



A case study of issues of strategy implementation in internationalization of higher education

Nan Jiang and Victoria Carpenter
University of Derby, Derby, UK

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this research is to identify and critically evaluate key issues faced by an institution in the quest to implement higher education internationalization.

Design/methodology/approach – A qualitative research is conducted in a post-1992 UK university. A total of 20 interviewees from three key departments participated in this project. Content analysis, critical discourse analysis and categorisation of meaning were applied on analysing three sources of data collection.

Findings – This study identifies critical issues that impede international strategy implementation within an institutional context. These issues include resource allocation, communication, operational process, cooperation and coordination, organizational culture, resistance to change, student support and external environment. Researching findings indicate that most issues are rooted internally. Higher education (HE) internationalization is deemed to be integration and cohesion.

Research limitations/implications – This research contributes to rich understanding of challenges of the present case study; therefore, further research in this area is encouraged to test these highlighted issues through quantitative population studies in other institutions.

Practical implications – Research findings show different understanding of critical issues of HE internationalization, and highlight the areas that need to be improved. This study encourages different key departments to conduct and evaluate internationalization internally.

Originality/value – This research suggests that HE internationalization is primarily an internal matter of integration rather than a process driven only by external environment. This study addresses particular forms of critical issues within an institutional context through a qualitative analysis.

Keywords Internationalization, Higher education, Strategy implementation, United Kingdom

Paper type Research paper

Introduction

Strategy implementation has become an essential part of business strategies in today's international competition; however, it seems little attention has been given to particular issues and challenges arising from higher education (HE) internationalization, in spite of the discussion of related factors in literature. Most research in this area either concentrates on commercial organizations (see Table I), or is based on quantitative studies (Teichler, 1996; Teichler and Maiworm, 1996; Van Damme, 2001; Joyce *et al.*, 2003; GATE survey, cited in Sidhu, 2007), which lack in-depth analysis and explanation of particular problems in an institutional context. The literature cannot fully explain the observed issues of HE internationalization in the present case study. Problems of HE internationalization may take different forms within institutional contexts, which require more research. This study addresses the issues and challenges of HE internationalization.



Impeders	Sources
<i>Planning consequences</i>	
Lack of exact strategic planning	Alexander (1985), Hambrick and Cannella (1989),
Insufficient lining of the strategy to goals	Al-Ghamdi (1998), Noble (1999a), Pechlaner and
Time limitation	Sauerwein (2002)
Lack of consensus among decision makers	
Lack of identification of major problems	
Lack of effective role for formulations	
Unsuitable training systems	
Unclear regulation and executive policies	
<i>Organizational issues</i>	
Incompatible structure with the strategy	Alexander (1991), Olsen <i>et al.</i> (1992), Schmelzer
Unsuitable resource allocation	and Olsen (1994), Al-Ghamdi (1998), Noble
Lack of adequate communication	(1999b), Aaltonen and Ikavaiko (2002), Heide
Lack of effective coordination	<i>et al.</i> (2002), Okumus (2001, 2003), Dobni (2003),
Lack of adequate information system	Freedman (2003)
Incompatible organizational culture	
Competing activities among people	
Competing activities among units	
Unsuitable evaluation and control system	
Unsuitable compensation system	
Inadequate physical facilities	
<i>Managerial issues</i>	
Unsuitable leadership	Alexander (1985), Reed and Buckley (1988),
Lack of adequate organizational support	Mintzberg and Quinn (1991), Al-Ghamdi (1998),
Lack of adequate manager commitment	Noble (1999a), Okumus and Roper (1999), Beer
Fear of insecurity among managers	and Nohria (2000), Heide <i>et al.</i> (2002)
Political factors in regards to power	
Unsuitable personal management	
Factors beyond management control	
<i>Individual issues</i>	
Lack of enough compatibilities of employees	Alexander (1985), Hambrick and Cannella (1989),
Resistance to change among people	Al-Ghamdi (1998), Okumus and Roper (1999),
Resistance to change among units	Okumus (2001, 2003), Pechlaner and Sauerwein
Fear of insecurity in the new territory	(2002), Freedman (2003)
Lack of understanding of strategy	
Inadequate connection to the vision	

Source: Alashloo *et al.* (2005)

Table I.
Impeders to strategy
implementation

A post-1992 university was chosen as a case study. This university is located in central England; it consists of four faculties[1], with approximately 25,000 students; the main focus is on undergraduate delivery. This university is a typical example of most UK universities that undertake HE internationalization without establishing satellite overseas branch campuses. First, a brief review of literature is presented, including factors of strategy implementation and choice of international market; this is followed by an evaluation of related educational issues highlighted in this area. Next, a discussion of the methodology addresses the research approach, data collection and analysis, followed by the discussion of the findings. Finally, this paper ends with conclusion, implications and suggestions for further research.

