How international are we?
A study of the barriers to internationalisation of UK Higher Education

- Current Doctorate study
- Primary research in 3 phases
  - Content analysis of internationalisation strategies
  - Questionnaire via SurveyMonkey of staff involved with internationalisation
  - Interviews with identified staff
- Mixed methods – common approach adopted by other significant research in this area (Elkin, Devjee & Farnsworth, 2005; Middlehurst & Woodfield, 2007; Elkin, Farnsworth & Templer, 2008; Fielden, 2008)
- Pragmatist philosophy
Internationalisation – a definition

“internationalization at the national, sector and institutional levels is defined as the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of postsecondary education” (Knight, 2003).

It has though been extended by the addition of a further statement

“it should aim to create values, beliefs and intellectual insight in which both domestic and international students and staff participate and benefit equally. It should develop global perspectives, international and cultural and ethical sensitivity and useful knowledge, skills and attitudes for the globalised market place” (Elkin, Devjee & Farnsworth, 2005).
Content Analysis of Internationalisation Strategies

• Four strategies analysed – selected as cross section of type (pre/post 1992), location and varying levels of engagement with internationalisation
• QSR Nvivo used for analysis
• Identify themes that are stated within the strategies - important to internationalisation process
• Comparison with themes identified in earlier studies – Aigner, Nelson & Stimpfl, 1992; Scott, 1992; Warner, 1992; de Wit, 1995; Knight, 1997; Knight, 2003; Elkin, Devjee & Farnsworth, 2005; Middlehurst & Woodfield, 2007; Elkin, Farnsworth & Templer, 2008
• Themes grouped under rationales - academic, competitive, developmental, economic, political, social and cultural plus operational
### Content Analysis cont

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coding Rationale</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>56 (29)</td>
<td>48 (23)</td>
<td>40 (53)</td>
<td>47 (34)</td>
<td>191 (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>39 (20)</td>
<td>26 (12)</td>
<td>14 (19)</td>
<td>25 (18)</td>
<td>104 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>22 (11)</td>
<td>35 (16)</td>
<td>4 (5)</td>
<td>14 (10)</td>
<td>75 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>11 (5)</td>
<td>15 (7)</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td>11 (8)</td>
<td>39 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>48 (24)</td>
<td>46 (22)</td>
<td>8 (11)</td>
<td>15 (11)</td>
<td>117 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>5 (3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; cultural</td>
<td>15 (8)</td>
<td>43 (20)</td>
<td>6 (8)</td>
<td>26 (19)</td>
<td>90 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coding of internationalisation strategies – number and % of codes per rationale per institution
Content Analysis cont

• Although not being the driver for the strategy analysis, the focus of each strategy could also be identified from the table above.
• B and D have a greater emphasis on social and cultural aspects and reflects the very wide ranging and institution-wide strategy of B
• There were significant correlations between previous research including;
  institutional links
  research collaborations
  internationally focused curriculum
  staff interaction internationally
  student recruitment
Questionnaire

• Prepared using surveymonkey software and was emailed out via two separate internationalisation interest groups
• BUILA, the British Universities International Liaison Association which has around 400 members across 125 HEI’s
• Internationalisation Special Interest Group (SIG) within the Business, Management, Accountancy and Finance (BMAF) network of the Higher Education Academy (HEA) with over 1230 members across 135 HEI’s.
• The majority of the questions were based on the Likert Scale
• Grouped into 6 main areas – staff, student, curriculum, collaborative, administration and operationalising, general
Analysis of questionnaires

- 76 respondents from 55 HEI’s, giving an excellent geographical spread and also of “types” of institution
- The provision of qualitative responses provided further detailed data
- Main barriers identified
  - Internationalising the curriculum
  - Support of senior staff
  - Resourcing
  - Support of whole institution staff
  - Mobility
  - Cultural awareness
  - Internationalisation strategy
Analysis of questionnaires cont

• Statistically significant difference between pre and post 1992 institutions on
  • REF 2013 and link to internationalisation
  • Mobility of staff
  • Staff international experience and profile
  • Institutional international aim/strategy

• Statistically significant difference between “roles” of respondent on
  • REF 2013 and link to internationalisation
  • Internationalising the curriculum
  • Internationalisation at home
Final Phase Interviews

- Two pre 1992 and two post 1992 institutions
- DVC, Head of International Office, Academic, Administrator
- Very early analysis re-confirms main barriers

- Internationalising the curriculum – close link to *internationalisation at home* agenda
- Support of senior staff
- Resourcing
- Support of whole institution staff
- Mobility
- Cultural awareness

BUT evident difference of barrier emphasis whether pre or post 1992 institution
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