particular focus on niche programmes. If the university does not change the central recruitment strategy, the study centre (grid 4, see discussion of potential area, Chapter 5, section 5.3.2) can be adopted as a potential way that helps Faculty D increase its international recruitment, especially starting with a small cohort of students.
Lack of international experience and expertise

Lack of international experience and expertise challenges certain faculties (such as Faculty C) because they are not used to participating in internationalization. They are less experienced and do not know where and how to get their programmes internationalized, and therefore feel more uncertain in both international initiatives and international markets. As a result, these faculties prefer not to go ahead with HE internationalization in order to avoid potential mistakes (according to corporate interviewee no. 6).

Good reputation of service

The university offers a good service to partnerships, which is a reason why partners choose the case study university: “they (partners) will not be treated the same if they choose other universities” (Department 2 interviewee no.14). However, this reason is Department 2’s own opinion; the other two interview groups do not mention it (see the discussion of potential reasons, Q 7.2, Chapter 4) and the related observed data shows an opposite view (see observed evidence, Q 6.1, Chapter 4). Thus this point is not qualified as a general comment.

Marketing positioning

Difference in marketing positioning influences the faculty’s international development. For example, Faculty D is positioned to target mainly U.K. further education students, rather than international students. More further education programmes are offered by Faculty D than the other three faculties. Due to the cost and length of study, most international students would like to come to the United Kingdom for top-up undergraduate courses, Masters programmes or postgraduate research degrees. Few students choose to study further education programmes (such as A-levels) abroad. Thus, the marketing positioning impedes Faculty D’s international development.
Faculty autonomy and inconsistent management

Some faculties handle internationalization autonomously. They deal with international initiatives personally and informally, without being granted the university's central approval or following quality assurance procedures (see Q 7.2, Chapter 4). These autonomous activities affect other departments, such as the corporate, International Office and Quality Enhancement. The answers to other interview questions have partially affirmed the issue of faculty autonomy. For example, a key Department 2 interviewee's (no.10) reply in terms of the problems of HE internationalization was that s/he "did not know what Faculty D is doing" (see Q 6.1, issue of communication and information sharing, Chapter 4). Inconsistent senior management also affects the faculty's internationalization. For example, Faculty D had three different deans in four years. Although the positions have been filled, without stable leadership, it is difficult for Faculty D to commit to a long-term strategy of internationalization. Inconsistent senior management is considered one of the reasons why the level of internationalization in Faculty D is behind other faculties (such as Faculties A and B).

Faculty specific culture and staff attitude

The issue of faculty specific culture and staff attitude is reflected in the culture clash among departments, especially between Department 2 and the faculty. This point is highly consistent with the findings of Q 6.1 (see Chapter 4), and also contributes to the difference in the process of internationalization across faculties: "Some faculties (including faculty senior management) are cooperative and enthusiastic about internationalization, while others may react with strong resistance or cooperate passively" (Department 2 interviewee no.11). Those faculties that want to embrace internationalization are ranked as having higher levels of internationalization; and those unwilling to cooperate and participate in internationalization are viewed as having lower levels.
Collaboration with industries
Some faculties have attracted more international students through industry-related collaborations. The faculties work together with local businesses and provide students with more opportunities of practice through internship, placement, semester projects or joint research (such as the computer games programme in Faculty A, and the programme of product design and illustration in Faculty B). Collaborations with industries not only enhance international recruitment, but also highlight a potential area for the case study university's further international development (see discussion of industry-related collaboration, potential area grid 2, section 5.2.2). However, this type of collaboration is less attractive to the off-campus students who choose to complete the entire programmes with the university's foreign partners without leaving their home countries. Other faculties (such as Faculty C) who have less industry links and generally lack international experience may not benefit from such collaborations. Therefore, although collaboration with industry can enhance the faculty's international development, it may not properly fit every faculty's particular situation and capability.

'Me too subject' phenomenon
The notion of the 'me to subject' explains why the Business School (under Faculty A) is a leader in internationalization among the faculties (see Q 7.2, corporate interviewee, no.3). Since business programmes are often set in an international context, they have an initial advantage when it comes to internationalization. In other words, the business school does not necessarily have to have niche programmes or unique projects; the school itself can be the reason why it is more internationalized than other faculties. Most universities (including the case study) think that they must offer international programmes in order to be called a university. Thus the business school actually becomes a faculty that mainly offers common business programmes, and because of the commonality and international character of the programmes offered, the business school becomes more internationalized. Although only one interviewee mentions this point and there is no other data available for triangulation, the view of the 'me too subject' is a logical and valid point based on the
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researcher's understanding, in terms of the different levels of internationalization across the faculties. Business school (Faculty A) was ranked as number one with the highest level of internationalization by all interviewees in the case study; however, from a long-term strategic point of view, the faculty does need to differentiate itself (Hitt, Ireland and Hoskisson, 2009), in order to achieve competitive advantage (Porter, 1980 and 1990) and continuous development in internationalization.

In short, some faculty-specific factors (such as faculty priorities, faculty culture and staff attitude) are highly corresponding to the previous discussion of the issues of HE internationalization raised in the case study (see Q 6.1, Chapter 4). Some factors (such as promoting priority, market demand, and marketing positioning) are determined by the university's current international recruitment strategy (see discussion of the university's international recruitment strategy, Q 2.1, Chapter 4). Some factors (such as the nature of programmes and collaborations with industries) depend highly on a particular faculty's curriculum and focus. Most faculty-specific factors are rooted internally and are therefore adjustable. Based on the possibility and potential outcomes of adjustment, the faculty-specific factors can be categorized into three groups. The first group consists of the following factors: lack of international experience and expertise, marketing position, faculty autonomy and inconsistent management, collaboration with industries, and priority promotion. These factors are related to a management matter that can be adjusted efficiently within the faculties and across the university. Positive outcomes are more likely to be achieved in a short time compared to the factors involved in the second group.

The faculty-specific factors categorized into the second group are the faculty's priorities, faculty-specific culture and staff attitude. These issues need long-term adjustment and cannot be resolved immediately because these factors contain the change of people's mindset and attitudes, which is more likely to be achieved incrementally through an internal top-down influence (from the senior management) of performance and behaviour. The remaining three faculty-specific factors involved in the third group include the nature of programmes, market demand, and the 'me too subject' phenomenon. The factors in
this group are not adjustable by the university or faculties because these issues are related either to external environment (such as market demand), the nature of programmes, or the features of the business school (such as the 'me too subject' phenomena). The objectivity of these factors needs to be considered in terms of HE internationalization. Since the factor of 'good reputation of service' is ineligible as an accurate representation of reality in terms of the difference in the process of internationalization across the faculties (see previous discussion of good reputation of service, Q 7.2, Chapter 4), there is no further discussion of the adjustment of this point. In addition, higher levels of internationalization may not always be better for faculties (corporate interviewee no.9, see Q 7.2, Chapter 4) because each faculty may have its own focus and priority and its success should not be measured simply by the degree of internationalization. Teaching and research on the original site are always the faculties' core activities (Shattock, cited in Hodges, 2007), which should not be eclipsed by internationalization.

Unlike the strategy implementation factors, these faculty-specific factors are particular for the case study university, and some of them are unlikely to be generalized. The reasons are listed as follows: firstly, other universities may have a different setup of faculties (either single or multiple); for example, Harvard Business School, Wharton Business School, American International Medical University and Atlantic University of Medicine, these universities place their subject in a single faculty or are dedicated to a single particular area (such as medicine or business), and therefore the faculty-specific factors in these universities may be beyond the issues discussed in this research as their factors move vertically into the finer aspects of their focus areas. Secondly, only two universities (including the case study university) around the world offer Leisure Management, Beauty and Spa Management, Hairdressing Management, Outdoor Activities and Sport Management as formal undergraduate programmes, thus most institutions will not have a faculty like Faculty D; therefore, Faculty D's specific factors (such as marketing positioning) are unlikely to be transferred. Thirdly, certain faculty-specific factors (such as 'good reputation of service') are determined by a single
department (such as Department 2) or an individual interviewee at the case study university. Their view may not be credited as an accurate representation of reality because the associated triangulated results show an opposite point (see discussion of good reputation of service, Q 7.2, Chapter 4), thus making it ineligible for generalization. Finally, some factors (for example, the nature of programmes, faculty culture, academics' attitude, and external environment) with high potential for generalizability, have already been included in a previous discussion (see discussion of implementation issues, Q 6.1, Chapter 4). Since not every faculty-specific factor has the potential to be generalized, the dynamic framework does not involve them all. But this arrangement does not affect the validity of these faculty-specific factors; for other universities with similar situations, these findings are still applicable and transferrable.