Literature review

Factors of strategy implementation

Numerous scholars are aware of the gap between strategy formulation and strategy implementation and identify various factors of strategy implementation (see Table I). One of the earlier popular implementation factor analysis studies is McKinsey's 7-S framework (strategy, structure, system, style, staff, skills and subordinate goals) proposed by Waterman *et al.* (1980); however, it was later concluded that these are seven individual factors (Kazmi, 2008), with no clear explanation of the interrelationship among them. Similar criticism applies to Pettigrew and Whipp's (1991) five-factor analysis (environmental assessment, leading change, human resource, link strategic and operational change and coherence). Similar key implementation factors were identified as understanding of strategy, culture, system, power, conflict, coordination and environment impact (Stonich, 1982; Hrebiniak and Joyce, 1984; Galbraith and Kazanjian, 1986; Reed and Buckley, 1988), yet none of them have been subsequently or empirically tested (Kazmi, 2008). Joyce *et al.* (2003) analyzed 160 companies over a five-year period and found that success was strongly correlated, among other things, with an ability to execute a strategy flawlessly. Different scholars summarize similar impeders of strategy implementation with various perspectives (see Table I).

All the above factors are derived from commercial background; some are based on empirical research and some on conceptual analysis. However, they have the same weakness: 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. Unlike commercial business, some industries (e.g. accounting) and non-profit public industries (such as national health care, education and local government authorities, as discussed in Naranjo-Gil and Hartmann, 2006) go beyond the preview factors as they move vertically into the finer aspects of strategy implementation. Implementation factors in these industries may reveal in different perspectives or certain forms, such as audit and taxation in accounting, Quality Assurance Agency examination for UK HE, and implementation of effectiveness evaluation in hospitals and health care. Thus, these highlighted factors may not fully address and explain the challenges and problems arising from certain industries or particular aspects of strategy implementation. The issues of HE internationalization may reveal its own unique forms through an education-specific interpretation within an institutional context.

Choice of international markets

Selecting right target countries for foreign operations is an important decision, which has a major impact on internationalization. Several studies in the area of international marketing and management have focussed on external environment (O'Farrell and Wood, 1994; Papadopoulos *et al.*, 2002; Rothaermel *et al.*, 2006; Ojala and Tyrvaainen, 2007a). Many external key factors were identified, including culture and languages, governmental regulations and policy, transactional costs, risk, opportunity and market size (Bell, 1995; McGoldrick and Davies, 1995; Coviello and Munro, 1997; Chetty and Campbell-Hunt, 2004; Moen *et al.*, 2004; Rothaermel *et al.*, 2006). Alexander and De Lira e Silva's (2002, p. 301) add further three factors and state that "geopolitical, economic and competitive conditions fundamentally altered the direction of market expansion." However, most factors have focussed on case studies (Coviello and Munro, 1997;

Moen *et al.*, 2004; Zain and Ng, 2006) or commercial surveys (Bell, 1995), rather than from a non-profit organization's (such as university) standpoint, where the impact of external environment may not be as obvious as in commercial internationalization.

Risks and challenges of HE internationalization

Compared to the impeters of business strategy implementation (see Table I), there are few discussions in relation to risks and challenges of HE internationalization, although internationalization has become a key strategic element for universities around the world (Ayoubi and Massoud, 2007; Maringe, 2009). Little research addresses the problems of HE internationalization into strategic implementation of an individual institution with in-depth analysis. A number of key issues are identified from previous research, including insufficient resource (Van Damme, 2001), and external issues, such as governmental policy and international competition (Altbach and McGill Peterson, 1998; Maringe, 2009), quality assurance (Van Overbeek, 1997; Bruch and Barty, 1998; Van Der Wende, 2002), recognition of foreign qualifications (Hildebrand, 1996; Van Damme, 2001), recognition of credits and length of study abroad (Steiner, 1996; Teichler, 1996; Teichler and Maiworm, 1996; Van Damme, 2001), gap of management of HE international strategy (Smith *et al.*, 1995; Maringe, 2009), challenges of managing diversity (Maringe *et al.*, 2007; Maringe, 2009), ongoing staff development and training (Killick, 2006; Maringe, 2009), lack of focus on the curricula (Beyer and Liston, 1996; Maringe, 2009). However, these challenges do not fully match the current issues that the case study is facing in HE internationalization.

Methodology

The focus group technique (Cohen and Manion, 1992) was adopted as a way to better understand why different departments feel the way they do in relation to issues of HE internationalization. Based on positions and job responsibilities, 20 interviewees from three key departments were selected and 1:1 interviews were conducted over the period of six months. The three interview groups are the corporate group, or the senior management in charge of advancing the university's strategic plan; the marketing group, who liaise with different departments in charge of international recruitment, partnerships, initiatives and student support; and the faculty group, or the academic teaching team who are responsible for strategy implementation. The answers from each group were used in comparative analysis, resulting in an overlapping pattern structure, which consists of common points (agreed by three groups), partially shared points (agreed by two groups), and group-specific points (single group).

