

previous surveys, research did not appear in the top three.

An interesting finding is that recruiting fee-paying students ranked fourth as a strategy, while recruiting non-fee-paying students ranked ninth. These items raise important issues on the anticipated role and benefits related to international students and also the commercial nature of internationalization. The same institutions identified commercialization as the primary risk related to internationalization. Is charging international students fees, which are often higher than for domestic students, not seen as a commercial activity? Is there a contradiction in these two findings? Apparently not. Perhaps the necessity of charging fees is linked to the high subsidizing of domestic students. Yet in countries where between 15 to 20 percent of enrollments consist of international fee-paying students questions should be asked about the motivation and rationales of recruiting fee-paying versus non-fee-paying students.

The past 10 years have seen significant interest levels and innovations in cross-border education—such as the mobility of students, programs, and providers. These developments have been a result of and also an incentive for new types of public and private institutions, nongovernment organizations, and corporations involved in academic programs being offered in international locations. The survey results showed that in terms of future growth, cross-border program mobility and branch campuses ranked 14th and 16th, respectively. Thus, the future importance of these two areas does not appear as widespread among traditional universities active in internationalization as one might have expected. Instead, program and provider mobility seems to involve a group of institutions in a

Of the 17 different internationalization strategies listed, international institutional agreements and networks ranked first.

small number of countries and nontraditional education providers such as companies in the Global Education Index that are listed on public stock exchanges and sell education programs and services in an international market.

The survey shows that the identified areas of future growth are in fact highly similar to current priorities and practices of internationalization. These findings raise the questions whether universities are taking a short-term approach to planning for internationalization and are still in a reactive mode to international opportunities rather than adopting more of a proactive or strategic stance to maximizing the benefits of internationalization and minimizing potential risks. ■

Institutional Responses to the Internationalization Agenda in the United Kingdom

STEVE WOODFIELD

Steve Woodfield is a research fellow at the Centre for Policy and Change in Tertiary Education, University of Surrey, Guildford, Surrey, GU2 7XH, UK. E-mail: s.woodfield@surrey.ac.uk.

UK higher education institutions have recently been transforming their approaches to international activities, influenced by the 2006 Prime Minister's Initiative for International Education. This initiative encouraged institutions to broaden the term *international* that while still focused on generating additional revenue via inward student mobility highlights solidifying the long-term reputation and standing of UK higher education “at home” and overseas, through international partnerships and the experiences of international students.

INSTITUTIONAL INTERNATIONAL STRATEGIES

In the United Kingdom, 77 percent of higher education institutions refer to *international activity* or *internationalization* in their strategic plans, either as a separate section or within other strategic areas (e.g., teaching and learning, research, etc.). A small number of UK institutions have either developed or are developing comprehensive stand-alone international strategy documents to guide their international activity.

Content. Conceptions of an *internationalized* institution determine the nature and coverage of international strategies. Some UK institutions focus selectively on one or a small number of activities (e.g., overseas recruitment, transnational education, or research partnerships) while others seek to integrate an international dimension within the whole institution. This latter approach is often informed by the recent definitions of internationalization developed by Jane Knight and can involve a range of different international activities and institutional culture or ethos as related to the international dimension.

Stages of development. It is possible to identify three sequential stages of strategic development in UK higher education institutions. At the first—*international activity*—stage, activities are disparate and uncoordinated at the central level. The second—*international strategy*—stage marks the beginning of central coordination and alignment of different agendas. The third—*internationalization process*—stage represents an attempt to integrate and achieve leverage and added value regarding all international activity. Most UK higher education institutions stand between the first two stages, although insti-

tutions with an international strategy under way for some time often carry out significant review and reorientation, usually reflecting a move from one stage to the next.

Rationales. The rationale for international activity at UK institutions is not always clear, and it is not uncommon for different parts of an institution to have various rationales for and understanding of the meaning of internationalization. The occasionally overlapping rationales include teaching and learning, research, culture, institutional reputation, the economy, management, and development.

Historically, UK institutions have managed their international activities via a combination of the work of an international office and activities in schools, faculties, or departments.

Looking across the UK sector, (using Jane Knight's typology) "internationalization-abroad" activities (e.g., international projects and cross-border mobility of people, programs, and providers) still appear more frequently in strategic documentation than those that could be classified as "internationalization at home" (e.g., internationalizing the campus, the curriculum, and the teaching and learning process). This has been attributed to the fact that many UK institutions have become dependent on international (non-EU) recruitment for their financial and sometimes academic sustainability, combined with historic encouragement of an economic rationale for international engagement by the UK government. Moreover, at many institutions questions remain as to the benefits produced by a strategy of internationalizing all elements of a domestic campus.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Historically, UK institutions have managed their international activities via a combination of the work of an international office and activities in schools, faculties, or departments. Such activities tended to be loosely coordinated, in the absence of any central unit responsible for international activities across the institution.

However, effective leadership, communication, and centralized procedures are increasingly seen as ways to improve efficiency and to avoid duplication, administrative inefficiency, and confusion. This trend has led many traditional organizational structures related to international activities to be reorganized and reconfigured. Three different models have been observed in the United Kingdom.

Executive model. This model's single focus on leadership includes membership of the senior management team and executive responsibilities, linked to specific resources. Titles that are emerging include "pro vice-chancellor" and "director

of international development." A number of discrete services report directly to this individual (e.g., international recruitment or international partnerships), and the senior role will also involve input into the international strategy and coordination and liaison with other key functions and activities across the institution. An international *division* or *directorate* may be created when following this model.

Matrix model. Under a matrix model, leadership is shared between two individuals exercising different and complementary leadership roles—for example, an *academic* role (e.g., deputy principal international) working with a senior *administrator* (e.g., a director of international services). The post holders need to be certain about the different leadership requirements and to work together closely. The latter position carries executive responsibility for strategy implementation and delivery of services, while the former carries responsibility for strategy development, coordination and liaison, and monitoring of strategy implementation. Resources would be allocated to the executive level through the deputy principal role as well as to other areas of the institution, including the academic units.

Coordination model. Here the responsibility of a pro vice-chancellor international or an equivalent official is lead the international agenda through chairing and coordination of a central committee (or similar body) that combines participants with relevant responsibilities and interests from across the institution.

Internationalization strategies tend to cultivate centralization in university management because of the long-term investments required, the need for operational efficiency, and requirements for quality assurance and good governance. However, at most UK institutions internationalization requires full academic engagement and, by itself, centralization is not sufficient for successful integration.

CONCLUSION

UK institutions have developed a diverse range of strategic responses to the rapidly evolving internationalization agenda, influenced by internal managerial and academic drivers and national policy. Although the rationale for many UK institutions' engagement in international activities remains primarily economic, there is evidence at both the institutional and sectoral levels that academic, social, and cultural rationales are being given more prominence within international strategies and organizational structures.

This article is based on Section 5 of a report for the Higher Education Academy in the United Kingdom, "Responding to the Internationalisation Agenda: Implications for Institutional Strategy and Practice," by Robin Middlehurst and Steve Woodfield. ■