6.2.4 Summary of contributions
The theoretical contribution is the market entry dynamic framework that provides education-specific modes of entry (business-based and education-based) and programme delivery methods in terms of international recruitment and academic collaboration. The practical contribution identifies the implementation issues of HE internationalization, interprets them within the institutional context, and concludes that instead of external environment, the university's internal integration primarily impacts HE internationalization. This point is further affirmed by the faculty-specific contribution, which indicates that most challenges and issues faced by the faculties are a matter of internal management, rather than external factors. These faculty-specific factors explain why the level of internationalization is different across the faculties and imply that internationalization cannot be conducted equally in all faculties. In short, HE internationalization is about internal integration: different key departments should work cooperatively to achieve the greatest degree of cohesion. The dynamic framework offers an education-specific market entry model and guides institutions to achieve that cohesion. The identified factors (implementation issues and faculty-specific factors) highlight the
challenges faced by the university during the process of HE internationalization. This is the main contribution of this research.

6.3 Recommendations
Based on research findings, recommendations are made in several areas. Part One contains general recommendations addressing the common issues of HE internationalization at the case study university. Part Two presents group-specific recommendations and discusses the areas for improvement within each key department (Corporate, Department 2 and Faculty). The issues identified in this research decrease the level of integration at the university; it is hoped that, by addressing and resolving these issues, greater cohesion is achieved.

6.3.1 Part One - General recommendations
General recommendations provide suggestions for all key departments in this research, covering the areas of learning, training and communication.

Learning and training
Learning culture is "the existence of a set of attitudes, values and practice within an organization which support and encourage a continuing process of learning for the organization and / or its members" (Johnston and Hawke, 2002, p. 9). Training and staff development activities can support strategic institutional plans and the transfer of knowledge and understanding (Sirianni and Frey, 2001; Zhao, 2005). The interviewees mention the importance of training and staff development in facilitating a culture shift (Carden and Challahan, 2007) during internationalization. The problem is, how to train the staff? The researcher recommends cross-department training by involving the staff from both Department 2 and the faculty. This training not only provides an opportunity for communication, but also increases internal interaction across the departments. Although training and staff development cannot fundamentally change staff attitude and
organizational culture, they can create a learning culture that can help staff improve their understanding of internationalization and the reasons for doing it, share more common values, and reduce the level of resistance to change.

Communication
Every interviewee understands that communication plays a powerful role in changing the organizational culture (Zamanou and Glaser, 1994). However, the efficiency of communication is difficult to measure; thus each key department should put more effort into improving communication. For example, Department 2 should make sure that each international recruiter understands the products (programmes) properly, and have the faculty more involved in internationalization, rather than simply passing them an approved partnership for implementation. The corporate management should release more information to Department 2 and faculties, instead of simply commanding them. Employees deserve to know more about what the international initiatives are, why the university should go for it, when to start and end up the projects, how to do it, and who is responsible for it, and the potential influence of changes in terms of HE internationalization. A good understanding of HE internationalization is the prerequisite for efficient strategy implementation. The faculty academics should say so if they are stressed or if there is lack of resource. Most frictions occur when people hesitate to speak out; if the faculties do not speak out, the appropriate solutions may remain beyond their reach. So the faculty academics should report their difficulties and give feedback to the corporate management. Setting up an online internal forum may be a good platform to encourage communication and interaction through discussions of international initiatives, giving and receiving updates.
6.3.2 Part Two - Group-specific recommendations

Group-specific recommendations are particular suggestions for each key department.

To Department 2

Department 2 should involve the faculties more (perhaps from the beginning) in the establishment of partnerships rather than simply passing approved collaborations to the faculties for implementation because it is difficult for a non-academic department to fully understand the needs of a particular partnership. If a partnership can be mainly located in the faculty, the related academics can better prepare themselves in advance in terms of workload, schedule and sequencing. Consequently, they will feel less forced to participate in internationalization, and will therefore react more cooperatively. Meanwhile, the role of Department 2 should emphasize supporting faculties and students, recruitment (through agents and online) administration, marketing, and staff development. The division of responsibility and accountability of HE internationalization between the faculties and Department 2 should be clear.

To the Corporate

The recommendation for the corporate group concerns changes, monitoring and motivation. Senior managers should use their leadership influence to change the organizational culture by fostering the employees' willingness to support international initiatives. Culture change needs to start from the top management level and incrementally penetrate downwards to every level of the university. An efficient feedback mechanism is encouraged to monitor strategy implementation (such as front line performance) and provide more adjustments or re-planning as needed. In addition, an internal incentive system should be created (and if already in existence, promoted) to recognize and reward the staff's contribution to HE internationalization. A large volume of experimental literature generally supports the common belief that financial incentives
To the Faculty

The faculty academics should understand internationalization better and be willing to understand it. Frese and Zapf (1994) state that high performance is not always the result of good effort, but of greater understanding. Good understanding can convert the staff’s resistance to change into a more cooperative attitude. International initiatives will be automatically included into academics’ daily work if they are keen to do it. As the front line staff, the academics are the most suitable group to identify implementation issues; thus the faculty should create an open atmosphere and encourage academics to point out their difficulties during operation.

6.4 Further research

There are two themes for further research. One is to test the generalizability of the dynamic framework; the other one is to investigate the circumstance of the overseas branch campus and, finally, to provide a general and comprehensive view of HE internationalization.

Test generalizability

Since the framework is based on qualitative research, it is a conceptual model at the current stage. The researcher intends to undertake postdoctoral research to test the generalizability of this framework through a quantitative population study of other universities. The sampling organizations will be separated into two groups. The first

---

43 The good awards, motivations or incentives are positive and come in two packages: utilitarian (salary, bonus, promotion) and psychological (autonomy, enjoying work, include psychological identification with a job or its outcomes) (Hrebičinik, 2009).
The second group includes those universities whose internationalization involves overseas branch campuses. The purpose of this arrangement is to check whether the research findings at the case study university are similar to other cases, including the universities who have satellite campuses in other countries.

**Exploration of overseas branch campus**

This stage aims to investigate the circumstance of establishing an overseas branch campus through a qualitative study. The main purpose is to examine how an overseas branch campus contributes to HE internationalization of the home university. This stage will only target the universities whose internationalization involves operating an overseas branch campus. Since these satellite campuses compete directly with local institutions, more challenges and external issues are expected. The findings will be used to compare with the issues identified in this research in order to fill the blank grid (grid 9) of the framework.

**Construction a general view of HE internationalization**

The final stage of the further research is to construct a general view of HE internationalization by combining the above findings. At this stage, a comprehensive concept of HE internationalization should be presented.
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Appendix

Appendix 1 Corporate Mission and Faculties International Planning

"The mission of the University is 'to be the learner's first choice university for quality and opportunity'. The Corporate Plan 2009-2014 states that 'the learner is placed at the heart of everything that we do, offering choices that match students' expectations and supporting them in achieving their aspirations and ambitions'. Eight Core Strategies underpin the Corporate Plan: Academic development, Learning, teaching and assessment, Student experience, Target markets and progression, Employer engagement, Internationalization and Research. Business Unit Plans detail how each operating unit (faculty/school/division) contributes to delivering the Corporate Plan." (source: QAA audit report, University of [X], November, 2009, p. 6)

Faculty A Priorities and progress to international plan (2010-2011)

Faculty A will only achieve significant growth in student numbers if it increases the recruitment of international students across all three Schools. Whilst law has some limitations in undergraduate (UG) provision due to jurisdictional issues, it has capacity to grow at postgraduate (PG) level. Computing and Business can grow at both UG and PG level. In terms of internationalization, all newly validated business programmes incorporate global business issues.

The Business School (under Faculty A) has one of the higher levels of international recruitment within the University (together with the Faculty B), it is still some way behind sector and benchmark norms. Working closely with Department 2 is critical to success in this area both in regard to partnership development, and direct international recruitment via the International Office. The School is fully engaged with current developments of the W.E Council (Malaysia) partnership and M.E College (Greece). The School did not hit target in relation to international recruitment this year – particularly with regard to full-time PG provision. It is anticipated that the newly validated suite of Masters Programmes will be more attractive to this market in future.

Business School will aim to strengthen its provision and become more visible within its various markets. It will aim to grow PG provision significantly and increase the number of International Students in line with targets set at Corporate Level. More effective working with Department 2 and the International Student’s Centre to develop and maximize direct international recruitment, development of strategic international partnerships and increase the quality and extent of e-learning capability and delivery is needed. --- is the main delivery vehicle for International activity at present and it is expected that this should continue, with some incremental growth from Law and Computing in addition. Computing is a world-wide industry and thus programmes reflect this. Law is tied to a specific jurisdiction (English law) – however, issues of human rights,
international law, civil liberties, European law, employment law and international trade law offer good opportunities to introduce global and regional issues.
Faculty C International Strategy (May 2010)

Recognition of the position

Faculty C has produced an international strategy with 5 priority activities
1. Off-campus TEL developments
2. Niche area development
3. Growth in PG research students
4. New collaborative arrangements
5. Enhancement of the support infrastructure for international activities

Despite a strategy the situation is one where Faculty C, although active in the recruitment and management of international cohorts, has not focused on developments with the energy that it might have. While showing pockets of excellence, development has been fragmented and generally uncoordinated at a faculty (and even school) level and we have not achieved the potential that we are considered capable of. Given the current political climate, the lack of ‘cap’ on international students and the strategic directives from the University executive this is not an acceptable position. Consequently, the following action has been initiated.