The principal researcher is not an internal academic at the university and therefore is better placed to maintain a more objective perspective on the data collected. The secondary author, while internal to the institution, is not directly involved in internationalization. Semi-structured interviews (Hammersley, 1992; Robson, 2002; Bell, 2002; Denscombe, 2003) played a dominant role in primary data collection. Other types of data collection were used to triangulate with primary data, including observation (Ackroyd and Hughes, 1992) and secondary documentary data. A total of 329 pages of interview transcripts were analyzed. Data analysis strategies included content analysis, critical discourse analysis (CDA), categorization of meaning and color coding. Content analysis normally accepts the circumstance as what has been told (Stemler, 2001); while CDA (Fairclough *et al.*, 2004) does not only recognize the denotative meaning (such as interview transcripts) (Chandler, 1998), but also interpret

the underlying connotative meaning (Barthes, 1974, 1977) of interviewees' subjective views. With categorization of meaning, the data are analyzed for common sub-themes and patterns (Kavale and Forness, 1996). Color coding of transcripts was used to identify the most frequently mentioned issues and to develop sub-themes within the categories (Strauss and Corbin, 1990).

Findings of primary data

The answers from each group were used in comparative analysis, categorizing data (Saunders *et al.*, 2009), and leading to an overlapping pattern structure (see Table II), which indicates the degree of integration among three key departments (corporate, SFPL and marketing) within the case study. The common points imply the highest

Common points

All groups Governmental policy and regulation
Competition, league table position and international reputation
Resources in terms of staff and capital

Partially shared points

Marketing-corporate Faculty cooperation – staff attitude with strong resistance
Workload for academic staff should not be a problem because international activities are part of their annual work
Organizational culture
Marketing-faculty Staff's efforts need to be fully recognized
Environmental uncertainty – health and safety in African states
Corporate-faculty Peak academic schedules
Technology
Certain faculties lack international experience
Volatile international market
International Office needs to support international students more
Low efficiency of application processing in International Office

Group-specific points

Corporate None
Marketing Low efficiency of agreement/contract preparation
Students need to be treated equally in both UK and partners' sides
Staff attitude – fear, uncertainty and stress
Lack of staff development and training
Partnership management – people and trust
Faculty Internationalization is additional workload
Anglo-centric curriculum barrier – dilemma between standardizing own syllabus and designing new programs
Communication and internal support
Faculty priority
Allowance delays
Lack of synchronization between partner and home institutions
Conflict around who goes for recruitment abroad (academics?/marketing staff?)
Conflict between faculty's own purpose and marketing central priority of international initiatives
International Office needs to work closely with faculties and improves student support
International students in each faculty should have equal access, opportunity and experience

Table II.
Key points summary

level of cohesion, while group-specific points present the lowest. Research findings identify and analyze the key critical issues as follows.

Resource allocation. All interviewees agree that financial and human resources are vital to strategy execution. The corporate group considers resource less of an issue of HE internationalization 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. The university does not intend to establish an overseas branch campus, thus the corporate management believes that resource in terms of capital is not a challenge, either:

Resourcing should not be an issue because we should have planned that so [...] all of our overseas activity has to be fully estimated before we start [...] (interviewee no. 5, corporate group).

However, the marketing group states that resource in terms of capital is a challenge because more capital is needed to develop international markets. Resource in terms of staff puts more pressure on faculty academics. Faculties talk about having to deal with work overload and peak schedules, and they need more people, thus the resource in terms of staff to faculty group is also an issue. The corporate group does not quite agree with that because they think that capital resource has already been given to marketing and faculties. The potential reason for this discord is that the corporate group is responsible for strategy formulation, rather than strategy implementation (Hrebiniak and Joyce, 1984; Hrebiniak, 2009). They hand off the “ball” of implementation to other departments and expect the strategy to be executed as it is supposed to be. Inefficient communication may also be considered a potential reason.

Communication. Communication is a critical issue on most levels at the university. In respect to international initiatives, information sharing within one group or among three key departments is inefficient, and staff are not well informed. For example, within the marketing department, interviewees comment that there is lack of staff development and training. Sometimes, they find it difficult to promote certain programs that are out of the scope of their understanding:

Some subjects I am very familiar with [...] but some subjects 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, marketing group).

Within the faculty group, interviewees state that there is inadequate central marketing support. Faculties with less international experience find it harder to implement the internationalization strategy:

[...] 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 [...] There is a diversity of advice and no central repository of that [...] We do not always recognize where the expertise is in the university (interviewee no. 16, faculty group).

Finally, compared with the other two groups, the corporate group rarely realizes this issue, stating instead that the internationalization is visible as they “do not have to force international initiatives across faculties and all the deans are very cooperative” (interviewee no. 4, corporate group). Inefficient communication may contribute to the reason why the corporate group feels this way as they may not be well informed. And there is no standard or measurement to evaluate the quality and efficiency of communication. Communication cannot guarantee understanding and action. The feedback that the corporate group gets does not appear to contain correct

understanding of the challenges that the university is facing because the triangulated results show that there is a strong resistance in terms of participating in internationalization at the faculty level (as discussed later).

Operational process. Most issues of operational process exist within faculty. For example, academics state that internationalization clashes with their teaching at home institution. Work overload is the main challenge for faculty academics. This point is interrelated with the previous issue of insufficient resource. Faculties require more staff and more time to handle internationalization:

Staff have to be marking while they are teaching [...] you can imagine where a pile of moderation of assessment comes in from overseas in the middle of that, the workloads can peak and get quite high (interviewee no. 16, faculty group).

However, the marketing and corporate groups have an opposite view of workload. They believe that workload should not be an issue because international activities are part of the duties stipulated in the academic contract:

[...] this activity should be built into the academic workload of appropriate faculty staff [...] It should be part of their overall annual workload [...] That is part of the overall institutional agreement [...] (interviewee no. 10, marketing group).

The next issue is scheduling, which is used in planning and control to indicate the detailed timetable of what work should be done and when. This issue is highlighted by the faculty group because international collaboration overextends academic schedules, and there is a lack of synergy between home institution and foreign partners. International collaboration clashes with the home university academic schedule. Consequently, staff's annual leave and individual holidays can be affected:

We have the variety of challenges from scheduling [...] that causes a logistical problem, you can get a situation where staff have nowhere to take a holiday [...] lack of synchronization between things (interviewee no. 17, faculty group).

Sequencing determines which work holds the priority and should be done first and which work can be done later. Marketing group believes that it is unfair if academics always put international activities (e.g. 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. Sometimes, faculties' version of sequencing puts pressure on the marketing staff, especially the coordinators or project leaders, because they feel uneasy in explaining the faculties' response to collaborative partners. It may impact on trust and communication during partnership development:

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] [...] 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 (interviewee no. 14, marketing group).

The issue of operational paradox exists in certain faculties who face a dilemma between standardizing existing curriculum and adopting foreign market demands, designing new programs. Some Anglo-centric programs (e.g. education, nursing and law) are bespoke for those who will teach or serve in the UK; thus there is little room for these types of programs to become internationalized:

My Master's [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).

Other negative aspects of operational process include staff's efforts of internationalization not being fully recognized, allowance delay in getting reimbursed for the expense incurred abroad and lack of internal support.

Cooperation and coordination. Cooperation and coordination are key criteria to achieve high level of cohesion within an organization. In the case study, cooperation and coordination are supposed to be reflected in different departments (corporate, marketing and faculty) working together and key units (marketing and faculty) or individuals (program leaders and project leaders) supporting each other cooperatively to pursue the same corporate goal of internationalization. However, there is lack of understanding and cooperation among them, especially between marketing and faculty. The responsibilities and accountability between marketing-driven and faculty-driven international initiatives do not enhance positive reaction. The faculty group argues that the roots of internationalization, especially partnership, must be within the faculty who has expertise in subject areas; while, marketing claims that, as a central department, it is mainly responsible for internationalization:

Faculties have to make the links, because if they are all centralized, it is very difficult for a centralized, non-academic department to understand what the needs might be [...] the roots of the plant (partnership) have to be the faculty (interviewee no. 19, faculty group).

Similar argument occurs about who (marketing or faculty) should go for recruitment abroad:

As a faculty we 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 (students) rather than him (marketing) passing information about the course to somebody because we think we can do it better than they can [...] (interviewee no. 17, faculty group).

And the faculty's own purpose may conflict with the marketing's central planning in internationalization:

We might want it (international initiative) for our own purposes but it might not fit in the overall university strategy so they (marketing) might not give the priority we want. So there will always be groups who will be fighting for one thing or another (interviewee no. 17, faculty group).

Unlike faculties, the marketing department does not have full operational functions or administrative authority to implement international initiatives, such as program delivery, moderation and assessment. Therefore, it can be argued that marketing may not fulfill its responsibility. Furthermore, within marketing, inefficient coordination in terms of preparation of contracts and agreements can frustrate its own staff's enthusiasm of internationalization:

[...] low efficiency, we need agent or partnership agreement [...] that agreement very slowly goes through certain procedure [...] and the result is obviously disappointing and frustrating, which is another reason I am leaving this university soon [...] (interviewee no. 13, marketing group).