It has been perceived that the institutional lead had not been strong enough and seemingly remote, with a failure by the ISG to link with operational issues (it is unreasonable to expect this high level group to do both). It has also been appreciated that all the agencies impacting on international development and operational activities also tended to be rather ‘soloed’ creating inefficiency and confusion.

Action: University
Stronger strategic position now evident and reflected in priorities set by the faculties creation of the IOG, with a specific link to ISG in order that university strategy can be effectively operationalized.

Action: Faculty
The portfolios of the Ads have been reviewed and as specific remit of International Development has been recognized and linked to overtly to Head of the School of Science. The faculty exec has then identified the need for a two stage scoping project in order that clear and realistic targets are set out for international development over the next 5 years. The targets will require that only a modest rise in recruitment is realized in the coming year as the process of internationalization is continued and faculty priorities identified. Following this targets will be strategically and confidently extended to quickly build student numbers and the international portfolio (mainly off campus) through collaboration, niche developments and TEL the diversity of the further more staff development to inculcate the concept of ‘internationalization’ throughout the faculty is being accelerated.
Faculty C Scoping Project:

**Part 1:** To generate an understanding of the current position so that strategic decisions regarding the direction of resources towards specific priority areas can be made. How?

By:
- Acquiring qualitative and quantitative data on current international cohorts
- Identifying expertise (and champions) and collecting inspirational ideas on current and potential areas of international development
- Appreciation of where TEL will increase market share and indicate new development directions both on-campus and OLDL
- Understanding the marketing, recruitment and performance in relationship to current IC and consideration of future marketing strategies
- Identifying barriers to development
- Estimating resource (budgetary and expertise) needs
- Identifying the barriers to development

**Part 2:** Scoping of the strategic direction, setting developmental priorities and identification of new areas for curriculum development from 2011 onwards.

**Process:**
- Part 1 of the Scoping project in process, tasked to report back in July 2010
- Staff development and training activities for international development scheduled in collaboration with the International Student Office
- Increase in ‘visit’ activities
- Increase in consideration of collaborative development
- Consideration of future budget and inclusion of resource to cover an international development fellow
- Consideration of the distinction between OLDL international cohorts and on-campus international cohorts with respect to targeting and conversion, induction and welcome, student experience, retention and performance, management alumni.
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Appendix 4 Central Marketing Strategy for International Recruitment
(University of [X], February 2010)

Guiding principles

This plan aims to support the strategic direction taken by Department 2 in terms of target countries and key courses. We are guided by Department 2’s decisions in terms of the overall strategic approach whereby there is a focus on establishing collaborative partnerships with key educational institutions in target countries. This aim is supported by the use of a network of agents in each country (and in some cases Super Agents) plus some use of exhibition attendance by the International Officers.

The focus of the support provided by Central Marketing will be on: producing specific publications relevant to each target country market; producing web content relevant to each target country; reviewing, upgrading and delivering the customer relationship management (CRM) activity for international enquirers and applicants; managing the CRM programme aimed at Agents; researching and delivering in-country marketing activity as recommended by the Agent network (such as press, radio, web advertising or sponsorship); providing targeted media relations activity for each country; providing relevant support from the alumni office; developing local ethnic community relations to echo the key markets overseas (such as China, India, Middle East, Africa).

Overall Strategic approach per country (from Department 2)

China
Mainly progression partnerships
Courses: business and computing

Hong Kong / Macau
Mainly agents
Courses: CPD business

India (North)
Mainly through Super Agent Pank Arj
Possible franchises if law changes

Kuwait / Middle East
Agents
May be closing

Nigeria/Ghana
Tba

(source: http://www.[---].ac.uk/marketing)
Appendix 5  BA College Botswana

Mission
To become the centre of excellence for accountancy and business education in Botswana and Southern Africa.

Strategy partners
BA College selects its partners based on the value proposition, convergence of values, industry and cultural relevance. Some of the partners include ACCA, CIMA, AAT, the University of [X1], UK, University of [X2], UK, IIA, IISA and Business Process Outsourcing, UK.

Background to the collaboration
The collaboration arrangements date back to 2007 with MSc Programme from the British Council. The possibility of delivering an MBA programme for qualified accountants was raised. The MBA programme was lunched in 2007 with 14 qualified CIMA accountants. During 2007, BA College also shadowed the final cohort of MSc students as the transition from the British Council to BA College took place. The following table represents the student intake from 2008:

(Source: Collaborative Conference: Internationalization – Enhancing the student experience, University of [X], [Venue], Wednesday, 7th July, 2010)
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Appendix 7  Definition of Collaborative Provision

The University of [X] defines a collaborative partnership as all arrangements in which the University makes an award or gives credit towards an award on the basis of education provided by, with or at another organization in the UK or overseas. The development and approval of collaborative provision encompasses a number of distinct arrangements identified as:

**Franchising:** A partner organization is authorized to provide all or part of a programme that has been designed by the University. Our partners are approved to directly deliver University programmes at approved locations. They are not permitted to deliver the programme through other organizations. This is called serial franchising and seriously compromises quality and standards as well as being in contravention of the QAA Code of Practice. All staff who are involved in the management of collaborative provision, Project Managers and Programme Leaders in particular, are asked to be vigilant in detecting any signs of serial franchising and to report this immediately to the Dean of Faculty or Director of Department 2. The Partnership Office regularly monitors partner websites for this and similar purposes.

**Validation:** The University recognizes (as leading to a University of [X] award) a programme of study designed and delivered by a partner organization.

**Articulation:** The University grants advanced standing to students completing a named programme of study undertaken in a partner organization.

**Credit Rating:** The University assigns credit to modules offered by a partner organization. This was previously described (within the University) as 'accreditation'.

**Off-Campus Delivery:** The University retains full responsibility for a programme delivered in a remote location by its own staff. The responsibilities of the partner organization are limited to the provision of accommodation and, possibly, some learning resources.

Appendix 8  Responsibility, Risk Assessment and Involvement

In developing a proposal, programme teams are encouraged to think about the following risk factors:

(i) **The market** – changing patterns of student or employer demand, competition (now or in the future) from other higher education institutions or private sector providers, and other factors which might impede the University’s ability to exploit the market for the proposal.

(ii) **The regulatory environment** – current or future developments in Government policy, funding regulations or the requirements of Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRB).

(iii) **Institutional** – current or future operation of the University’s administrative or quality management systems, management arrangements and changing institutional or Faculty priorities.

(source: Quality Enhancement Department Handbook 3: Validation and Approval of Taught Programmes, 2009, Section 2: Risk Associated with Programme Development, B8, pp. 18)

The University manages these risks by varying the size and composition of validation panels based upon an analysis of the characteristics of the proposed programme, the capacity and capability of the subject group(s) that will be responsible for its delivery, and the actual or anticipated ‘risk factors’. This approach ensures that the approval process is in proportion to the level of risk. To this end, an initial assessment of risk is undertaken prior to the conferral of development approval as detailed in Part C. In determining the level of ‘risk potential’ associated with a proposal, the initial assessment considers the nature of the operating environment. Once development approval has been granted, the level of risk potential is confirmed by a University Panel event or a Paper-Based process.

The risk-based approach adopted by the University enables the institution to achieve an appropriate balance between integration and independence. It ensures that its quality enhancement systems are sufficiently well integrated with one another and with the management of the institution for problems to be identified quickly and accurately, resulting in prompt and effective action. At the same time, it is also sufficiently independent of line management structures and vested interests to be capable of sending uncomfortable messages in any direction.
Risk assessment is central to the development process, as reflected in the Development Approval Document (DAD), and complements the approach taken to annual monitoring and periodic review. It informs the decisions that are made after the Faculty Management Board (FMB) has approved the proposal, and development teams will want to consider its recommendations in the planning process. The University’s approach to risk assessment is based on the premise that ‘front line’ academic staff are in the best position to know what is ‘coming up over the horizon’. Development teams know their markets, they are the experts in their discipline and they have day-to-day experience of the institutional (Subject, School, Faculty and University) environment in which they are working.

SECTION 3: RESPONSIBILITIES

Guidance: This is a really critical part of the Manual and the various sections may be used as prompts when staff from the University and the partner are discussing the various management arrangements. It is important that wherever possible you indicate the names of the relevant staff and not just their job titles. Where a particular responsibility is shared, and an indication made in the 'Both' column, then the 'notes' column should be used to provide the necessary information to explain specifically how the responsibility is carried out. The 'notes' column should also be used to provide any relevant additional information where, for example, the responsibility for undertaking the particular procedure is exercised at variance with the University regulation, policy or procedure. Such variation will, of course, require careful consideration by the approval panel.

It is important when completing this section that communication takes place with all of those staff whose names are to be inserted. For example, where the Partnership Office is to assume responsibility, then contact should be made with it to clarify precisely who will assume such responsibility.