Organizational culture and resistance to change. In the case study, organizational culture is reflected in the culture clash among departments. The culture of marketing is more forceful in promoting internationalization, because establishing partnerships and

recruiting students are their main job. The faculties see teaching as their primary task. Some academics are not used to participating with internationalization. Both the corporate and marketing groups consider internationalization to be an integral part of the faculties' daily job. Marketing passes international initiatives to faculties for implementation. Then, faculties feel forced into cooperation. They have to deal with work overload and peak schedules. Academics are less motivated because their efforts may not be fully recognized by senior management. Allowance delay and unsuitable incentive affect academics' enthusiasm of internationalization and lead to passive reaction. Additional work represents how academics conceptualize or think about internationalization, for example, what is the value of internationalization/will the changes benefit or harm my department, or me? This results in reluctance to change. Consequently, the marketing group points out that the nature of programs is always used by faculties as an excuse to refuse participating and there is strong resistance in faculties in terms of cooperation:

There is quite a lot of resistance to anything new. I do not think a lot of the academics here are that happy with change [...] they will say, "well, my subject is very specifically British" [...] we do not quite understand it really [...] (interviewee no. 3, marketing group).

The context implies a rather unhealthy institutional culture, where there is a discord among the key departments involved in internationalization. Moreover, besides allowance, academics resist change simply because change represents uncertainty (Visagie and Botha, 1998), and faculties fear the uncertainty and difference (Karim and Kathawala, 2005). Staff are struggling to deal with stress, fear of changes and uncertainty:

It was not to do really with the allowance, it was maybe more to do with dealing pressures, culture and fear [...] Fear about the unknown and difference (interviewee no. 14, marketing group).

When academics are forced to participate internationalization, they may take their own frustrations out on the partners:

They (academics) can see internationalization as a drain on themselves and they can blame the partners. Quite often, people used to take their frustrations out on the partners [...] When they moderated work they were naturally inclined to be very negative [...] (interviewee no. 14, marketing group).

Some academics might resist change 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?" (interviewee no. 14, marketing group) because most staff are used to teaching or demonstrating to partners how to deliver programs. However, when their partners have higher qualifications, some academics may feel uncomfortable to guiding those partners during collaborations.

Student support. Issues of student support concentrate on English language, international student settlement, transport and accommodation. A faculty interviewee points out that international students at different campuses should have equal access, opportunity and experience:

I think the challenge for us is to ensure equal access and equal opportunity and equal experience for the international students here (interviewee no. 20, faculty group).

Faculty suggests that the International Student Centre (under marketing department) needs to play a greater role and work closely with faculties to provide better student

service, including improving the efficiency in processing international applications, especially for advanced standing students or applications with exemption requests:

International Office needs to play a greater role in supporting students in the faculties [...] I do not think it is as strong as it could be [...] and applications have not been dealt with as speedily as they could do [...] (interviewee no. 19, faculty group).

Low efficiency of the application process can result in the faculty losing potential international students. Insufficient student support leads a negative word of mouth, consequently, adversely affects the university's international reputation and recruitment.

External environment. Research findings show that external environment also impacts on HE internationalization. These external factors include governmental policy, such as UK Boarder Agency visa regulations and English language requirements (Altbach and McGill Peterson, 1998), overseas environment, such as health and safety situation in African states, competition, such as league tables and international reputation (Maringe, 2009), volatile international market, campus location and technology, such as access to internet in some African countries.

In addition to above criteria, this research identifies two more potential issues of HE internationalization: first, on-campus overcrowded or unbalanced groups and second, impact on off-campus study. The former typically occurs when international students from one nation dominate classes; this results in unbalanced group and less mutual inter-cultural enrichment. The latter implies that there is a significant quality drop in terms of study experience because students who study locally with partners cannot have the same experience as those who study abroad. This is the students' choice due to various factors (e.g. distance, economy and jobs); however, what the university can do is to ensure that the academic standard of service provision is the same, no matter which study model is adopted.

Conclusion, implication and further research

The research concludes that issues of HE internationalization are mainly in relation to integration, operation, communication, resource, people, change and culture. Most factors are rooted internally, and the university's internal cohesion, capability and willingness are primarily vital to HE internationalization, although external factors are also important. First, these critical factors present particular forms of international strategy implementation issues within an institutional context, and highlight the areas where the university needs to improve. Different key departments can better realize and understand the challenges of HE internationalization, and adjust themselves to achieve a more efficient outcome. Next, these factors are not unique to education nor do they exist within one particular university. For other similar institutions, these critical factors are also applicable. The larger proportion of overlap among the key departments implies the higher level of integration within the university, and the more possibility of success in HE internationalization.

Recommendations suggest that the university should provide more training and staff development that can help in the transfer of knowledge (Sirrianni and Frey, 2001; Zhao, 2005), share more common values, increase interaction and level of cooperation across key departments. Organizational culture needs to be changed fundamentally through an internal top-down influence from leadership (Hrebiniak, 2009), facilitating a culture shift (Carden and Callahan, 2007) and fostering the employees' willingness to support international initiatives. High performance is not always the result of good

effort, but of greater understanding (Frese and Zapf, 1994), thus efficient communication and understanding are highly encouraged. This qualitative research contributes to a better understanding of the issues and challenges of HE internationalization in the present case study, and creates a sound basis for a more broad-based study across the HE sector. Further research will concentrate on testing these critical factors in other institutions through quantitative population studies.

Note

1. The term "faculty" is used to describe four distinct colleges or college groups within the university. One of the examples is the Faculty of Education, Human Science & Law (currently restructured).

References

- Aaltonen, P. and Ikavaiko, H. (2002), "Implementing strategies successfully", *Integrated Manufacturing Systems*, Vol. 13 No. 6, pp. 415-18.
- Ackroyd, S. and Hughes, J. (1992), *Data Collection in Context*, 2nd ed., Longman, London.
- Alashloo, F.R., Castka, P. and Sharp, J.M. (2005), "Towards understanding the impellers of strategy implementation in higher education – a case study of HE institutes in Iran", *Quality Assurance in Education*, Vol. 13 No. 2, pp. 132-47.
- Alexander, L.D. (1985), "Successfully implementing strategic decisions", *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 18 No. 3, pp. 91-7.
- Alexander, L.D. (1991), "Strategy implementation: nature of the problem", *International Review of Strategic Management*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 73-91.
- Alexander, N. and De Lira e Silva, M. (2002), "Emerging markets and the internationalization of retailing: the Brazilian experience", *International Review of Retail and Distribution Management*, Vol. 30 No. 6, pp. 300-14.
- Al-Ghamdi, S.M. (1998), "Obstacles to successful implementation of strategic decisions: the British experience", *Journal of European Business Review*, Vol. 98 No. 6, pp. 322-7.
- Altbach, P.G. and McGill Peterson, P. (1998), "Internationalize American higher education? Not exactly", *International Higher Education*, Vol. 30 No. 4, pp. 36-9.
- Ayoubi, R.M. and Massoud, H.K. (2007), "The strategy of internationalization in universities", *International Journal of Education Management*, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp. 329-49.
- Barthes, R. (1974), *Elements of Semiology* (Trans by L. Lavers and C. Smith). Jonathan Cape, London.
- Barthes, R. (1977), *Image-Music-Text*, Fontana, London.
- Beer, M. and Nohria, N. (2000), "Cracking the code of change", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 78 No. 2, pp. 133-41.
- Bell, J. (1995), "The internationalization of small computer software firms: a further challenge to 'stage' theories", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 29 No. 8, pp. 60-75.
- Bell, J. (2002), *Doing Your Research Project. A Guide for First Time Researchers in Education and Social Sciences*, 3rd ed., Sage, Buckingham.
- Beyer, L.E. and Liston, D.P. (1996), *Curriculum in Conflict, Social Visions, Educational Agendas and Progressive School Reform*, Teachers College Press, New York, NY.
- Bruch, T. and Barty, A. (1998), "Internationalizing British higher education: students and institutions", in Scott, P. (Ed.), *The Globalization of Higher Education*, SRHE and Open University Press, Buckingham, pp. 18-31.

- Carden, L. and Callahan, J.L. (2007), "Creating leaders or loyalists? Conflicting identities in a leadership development programme", *Human Resource Development International*, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 169-86.
- Chandler, D. (1998), *Semiótica para Principiantes* (Trans by V. Hogan Vega and I. Rodrigo Mendizábal), Ediciones Abya-Yala/Escuela de Comunicación Social de la Universidad Politécnica Salesiana, Quito, Ecuador.
- Chetty, S.K. and Campbell-Hunt, C. (2004), "A strategic approach to internationalization: a traditional versus a 'born-global' approach", *Journal of International Marketing*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 57-81.
- Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (1992), *Research Methods in Education*, Routledge, London.
- Coviello, N. and Munro, H. (1997), "Network relationships and the internationalization process of small software firms", *International Business Review*, Vol. 6 No. 4, pp. 361-86.
- Denscombe, M. (2003), *The Good Research Guide: For Small Scale Social Research Projects*, 2nd ed., Open University Press, Maidenhead.
- Dobni, B. (2003), "Creating a strategy implementation environment", *Business Horizons*, Vol. 46 No. 2, pp. 43-6.
- Fairclough, N., Jessop, R. and Sayer, A. (2004), *Critical Realism and Semiosis – Critical Realism, Discourse, and Deconstruction*, Routledge, New York, NY.
- Freedman, M. (2003), "The genius is in the implementation", *Journal of Business Strategy*, Vol. 24 No. 2, pp. 26-31.
- Frese, M. and Zapf, D. (1994), "Action as the core work psychology: a German approach", in Triandis, H.C., Dunnette, M.D. and Hough, L.M. (Eds), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto, CA, pp. 271-340.
- Galbraith, J. and Kazanjian, R. (1986), *Strategy Implementation: Structure Systems and Process*, 2nd ed., West Publishing, New York, NY.
- Giangreco, A. and Peccei, R. (2005), "The nature and antecedents of middle manager resistance to change: evidence from an Italian context", *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 16 No. 10, pp. 1812-29.
- Hambrick, D. and Cannella, A. (1989), "Strategy implementation as substance and selling", *The Academy of Management Executive*, Vol. 3 No. 4, pp. 278-85.
- Hammersley, M. (1992), *What's Wrong With Ethnography?* Routledge, London.
- Heide, M., Gronhaug, K. and Johannessen, S. (2002), "Exploring barriers to the successful implementation of a formulated strategy", *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, Vol. 18 No. 2, pp. 217-31.
- Hildebrand, M. (1996), "Overview of the development of academic recognition practices in Europe", *Higher Education in Europe*, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp. 39-49.
- Hrebiniak, L. (2009), *Making Strategy Working*, Wharton School Publishing, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Hrebiniak, L. and Joyce, W. (1984), *Implementing Strategy*, Macmillan, New York, NY.
- Joyce, W., Nohria, N. and Roberson, B. (2003), "What (really) work", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 81 No. 7, pp. 43-52.
- Karim, A. and Kathawala, Y. (2005), "The experience of manufacturing firms with the implementation of different production philosophies: a United States survey", *International Journal of Management*, Vol. 22 No. 3, pp. 351-65.
- Kavale, K.A. and Forness, S.R. (1996), "Social skill deficits and learning disabilities: a meta-analysis", *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, Vol. 29 No. 3, pp. 226-37.