*Indicate the name of the person responsible together with their job title at the partner or University of [X] (Uo[X]) or both as appropriate who has primary responsibility for undertaking this task

**It is essential that this column is completed with essential details particularly where responsibility is shown as 'Both'. Where the task is not applicable 'n/a' should be inserted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Partner*</th>
<th>University*</th>
<th>Both*</th>
<th>Notes or not applicable**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marketing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance: Reference to the marketing protocol (Annex T) should be referred to during initial discussions between the partner and the University so that you are able to clearly indicate respective responsibilities and the need for Uo[X] approval.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing materials are produced by (Link to Marketing Protocol)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All marketing is done by IPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner marketing materials monitored and approved by</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uo[X] Programme Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner web site monitored by</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uo[X] Programme Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recruitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance: Indicate responsibilities for recruiting students. This often lies with the partner but can also involve University staff. Make clear who has responsibilities for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each aspect of the process:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Partner*</th>
<th>University*</th>
<th>Both*</th>
<th>Notes or not applicable**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring of recruitment against target is undertaken by</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Admissions

**Guidance:** Reference the programme handbook/programme specification which will include the admissions criteria and use the final column to indicate any diversions from these criteria which will have to be considered for approval by the approval panel. Don't forget to include any specific criteria which may apply relative to the country in which the collaboration operates and/or the requirements of a professional body. In the case of non-UK qualifications, it is particularly important to specify by what means and through which agencies equivalence of qualifications is established. In the vast majority of cases, the ultimate approval of admissions rests with the University and so it is important to indicate precisely who at the University has this responsibility and who therefore signs enrolment forms. Student qualifications must always be checked for authenticity by the University and here again the person responsible should be indicated. Sometimes, once a collaborative partnership has been operating for some time a process of standard decision making may be applied which means that the partner initially approves standard admissions i.e. those which precisely meet the programme criteria and all those non-standard applications are considered by the identified University person. In such cases a process of auditing will be required and relevant information should indicate the process and who has responsibility for it. Often the Partnership Office will provide this service but you should be sure to check with it to make such arrangements. A similar process must operate in relation to claims in relation to Accreditation of Prior Learning (APL).

<p>| Student applications are considered initially by                    | X        |             |       |                           |
| Indicate whose application form is used                           | X        |             |       |                           |
| Student applications are approved by                              | X        |             |       | Uo[X] Programme Leader    |
| Partnership Office is informed of students whose applications have been approved by and who may therefore be enrolled by | X        |             |       | Uo[X] Programme Leader    |
| Student qualifications are checked for authenticity by or admissions audits are carried out by | X        |             |       | Uo[X] Programme Leader    |
| APL claims are reviewed initially by                              | X        |             |       | Uo[X] Programme Leader    |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Partner*</th>
<th>University*</th>
<th>Both*</th>
<th>Notes or not applicable**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrolment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guidance:</strong> Student enrolment and registration may take place either at the University or at the partner's premises. Check with Partnership Office about the arrangements for your partnership so that you are able to indicate the persons responsible for the various elements of the process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolment takes place at</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolment is undertaken by</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Department 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student fees are collected by</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student cards are produced by</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are registered by</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UoX user names and passwords are provided by</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student records are established and maintained by</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Department 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner invoicing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guidance:</strong> This may be done by the Department 2, Ascertain this so that you are able to indicate the relevant name.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner is invoiced by</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guidance:</strong> It is crucial that students are provided with all the relevant information to include module and programme handbooks. The importance of their awareness of the 3Rs and how to access this (and other information) via the web cannot be overemphasized. Whilst the production of the former may be undertaken by the partner, it is important that relevant University staff approve them and so the names of such individuals are indicated here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module Handbooks are produced by</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Payroll modules – IPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business Modules – Uo[X]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module Handbooks are approved by</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uo[X] Programme Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Programme Handbook is produced by <em>(Link to Programme Handbook)</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uo[X] Programme Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Programme Handbook is approved by</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty A Quality Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are alerted to the availability of the 3Rs on the web by</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(source: Operational Manual, MSc Business and Payroll Management, Faculty A, section 3 Responsibility, pp. 45-56)
Appendix 9  Value People and Customer Focus

Value People
We treat all people with courtesy and respect. We involve and listen to others and show consideration and empathy for their emotional and physical well-being. We value others for their contribution irrespective of personal differences. We are honest, trustworthy and straightforward in our dealings and use time, money and resources wisely. We derive value through investing in our people, supporting their development and encouraging them to achieve their potential. We recognize that people are at the centre of everything we do and that the quality of our relationships has a direct impact on our performance. We consistently display positive behaviour towards all people and are proactive in building effective relationships.

Level 1 Responds when invited
• Is polite
• Is courteous
• Shares information when asked
• Communicates the minimum needed to get by
• Respects diversity/difference in people

Level 2 Develops constructive working relationships
• Is visible – talks whenever possible instead of always using emails
• Is friendly and approachable
• Respects others’ views
• Listens
• Involves others
• Offers praise and recognition (says ‘thank you’ and means it)
• Is sensitive to others’ needs
• Shows consideration and empathy
• Has a positive/helpful intent
• Offers support and advice
• Smiles.

Level 3 Builds trust and rapport
• Gives time to people
• Makes people feel good – remembers and uses their name
• Trusts and can be trusted
• Empowers – delegates effectively
• Offers constructive feedback – positive and negative
• Welcomes feedback
• Is supportive – recognizes and responds to individual needs
• Uses personal and sincere communication
• Recognizes that everyone has an important role – irrespective of level
• Treats others the way he/she wants to be treated
• Takes an appropriate interest in personal and work life
Level 4 Strives to understand people and utilize their talents
- Consistently goes the extra mile to understand people
- Strives to accommodate people’s aspirations
- People want to work for them
- Adapts own style to meet the needs of others
- Actively supports people’s personal development
- Creates opportunities for others to learn and develop
- Uses people’s strengths
- Builds systems/methods for involving others and getting feedback
- Listens to and takes action on feedback
- Celebrates success.

This means not...
- Dumping on people
- Ignoring people
- Forgetting common courtesies
- Being superior (I’m too important to talk to you)
- Disregarding others’ time pressures – being late for meetings
- Refusing to listen
- Taking decisions without talking to people involved on the ground
- Passing on calls without saying who it is
- Bullying
- Being unsympathetic about others’ feelings
- Overlooking the impact of your actions on others e.g. setting unnecessarily tight timescales
- Being aggressive, even shouting
- Being wholly task and results driven
- Back biting
- Putting people down
- Focusing only on the negatives/people’s weaknesses
- Treating people differently e.g. because of status, gender etc
- Refusing to release people for training events

Potential development actions:
- Communication/presentation skills
- Feedback skills – giving and receiving
- Coaching skills
- Mentoring skills
- Time management
- Self awareness
- Teambuilding

(source: Our core values and behaviours – releasing our people potential, Value People, pp. 17-19, www.[--].ac.uk)

* Customer Focus see Appendix 3
Appendix 10  ISB International Student Barometer:
What School/Faculty Are You In?

University of [X] (133)

(source: ISB International Student Barometer, 2010, pp. 13)
The first question is, by your understanding, what is the internationalization strategy of the University of [X]?

Okay. I think it's a strategy that's got three parts to it. One is about bringing in more international students, and that's on-campus in particular, but I would also say it's online as well. So it's actually about student numbers and getting students who are international, involved in our programmes. Secondly, it's about the programmes and how appropriate are they for international students and how internationalized is the curriculum, not only for international students, but for UK and home students as well.
And then thirdly there's a whole strand about the internationalization of our staff, both to deliver the curriculum, whether that's to international students or home students, and to have an understanding of the needs of international students. So it's multifaceted.

Thank you. Okay. Can you briefly talk about the international development of the University of [X]?

In my experience the University, in the last year or so, has really begun to do a lot around international development, but up until that point, not that much. And as a faculty we have taken decisions in the past to prioritize other areas. So we've prioritized online. We have a good and growing portfolio of online, which includes online for international students.

Psychology.

Psychology being a very good example. Environmental health and environmental management being other good examples. And part of the reason we took that decision was because we didn't perceive the university as providing the right environment to bring international students here, or not as good as it could be. Secondly we have large parts of the faculty where bringing international students is very difficult. Health being a good example, where we can't offer placements, we can't do undergraduate stuff because we're not allowed to by the NHS etc. So we have got quite a large amount of the faculty where bringing international students to the campus is never going to be part of what we do. So a combination of lack of support at the university, some areas of the faculty being difficult, and prioritizing other things, because we have very little international
experience amongst the staff, means that we are way behind in terms of international compared to some of the other faculties. Having said that, I've watched some of the other faculties really struggle and I'm prepared to learn from their lessons rather than make the mistakes myself. So we will do some learning and we've led on other things. So I don't feel bad about it, but the pressure is now on to do a lot around international, and the support is getting better across the university, but we need to put far more support in to really get from where we are to where we need to be.

And just now you mentioned the environment here for international students are not ready or are not very good. So what does that mean? The environment, you mean the facility or the student support?

I think it's everything. I think we've learnt a lot in the last year or two about physical environment, you know, halls of residence and where international students want to stay, who do they want to mix with. So what do we do with our halls? How do we help them find other accommodation? There's that side of it. What about English language and English language support and academic writing skills support. All that side of it is getting a lot better but wasn't very good. What about friendship and that sort of support. Buddying with other students, international students in my experience can feel a huge culture shock and very lonely when they first arrive. How are we meeting them at the airport? How are we looking after them psychologically, spiritually, all that. So it's everything and I don't think we've done anywhere near enough in the past. We are now beginning to do a lot more.

So that's why the students in Faculty A, international students, would like to stay together.

Yeah.

Because they feel it's more secure?

Absolutely. And it's that sort of thing that if they want to stay together, that's fine, how do we accommodate that, how do we make it happen, but how do we also encourage them to mix with home students, because actually part of coming to study abroad for them is to mix and to learn more about the culture and to share learning. So you need to do both.

Thank you. We notice university have a department called Department 2.

Yeah.

So what the purpose to set up Department 2? How Department 2 support Faculty C?

My understanding the purpose of Department 2 is to be an overarching school that brings together cross-faculty initiatives around flexible learning, partnership learning, and in this case, international, although they've only been doing the international work for about probably a year now. That's its remit and its international department is meant
to support Faculty C, both at the individual level, individual staff who've got ideas, initiatives etc., but also to help us collectively around new collaborations and bringing business into us as well as us having ideas and working with them. So it’s meant to be partnership working.

Okay. Thank you. So what are the motives of internationalization?

I think there’s probably two. I think there’s the fact that the world is small. We live in a global market, a global economy, a global village, whatever you want to call it. We are doing a disservice to our home students if we don’t help them think about the international scene, and we’re doing a disservice to our international students if we don’t. So some of it’s about employability of students and what the expectations of students and employers. But there is a key driver about income generation. It’s one of the areas we can grow and there are lots of other areas which the Government is stopping us growing. So it is financial, but it’s also about the global environment in which we live and the student experience and the employer requirements.

Yeah. Thank you. Okay. Question 2, regarding international recruitment. So what is the university recruitment strategy or like have your faculty staff being actually involved into recruitment?

No.

Or we use the formal like education fair, the agents?

I would say that Faculty C has done very little. It doesn't have a recruitment strategy and it hasn’t done much in terms of education fairs. We’ve done a little bit with agents around education and psychology, and that’s about it. We are in the...well towards the end, of a scoping strategy for Faculty C, that is looking at all of this sort of thing, and by the end of July will deliver some recommendations on what our strategy should be, in what countries, what routes to market, do we want to use fairs, do we want to use agents. So by the start of next academic year we will have a much clearer strategy. We don’t have one at the moment.

Oh. Actually now you are looking for which area you should focus?

Absolutely. Yeah. And that’s being done as we speak yeah. Big piece of work. Very big [laughs].

Yeah. I interviewed ----.

Yes.

And he told me we are looking at which area we should put our investment in.

Absolutely. Yeah. He’s leading on that for me.
Yeah. Thank you. Okay. So in that case, do you have any special arrangement for recruitment?

Well I think the answer to that is online. We see one of our strengths as being online and we know that like psychology, like environmental health, like acoustics, ergonomics, possibly nursing online as a top-up degree, early years for childhood studies, but they'll all be online. They won't be bringing international students on-campus. We shall be delivering online. That will still be a focus of our strategy.

Okay. That one is seems like direct recruitment.

Yeah.

Is it.

Yes.

So the students are individual applicants?

Certainly at the moment they are yes.

So they are all over the world?

Yes. Yeah. And it works really well.

Yeah. I know. I interviewed ------.

------

Yeah. ------.

Yeah.

So online, do you see some issues like because some countries, like China, some countries they are not recognized online qualification or it's recognized in different levels?

We've had less issues of recognizing the qualification. Where we have issues are about being able to connect, speed of internet connection, ability to download. Those are the issues that we tend to have more of at the moment.

Okay.

So far.
Oh I think maybe the student check their country is recognized first, so they apply?

*I think that's probably right. Yeah.*

Okay. Thank you. International academic collaboration, in Faculty C do we have some?

*We do but not many. We're just developing a new one with a place in --- and that is being... well it's looking at... Well we're in the middle of trying to decide whether it's going to be a franchise or a top-up or how we're going to do it. So that's one that's current. We have been very involved, as a faculty, with our Israel campus and had a number of programmes being run out in Israel, being run by the staff out there and we very much take an overseeing and a quality role.*

So it's a bit like a franchise?

*A bit, although... Yes I suppose I would describe it...*

Do our faculty flying out to teach?

*We tend not to fly out because we tend to use electronic teaching. So we do teach, but we do it through electronic medium. Live classroom for example.*

It's like hybrid programme?

*Yes. It probably is more like hybrid. We've also got a... We're looking at a new collaboration out in Malaysia at the moment, again with psychology, which is likely to be top-up I think. But we don't do a lot of collaborations and again that's an area we need to grow in.*

Okay. Thank you. Then the next question, why do we choose that particular way to collaborate with them? Is that because the resource risk or opportunities?

*I think it's probably a mix. We always do due diligence before we enter into any collaborative venture. If the risk is high, we might choose one route over another because to manage the risk. Some of it is opportunities and wanting to actually be broad in what we can offer. So I think it varies but the risk is clearly part of what we do. We are a risk based organization with an approach to quality that is a risk and an enhancement approach. So risk is clearly part of what we're looking at. The higher the risk, the more likely we are to try and contain it.*

So if we're teaching them through like video conference, so our staff teaching them, so the risk will be lower is it?

*In theory, but it doesn't always work like that.*
Okay. Thank you. Okay. Then during the collaborations, how do they arrange the responsibilities and the resource?

Okay. Most of our collaborations are negotiated by Department 2 and up until recently with limited faculty input. So it depends what's negotiated in the contract as to what we do and what we don't do.

Oh. Like all black and white?

Um-hum.

Then question four, the programme delivery methods. So can you give an example of the ways that they deliver it?

Yeah. We've certainly got the first one, our own lecturers teaching abroad. We have an M.Ed that we run in --- and the faculty fly out there, deliver and fly back. We have partners delivering syllabus on our behalf which is probably what we will do out in ---, which is the collaboration with --- College. We're just negotiating that with them at the moment. And we do some hybrid. We certainly use e-learning and then we use e-learning in its own right.

Yeah. Okay. Thank you. So I heard about Israel before the business faculty get in, the Faculty C first get in there collaborate with them. So by that time, what course we collaborate with Israel?

We did psychology, and counselling and psychology, and education, and those were the key ones. Education, and counselling and psychology, and psychology were our key programmes out in Israel.

With --- College?

Yes.

Same college?

Yeah.

Okay. The University of [X], we don't have overseas campus do we?

Only Israel and we're just moving away from Israel at the moment. So no, we won't have.

Then why we don't? The overseas campus is not in our planning. What are the reasons?

I have no idea. I don't know. You'd have to ask the Vice Chancellor. I'm sure that he would have some reasons for it. They must be connected with risk, finance, etc.,
opportunity, but I've never discussed it with him, so I don't know why it's not a feature of the University of [X].

Okay. Next one. Question six. During internationalization, do you facing some challenge or issues which you could talk about?

Um-hum. I do. My staff, they're not geared up to either internationalize the curriculum or deal with international students. They don't have the experience.

Don't know how.

They don't know how and they need a lot of staff development. And a lot of the staff, not all, there are a few, who have good contacts internationally and they would be the people who do have some knowledge, but the majority don't. I don't necessarily have the right curriculum. So take education as a good example. My masters in education is an excellent one but it's very Anglo-centric, and it needs to be because it's very bespoke for people who are going to teach in England. If I was going to open it up to international students I would have to rewrite a different curriculum that wouldn't be appropriate for home students. So we'd have to have two curriculums. Whereas there are other programmes where you can write one curriculum and it's fine for both. So some of it is the curriculum. Some of it is finance. For marketing, for people to fly abroad and either market or teach. So it's financial as well. There's some real issues abound finance, but the biggest issue is lack of experience in the faculty of international working. I would say I've got one, maybe two, members of staff, out of 250 who've got any idea about internationalization and making international links. That's my problem.

That's a big issue.

That's my biggest yeah.

Is it like other, like Department 2, support you or advise?

Well in theory yes, but they haven't got many staff either and we're the experts in the area and it's how you take the, you know, the lecturers who are expert in their own subject and help them develop expertise in marketing things internationally.

Do you think there is a gap between Faculty C and Department 2 or marketing, because my understanding, Faculty C staff have very professional knowledge about the curriculum, but they don't know how to do... the lack of the international experience. And the other side, they (Department 2) know the international and have international experience, but they don't know much about the curriculum.