- Kazmi, A. (2008), "A proposed framework for strategy implementation in the Indian context", *Management Decision*, Vol. 46 No. 10, pp. 1564-81.
- Killick, D. (2006), "Worldwide horizon: cross cultural capability and global perspectives: guidelines for curriculum", available at: www.lmu.ac.uk/lisif/RefreshingTheCurriculumFinal.doc (accessed September 18, 2010).
- McGoldrick, P.J. and Davies, G. (1995), *International Retailing, Trends and Strategies*, Pitman Publishing, London, pp. 207-18.
- Maringe, F. (2009), "Strategies and challenges of internationalization in HE: an exploratory study of UK universities", *International Journal of Educational Management*, Vol. 23 No. 7, pp. 553-63.
- Maringe, F., Lumby, J. and Morrison, M. (2007), "Leadership diversity and decision making in FE colleges", working paper, Centre for Excellence in Leadership, Lancaster.
- Mink, O.G. (1992), "Creating new organizational paradigms for change", *International Journal of Quality and Reliability Management*, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 21-35.
- Mintzberg, H. and Quinn, J.B. (1991), *The Strategy Process*, Prentice Hall, London.
- Moen, O., Gavlen, M. and Endresen, I. (2004), "Internationalization of small, computer software firms: entry forms and market selection", *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol. 38 Nos 9/10, pp. 1236-51.
- Naranjo-Gil, D. and Hartmann, F. (2006), "How top management teams use management accounting systems to implement strategy", *Journal of Management Accounting Research*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp. 21-54.
- Noble, C.H. (1999a), "Building the strategy implementation network", *Business Horizons*, Vol. 42 No. 6, pp. 19-28.
- Noble, C.H. (1999b), "The eclectic roots of strategy implementation research", *Journal of Business Research*, Vol. 45 No. 2, pp. 119-34.
- O'Farrell, P.N. and Wood, P.A. (1994), "International market selection by business service firms: key conceptual and methodological issues", *International Business Review*, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 243-61.
- Ojala, A. and Tyrvainen, P. (2007a), "Market entry and priority of small and medium-sized enterprises in the software industry: an empirical analysis of cultural distance, geographical distance, and market size", *Journal of International Marketing*, Vol. 15 No. 3, pp. 123-49.
- Okumus, F. (2001), "Towards a strategy implementation framework", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 13 No. 7, pp. 327-38.
- Okumus, F. (2003), "A framework to implement strategies in organizations", *Management Decision*, Vol. 41 No. 9, pp. 871-82.
- Okumus, F. and Roper, A. (1999), "A review of disparate approaches to strategy implementation in hospitality firms", *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Research*, Vol. 23 No. 1, pp. 20-38.
- Olsen, M.D., Tse, E.C.Y. and West, J.J. (1992), *Strategic Management in the Hospitality Industry*, Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York, NY.
- Papadopoulos, N., Chen, H. and Thomas, D.R. (2002), "Toward a tradeoff model for international market selection", *International Business Review*, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. 165-92.
- Pechlaner, H. and Sauerwein, E. (2002), "Strategy implementation in the Alpine tourism industry", *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, Vol. 14 No. 4, pp. 157-68.
- Pettigrew, A.M. and Whipp, R. (1991), *Managing Change for Competitive Success*, Blackwell, Oxford.