Yeah. And I think that's fair comment. I think there is a gap and either we've got to have more international experience in the faculty so we grow it internally, and we are looking to appoint an international development. We haven't agreed on the title, but fellow or officer or something like that within the faculty who will really help us take some of the
international work forward. I think marketing, there's only a gap because we don't ask for more marketing input and that's because we don't know what we're doing. If we knew what we were wanting to ask for, I think marketing would actually help us. So I think the marketing support is there when we want it and when we're ready for it.

Okay. Thank you. So do you think University of [X] or Faculty C need a big organizational change to adapt internationalization?

I do. I think we need a huge culture shift, both in Faculty C for the staff and the curriculum, and the university probably has begun its journey to shift in terms of creating the right environment for the students when they get here and making sure that the application process is smooth and all the rest of it. So I think the university needs to support the environment for the students, the faculty needs to develop the staff in order to make it happen.

I think that is a big challenge for you is it because your faculty, over 250 staff, only one or two has the experience. So there will be...

It's a huge challenge.

It's a huge challenge. And just now you mentioned about the staff. So is that the staffs' knowledge or their attitude, because everyone will fear to change something?

It's certainly knowledge. I think there's a real range of attitudes. I think there will be some staff who are frightened but are also excited and would like to embrace it and move forward. There's a whole raft of staff in the middle and then there will be some staff at the other end who don't want it, don't want to know, so frightened that they'll bury their head in the sand, and it's finding the people who are at the one end to begin to help them develop first to become our champions to take the rest forward. Yeah.

So actually it's not for every staff to be internationalized, someone has to lead them?

Yeah. We cannot develop all our staff to do everything. So some staff will do more online, and some staff will do more international, and some staff will do more of this, that and the other, because they can't all do everything.

Yeah. It is. The workload is...

Yeah. Absolutely.

... overloaded.

But I do think that all staff need to have an understanding of the needs of international students and an understanding of how to internationalize the curriculum, although some will do more of it than others.
How do you motivate them, encourage them, especially those ones staff they are interested to do internationalization?

I think there’s a step before that which is helping all the staff to understand the importance of international and internationalization. Having done that, then yes there’s a workload issue to make sure that those staff who have got some skills and want to develop them, have more time to do that, whereas other staff do more of something else.

Okay. Question 7. We have four faculties. Could you give a brief ranking about level of internationalization by your understanding? Four will be the highest, one is lowest.

Well Faculty A and Faculty B both do a lot of international relatively speaking. Faculty A is probably more diverse, into more countries. Faculty B has a lot of students on campus, but they’re very specific to the Middle East. And then Faculty C and Faculty D bring up the rear. Yeah.

Okay. The next one will be why it is the ranking like that?

In Faculty A, it’s because it’s got business and business is always attractive to overseas students. So in some ways that makes it easy. Not in every way but, you know, it’s logical, it’s where people want to go, so it does make it easier. In Faculty B, it’s because the Dean has personally gone out and developed the business ... I think some of it’s the characteristics of the programme. Some of it’s the contacts of the individuals, and some of it’s the priorities of the faculty, you know, Faculty B has seen international as their priority but they haven’t done as much online. We (Faculty C) have done more online, less international. So we’re all yeah, we’ve all chosen different priorities.

So Faculty C internationalization, the direction of internationalization more focused online is it?

Yeah. Definitely.

And we also have the psychology have a successful example?

Yeah. We have a very good model to follow. We’ve got several good models to follow, which really helps.

That’s different approach in different faculties?

Yes. And I think that’s right. We’re different faculties with different expertise, different professional areas we work in. Our approaches will be different.

Do you have target, such as how many students?
Yes. Yes.

Every faculty has that?

Every faculty has targets, yes.

Faculty A has a big one?

Yes.

Okay. Then how to enhance the internationalization in Faculty C?

In terms of the staff or curriculum?

Both.

Well, some of it is using our annual appraisals, our annual performance reviews for staff, and some of it is the targets that we have in the business plan. So there's the targets for the senior leadership team. There's targets for individual staff. That's one way to incentivise. There's targets through curriculum development and identifying new niche and new opportunities. There's some very risky issues, but I think more and more staff are aware of what's happening with the government, what's happening financially, and knowing that actually in terms of job security, things like international have got to grow. So although sometimes that's not over helpful motivation, it does motivate people because they want to keep their jobs. But, you know, it can be a double-edged sword. It's also about taking good practice. Psychology, environmental health, etc., and getting the staff who've really developed those to work with other staff and show them how to do it and sharing best practice, that's really important for us.

Thank you. And just now you mentioned the curriculum. So like you think there is a Dilemma between standardizing our own curriculum and adopting local requirement and design new programmes for international student? We may decide new curriculum?

Yes. I mean one of the things that our international scoping study is doing at the moment is to say what current curricular we have got that we ought to be marketing more that would be very appropriate for international students. What areas have we got that are unique to the University of [X], unique to Faculty C, and we should not be developing them for international students. We should develop some new things and where's the research and evidence base to inform that.

What is the unique selling point for Faculty C's programmes?

They're so diverse, it's very variable, and that's one of the things that we've got to work out for international. What is it we've got that's unique, because we don't...Well
psychology is a really good example. We're the only British Psychology Society accredited online programme. That makes us unique in the world.

Is it only University of [X]'s programme been recognized?

It's only University of [X]'s programme that is BPS (British Psychology Society) recognized and online.

So the other university, if they offer psychology may be different?

If they offer it online, it isn't BPS accredited, or it's BPS accredited but it's on-campus, not online. So that's very unique. Similarly, with our environmental health and environmental management, unique to be online and international students come to it. So we've got some examples where we've found a unique niche and we've, you know, exploited that. We've got to do the same across the rest of the faculty.

Okay. Just now you say the online, the psychology, we have some issue like technical issues.

Yeah.

So can you talk more? Like the technical issue on our side or on the other side?

Both. Both. For the student sitting wherever they're sitting in the world, depending on how well developed their country is and how good their internet connections are, they may or may not get a good service. So some of it's about what the country that they are working in has and how well it accommodates to the University of [X]'s systems. Some of it is internal, although I have to say internally our information and technical services are very, very good at supporting our online, and if there is an issue, they manage it and mend it or fix it very quickly. So there are less issues on our side. There are often issues for the students.

On the receiver side?

Yeah. Yeah. And that's about, in our marketing, saying you know, if you haven't got broadband or you haven't got a good width or you haven't got this, that and the other, actually doing this course is going to be really difficult. So you do have to be very upfront with the student. You know, if you haven't got this (internet), this is not the course for you, and that has been quite hard.

Yeah. And student have to be very high disciplined.

Absolutely.

Sitting there.
Okay. Alright, so any comment on the future of the internationalization?

Every single university will be trying to grow in international. So we’re competing against absolutely everybody, both in the UK and abroad. So America, Australia, you know, all the countries that traditionally do education are competing for international students. So that’s an issue. And I think some of the recent regulations our government had brought in, the UK Border Agency and that sort of thing, has made life very difficult this year. It doesn’t help us grow. So I think it’s going to be difficult but we’ve got to do it.

In Faculty C, within the faculty, what you expect... what’s your expectation of internationalization?

We’ve got to treble the student numbers in five years, and that’s on-campus, and then we’ve got to continue to grow well online.

Like the University of [X], not in the top league tables. Do you think that competition will affect Faculty C?

Yeah. Definitely. It’s a big, big challenge.

Yeah. That’s the issue for every faculty actually facing.

Um-hum.

And is there any way we can improve it, improve the league table?

Well I think it’s a bit chicken and egg because the more international students you get and the better experience they have, the better their feedback will be. And one of the things that’s important is student feedback, the [Unclear – 00:31:30] survey, things like that. That can help your league table position, but in order to get more students and give them a better experience, you’ve got to get more students. So you’re on a, you know, it’s quite difficult to break into that cycle. There are some things we can do working with the British Council in other countries to raise our reputation, which I think we need to do more of as well. So yes, I think there are some things we can do, but it is difficult. We need to use our alumni more, our graduates, to work all over the world. We need to use them to market the University of [X] more.

Okay. Thank you.

Does that help?

Yeah. Yeah.

Good
Appendix 12 Interview Questions

Q-1. International strategy of the University of [X] (T1)

Q1.1 What is internationalization strategy of the University of [X]? And what do you understand by 'internationalization of higher education'? Would this include

- A certain number or percentage of overseas students?
- Staff/student exchange?
- Joint research?
- Overseas market-targeted syllabus?
- Collaborated partnership?
- Overseas office?
- Overseas campus?

In other words, what standards should be used to assess the level of internationalization?

Q 1.2 What are the motives of this internationalization strategy? (Examples might include; income generation, increasing international profile, competition, scholarship, expansion into a new market, dissemination of knowledge, teaching and research.)

Q 1.3 What are the international developments of the University of [X]? (Examples might include recruitment of foreign students, international academic collaboration, E-learning.)

Q 1.4 The University of [X] has a department called the [Department 2]. What is the purpose of Department 2 as part of the organizational structure? What is Department 2 expected to achieve?