- Reed, R. and Buckley, M. (1988), "Strategy in action – techniques for implementing strategy", *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 21 No. 3, pp. 67-74.
- Robson, C. (2002), *Real World Research*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Rothaermel, F.T., Kotha, S. and Steensma, H.K. (2006), "International market entry by US internet firms: an empirical analysis of country risk, national culture, and market size", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 32 No. 1, pp. 56-82.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P. and Thornhill, A. (2009), *Research Methodology for Business Students*, 5th ed., Prentice Hall, London.
- Schmelzer, C. and Olsen, M. (1994), "A data-based strategy-implementing framework for companies in the restaurant industry", *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol. 13 No. 4, pp. 347-59.
- Sidhu, R. (2007), "GATE and the new developmentalism: governing transnational education", *Comparative Education Review*, Vol. 51 No. 2, pp. 203-28.
- Sirianni, P.M. and Frey, B.A. (2001), "Changing a culture: evaluation of a leadership development program at Mellon financial services", *International Journal of Training and Development*, Vol. 5 No. 4, pp. 290-301.
- Smith, D.N., Scott, P. and Lynch, J. (1995), *The Role of Marketing in the University and College Sector: A Study of How Marketing is Defined and Organized in British Universities and Colleges as Compared with Other Service Sectors*, Higher Education Information Services Trust, Leeds.
- Steiner, D. (1996), "European higher education and the issues of tradition, transfer-credit and credibility", *Higher Education in Europe*, Vol. 21 No. 4, pp. 65-75.
- Stemler, S. (2001), "An overview of content analysis", *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation*, Vol. 7 No. 17, pp. 24-36.
- Stonich, P. (1982), *Implementing Strategy: Making Strategy Happen*, Ballinger, Cambridge, MA.
- Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1990), *Basics of Qualitative Research*, Sage, Newbury Park, CA.
- Teichler, U. (1996), "Student mobility in the framework of ERASMUS: findings of an evaluation study", *European Journal of Education*, Vol. 31 No. 2, pp. 153-79.
- Teichler, U. and Maiworm, F. (1996), *The ERASMUS Experience, Major Findings of the ERASMUS Evaluation Research Project*, EC-DGII – Universität Kassel, Luxemburg-Kassel, available at: <http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/socrates/erasmus/public.html> (accessed September 30, 2009).
- Van Damme, D. (2001), "Quality issues in the internationalization of higher education", *Higher Education*, Vol. 41 No. 4, pp. 415-41.
- Van Der Wende, M.C. (2002), "New perspectives for learning – briefing paper 60: higher education institutions' responses to Europeanization, internationalization and globalization", available at: www.pjb.co.uk/npl/bp60.pdf (accessed April 12, 2010).
- Van Overbeek, M. (1997), "On internationalization, student mobility and quality assurance", *Higher Education Management*, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 49-57.
- Visagie, J.C. and Botha, C.J. (1998), "Contextual and empirical approach to social change and social responsibilities", *Management Decision*, Vol. 26 No. 10, pp. 694-701.
- Waterman, R. Jr, Peters, T. and Phillips, J.R. (1980), "Structure is not organization", *Business Horizons*, Vol. 23 No. 3, pp. 14-26.
- Zain, M. and Ng, S.I. (2006), "The impacts of network relationships on SMEs' internationalization process", *Thunderbird International Business Review*, Vol. 48 No. 2, pp. 183-205.
- Zhao, C.L. (2005), "Management of corporate culture through local managers' training in foreign companies in China: a qualitative analysis", *International Journal of Training and Development*, Vol. 9 No. 4, pp. 232-55.

Further reading

- De Vita, G. and Case, P. (2003), "Rethinking the internationalization agenda in UK higher education", *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, Vol. 27 No. 4, pp. 383-98.
- GATE (2000), *Trade in Transnational Education Services: A Report by the Global Alliance for Transnational Education*, GATE (Global Alliance for Transnational Education), Washington, DC.
- Jiang, N. (2011), "Market entry mode of higher education internationalization", unpublished PhD thesis, pp. 107-8.
- Porter, M.E. (1990), "New global strategies for competitive advantage", *Planning Review*, May/June, pp. 4-14.
- Rosenthal, M.B., Frank, R.G., Li, Z. and Epstein, A.M. (2005), "Early experience with pay-for-performance: from concept to practice", *Journal of the American Medical Management*, Vol. 29 No. 4, pp. 1788-93.
- Voloshinov, V.N. (1973), *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* (Trans by L. Matejka and I.R. Titunik), Seminar Press, New York, NY.
- Yin, R.K. (1994), *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, 2nd ed., Sage, London.

About the authors

Nan Jiang is a PhD candidate at the University of Derby, UK. Nan Jiang is the corresponding author and can be contacted at: vanessa3999@yahoo.com

Victoria Carpenter (PhD, Hull) is a Reader in Hispanic Studies at the University of Derby. Her specialisms include cross-cultural discourse analysis, history and collective memory, transculturation and multicultural issues in modern society. She has published several collected volumes and a number of articles on the above subjects. Currently, she is working on hegemonic and posthegemonic approaches to cultural studies.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.