Q-2. International recruitment (T2)

Q 2.1 What is the university's current recruitment strategy? (Examples include; using Education Fairs, Agents, Direct recruitment, Academic partners, Overseas offices and student recruitment directly conducted through faculty.)

Q 2.2 Faced by the competitive pressure, has the university adopted some special or different recruitment arrangement? If yes, what are they? (Examples might include; '3+1'/'2+2", Top-up programmes, Credit transfer and language programmes.)
Q-3. International Academic Collaboration (T3A)

Q 3.1 Could you please give examples of different ways the University uses to collaborate with overseas partners? Examples might include

- Franchise programmes
- Alliance with partners (e.g. '3+1' top-up programmes or '1+3' international foundation programmes)
- Online programmes
- Hybrid programmes (online + teaching abroad)
- Joint venture to form new institutions/organizations
- Acquire foreign institutions
- Joint research / international conference
- Exchange students/staff
- Credit transfer

Q 3.2 Why does the University of [X] adopt these collaborative methods?

Q 3.3 What is the role of overseas partners? It might be as a facilitator, recruiter, local marketer, course deliverer, local administrator / coordinator or a 'mixed' role?

Q 3.4 How should the associated responsibilities between the University of [X] and overseas partners be arranged? And how should the related resources (staff and financial), involvement, risk and return be managed by both sides?

Q 3.5 What is the difference between conducting internationalization through overseas agents versus academic partnership?

Q-4. Programme delivery methods (T3B)

Q 4.1 What are the different ways the University of [X] uses to deliver its programmes?

- Our own lecturers teaching abroad
- Partners delivering our syllabus on our behalf
- Partners delivering their syllabus on our behalf and we validate it
- Part-time staff / sessional staff deliver our programmes (abroad / locally)
- Hybrid teaching (teaching abroad + E-learning)
- Wimba-classroom, ICT and video conference
- Online and distance learning
- Others
Q-5. Overseas branch campus (T4)

Q 5.1 Does the University of [X] establish an overseas branch campus? Why?

Q-6. Problems or Issues in HE internationalization (T5)

Q 6.1 During the process of internationalization, what are the challenges you face?

- Resources (staff and capital)
- Political issues (such as policy and regulation)
- Competition, league table and international profile
- Partnership management
- Agent management
- Culture and language
- Communication and integration
- Efficiency of processing (such as application, enquiry and feedback)
- Dilemma between standardizing our own curriculum and adopting local requirements and design new programmes.
- Quality assurance, especially with off-campus programmes
- Programmes articulation and validation
- Workload confliction between home institution and transactional teaching (such as teaching abroad, extra marking and administration stuff, course material preparation)
- Schedule and time management
- Availability to cooperate with other departments
- E-learning: the limited extent which can be delivered online

Will the following present any concerns please comment:

Q 6.2 If the trend towards internationalization on traditional centralized campuses will mean that more foreign students come here, what impact will this have? Are there any challenges to teaching and learning practice, faculty or facility? Will a larger number of overseas students cause an overcrowded or unbalanced groups?

Q 6.3 If the trend towards internationalization focuses on partnership collaboration, that means more overseas students will study in their home countries (with our partners). What is the impact on off-campus course delivery, such as, staff arrangement and quality assurance?
Q-7 Internationalization of faculties (T6)

Q 7.1 Could you please rank the level of internationalization among the following four faculties on a four-point scale (for example, 4 indicates the highest level of internationalization; 1 indicates the lowest level):

Faculty A: 
Faculty B: 
Faculty C: 
Faculty D: 

Q 7.2 Why do you think the level of internationalization in each faculty is different? Reasons would relate to:

- Characteristics of the programme, the design of curriculum
- Facilities requirement (such as, studio, lab, workshop)
- Human resource limitation (enough staff?)
- Financial support / resources (cost or insufficient investment)
- Level of international experience in each faculty
- International market demand for particular programmes
- Recruit strategy or prior focus
- Internal support and training in faculty or departments
- Communication from/with other department
- Language / foreign policy barrier
- Others

Q 7.3 How can you enhance and improve the internationalization within faculty? Does the University of [X] need a big organizational change to accommodate internationalization?
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To: Faculty interviewee no.20
Cc: Department 2 interviewee no.13
Sent: Thu Apr 29 17:48:24 2010
Subject: interview

Dear ---:

This is Nan Jiang (vanessa), a research student in [X] Business School. I would like to interview you in regard to how the University of [X] conducts its internationalization. Your cooperation will be highly appreciated. Interview question and detail are attached. I am looking forward to meeting you. Could you please let me know your availability?

Thank you very much indeed.

best wishes
Nan Jiang (vanessa)
RE: interview

Corporate interviewee no.4’s email address

Vanessa-@-.com;

CC: PA of corporate interviewee no.4;

30th April 2010, 11:16

Dear Vanessa,

Thank you for your email. I have forwarded the details to my PA --- who will contact you regarding a convenient date and time.

I look forward to meeting you in the near future.

---

-----Original Message-----
From: Nan Jiang [mailto: Vanessa-@-.com]
Sent: 30 April 2010 01:02
To: Corporate interviewee no.4
Subject: interview

Dear ---:

This is Nan Jiang (vanessa), a research student in [X] Business School. I would like to interview you in regard to how the University of [X] conducts its internationalization. Your cooperation will be highly appreciated. Interview question and detail are attached. I am looking forward to meeting you. Could you please let me know your availability? If ok, I will make an appointment through your PA/Secretary.

Thank you very much indeed.

best wishes
Nan Jiang (vanessa)
Dear Nan Jiang

I am happy to be interviewed. Is Wednesday 5 May at 2pm ok? My office is within --- (room 4)

Best wishes

---

-----Original Message-----
From: Nan Jiang [mailto: Vanessa---@---.com]
Sent: 29 April 2010 02:31
To: Department 2 interviewee no.11
Cc: Department 2 interviewee no.13
Subject: interview

Dear ---:

This is Nan Jiang (vanessa), a research student in [X] Business School. I would like to interview you in regard to how the University of [X] conducts its internationalization. Interview question and detail are attached. Your cooperation will be highly appreciated. I am looking forward to meeting you. Could you please let me know your availability?

Thank you very much indeed.

best wishes
Nan Jiang (vanessa)
Appendix 15  Other Interview-related Conversations

RE: Thank you

Department 2 interviewee 10’s email address

Vanessa---@-.com;

12th May 2010, 8:51

Vanessa:

No problem. I hope that your schedule of interviews continues to go well. The new partner that I mentioned is --- College, which has campuses in --- and ---. I look forward to seeing the final outcome of your work.

Best wishes

---

-----Original Message-----
From: Nan Jiang [mailto: Vanessa---@-.com]
Sent: 11 May 2010 17:49
To: Department 2 interviewee no.10
Subject: Thank you

Dear --- :

Thank you so much for your time and support. you gave me a very fruitful, natural and true answers. I am very appreciated. During the interview, you mentioned about another institution in --- (not ---), which is recently launched by franchising. It was recorded, but I am not sure how to spell that particular institution's name. Could you please email that name? Thank you. I will send a copy of transcript to you and feedback you the final finding when this research ends. Thank you ---.

regards

vanessa
Appendix 16  Reply to Interview Transcripts

RE: Interview Transcript

Corporate interviewee no.8

Vanessa---@.com;

7th August 2010  11:26

Dear Vanessa

I've highlighted the bits where I do not wish to be directly quoted. I've also added in a couple of points for clarification. I would not wish the full transcript to be included.

Some bits don't make sense so I can't check them - you also seem to recognize this as you have included the word 'unclear' several times.

Best wishes
---

From: Nan Jiang [Vanessa---@.com]
Sent: 01 August 2010 00:12
To: Corporate interviewee no.8
Subject: Interview Transcript

Dear ---:

First of all, thank you very much to participate in my research. A copy of your interview transcript is attached for your checking. And may I seek your permission to directly cite your original answer? If no, could you please indicate the particular section that will be indirectly cited?

All transcripts are private and confidential. Your identity is fully protected. No name, no initial and no job position will appear in this research. All interviewees will be presented as “Interviewee 1”, “Interviewee 2”, “Interviewee 3” and “Interviewee 4” ....

Please do not hesitate for any question. Thank you very much indeed.

Best wishes
Vanessa
This is fine, thanks. And please feel free to use quotes as needed

Dr. ---

From: Nan Jiang [Vanessa---@-.com]
Sent: 31 July 2010 23:15
To: Faculty interviewee no.18
Subject: Interview Transcript

Dear ---:

First of all, thank you very much to participate in my research. A copy of your interview transcript is attached for your checking. And may I seek your permission to directly cite your original answer? If no, could you please indicate the particular section that will be indirectly cited?

All transcripts are private and confidential. Your identity is fully protected. No name, no initial and no job position will appear in this research. Interviewees will be presented as “Interviewee 1”, “Interviewee 2”, “Interviewee 3” and “interviewee 4” ....

Please do not hesitate for any question. Thank you very much indeed.

Best wishes
Vanessa
Hello Vanessa

Hope the work is going well and yes you can cite original answers from the interview. The only caveat is that things have changed since the interview of course and so the comments must be taken as reflecting the situation as I saw it at the time, which may not always be the same as time goes by.

Best wishes

---

-----Original Message-----
From: Nan Jiang [mailto: Vanessa---@---.com]
Sent: 31 July 2010 23:24
To: Faculty interviewee no.16
Subject: Interview Transcript

Dear --- :

First of all, thank you very much to participate in my research. A copy of your interview transcript is attached for your checking. And may I seek your permission to directly cite your original answer? If no, could you please indicate the particular section that will be indirectly cited?

All transcripts are private and confidential. Your identity is fully protected. No name, no initial and no job position will appear in this research. All interviewees will be presented as "Interviewee 1", "Interviewee 2", "Interviewee 3" and "Interviewee 4" ....

Please do not hesitate for any question. Thank you very much indeed.

Best wishes
Vanessa
Appendix 17  Reply to De-briefing Request

RE: Research findings de-briefing

Department 2 interviewee no.14’s email address

Vanessa---@---.com;

10th November 2010, 13:59

Hi Vanessa,

How are you?

Can we go for Mon 22 Nov at 4pm?

Thanks

---

From: Nan Jiang [Vanessa---@---.com]
Sent: 10 November 2010 12:54
To: Department 2 interviewee no.14
Subject: Research findings de-briefing

Dear ---:

I am Nan Jiang (Vanessa), a PhD student in [X] Business School. May I interview you again (15-20 minutes) to de-brief you my research finding and seek further advice and recommendations if needed? A briefing of research finding is attached.

Thank you very much indeed.

Yours sincerely,

Nan Jiang (Vanessa)
Hi Vanessa,

How about Monday 22nd, around 9am / 9.30am? (I have a meeting at 10am)

Regards

---

-----Original Message-----
From: Nan Jiang [mailto: Vanessa---@---.com]
Sent: 10 November 2010 13:07
To: Department 2 interviewee no.12
Subject: Research findings de-briefing

Dear --- :

I am Nan Jiang (Vanessa), a PhD student in [X] Business School. May I interview you again (15-20 minutes) to de-brief you my research finding and seek further advice and recommendations if needed? A briefing of research finding is attached.

Thank you very much indeed.

Yours sincerely

Nan Jiang (Vanessa)
Dear Vanessa,

--- is available on the 6th January 2011 at 10:00am. The meeting will take place in ---, if unsure where this is, then ask reception to phone me and I will gladly come collect you.

Could you please provide me with a contact phone number for incase of an emergency?

PA of corporate interviewee no.4

-----Original Message-----
From: Nan Jiang [mailto: Vanessa-@-.com]
Sent: 08 December 2010 11:29
To: PA of corporate interviewee no.4
Subject: Re: FW: Research finding de-briefing

Dear ---:

Thanks for your email, i am available from now until 17th Dec this year and also available from 5th Jan 2011 to 25th Jan next year. The de-briefing takes about 20 minutes. Thank you very much, is it ok? if not, it can be arranged in middle of Feb 2011. Please advise. Many thanks.

best regards
vanessa

On Wed, 12/8/10, PA of corporate interviewee no.4 wrote:

From: PA of corporate interviewee no.4
Subject: FW: Research finding de-briefing
To: "Vanessa-@-.com " <Vanessa-@-.com >
Date: Wednesday, December 8, 2010, 4:50 PM

Dear Vanessa,

How much time would you require? Is 30 minutes ok? Also how soon would you like to meet with --- ?

Regards,

PA of corporate interviewee no.4
Dear Vanessa,

I have copied this into --- my PA so she can liaise with you on time and date.

---

Dear --- :

I am Nan Jiang (Vanessa), a PhD student in [X] Business School. May I interview you again (15-20 minutes) to de-brief you my research findings and seek further advice and recommendations if needed?

Thank you very much indeed.

Yours sincerely,

Nan Jiang (Vanessa)
Appendix 18 Nature of Interview Questions and Answers

Table 4.1 Internationalization strategy and understanding (Q 1.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Informative</th>
<th>Analytical</th>
<th>Evaluative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 1</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 2</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 3</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 4</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 5</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 6</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 7</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 8</td>
<td>Declined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 9</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 10</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 11</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 12</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 13</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 14</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 16</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 17</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 18</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 19</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 20</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 Reasons for HE internationalization (Q 1.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Informative</th>
<th>Analytical</th>
<th>Evaluative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 1</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 2</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 3</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 4</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 5</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 6</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 7</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 8</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 9</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 10</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 11</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 12</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 13</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 14</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 15</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>no. 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 19</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 International development (Q 1.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Informative</th>
<th>Analytical</th>
<th>Evaluative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>no. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 3</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 8</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department 2</td>
<td>no. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 11</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 13</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>no. 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 17</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 20</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 Role of Department 2 (Q 1.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Informative</th>
<th>Analytical</th>
<th>Evaluative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>no. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 5</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 7</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 8</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Interviewees</td>
<td>Informative</td>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td>Evaluative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 8</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 19</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 20</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 International recruitment strategy (Q 2.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Informative</th>
<th>Analytical</th>
<th>Evaluative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11 Special recruitment arrangement (Q 2.2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Informative</th>
<th>Analytical</th>
<th>Evaluative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>no. 1</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 2</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 3</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 4</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 5</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 6</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 7</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 8</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 9</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department 2</td>
<td>no. 10</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 11</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 12</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 13</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 14</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 15</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>no. 16</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 17</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 18</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 19</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 20</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13 Academic Collaboration (Q 3.1)
Table 4.15 Reasons of adopting particular collaboration methods (Q 3.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions 3.2</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Informative</th>
<th>Analytical</th>
<th>Evaluative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>no. 1</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 2</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 3</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 4</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 5</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 6</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 7</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 8</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department 2</td>
<td>no. 10</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 11</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 13</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 14</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>no. 16</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 17</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 18</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 19</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.17 Roles of partners (Q 3.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions 3.3</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Informative</th>
<th>Analytical</th>
<th>Evaluative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>no. 1</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 2</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 3</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 4</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 5</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 6</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 7</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 8</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 9</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department 2</td>
<td>no. 10</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 11</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 12</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 13</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 14</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 15</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>no. 16</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 17</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.19 Responsibility, risk assessment and involvement (Q 3.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Informative</th>
<th>Analytical</th>
<th>Evaluative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 13</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 14</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 17</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 19</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 20</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.21 Difference between agents and partners (Q 3.5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Informative</th>
<th>Analytical</th>
<th>Evaluative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.23 Programme delivery (Q 4.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Informative</th>
<th>Analytical</th>
<th>Evaluative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>no. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department 2</td>
<td>no. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>no. 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.25 Overseas branch campus (Q 5.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Informative</th>
<th>Analytical</th>
<th>Evaluative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>no. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Interviewees</td>
<td>Informative</td>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td>Evaluative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>no. 1</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 2</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 3</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 4</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 5</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 6</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 7</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 8</td>
<td>Declined + o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 9</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department 2</td>
<td>no. 10</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 11</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 12</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 13</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 14</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 15</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>no. 16</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 17</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 18</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 19</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 20</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.27 Problems, issues and challenges of HE internationalization (Q 6.1)
Table 4.29 Impact of overcrowding or unbalanced groups (Q 6.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Informative</th>
<th>Analytical</th>
<th>Evaluative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>no. 1</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 2</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 3</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 4</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 5</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 6</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 7</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 8</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 9</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department 2</td>
<td>no. 10</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 11</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 12</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 13</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 14</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 15</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>no. 16</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 17</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 18</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 19</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 20</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.31 Impacts on off-campus study (Q 6.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Informative</th>
<th>Analytical</th>
<th>Evaluative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>no. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mismatched</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 4</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 5</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 6</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 7</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 8</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 9</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department 2</td>
<td>no. 10</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 11</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 12</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Mismatched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 13</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 14</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 15</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>no. 16</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 17</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 4.33 Ranking of level of internationalization across faculties (Q 7.1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions 7.1</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Informative</th>
<th>Analytical</th>
<th>Evaluative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>no. 1</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 2</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 3</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 4</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 5</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 6</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 7</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 8</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Declined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 9</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department 2</td>
<td>no. 10</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 11</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 12</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 13</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 14</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 15</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>no. 16</td>
<td>o + Declined</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 17</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 18</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 19</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 20</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.35 Reasons of faculty international status (Q 7.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions 7.2</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Informative</th>
<th>Analytical</th>
<th>Evaluative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>no. 1</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 2</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 3</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 4</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 5</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 6</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 7</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 8</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Declined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 9</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department 2</td>
<td>no. 10</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 11</td>
<td>Mismatched</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.37 How to encourage internationalization within faculty? (Q 7.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
<th>Informative</th>
<th>Analytical</th>
<th>Evaluative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Declined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 11</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 13</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 14</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 15</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not addressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 19</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 20</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>