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Chapter Seven

Strategies and Organisation Models for the Internationalisation of Higher Education

The overview of meanings, definitions, approaches and rationales in previous chapters demonstrates that various elements play a role in the internationalisation process. These elements are described in a variety of different ways – mechanisms, facilitators, activities, barriers, factors and strategies. For the purposes of this discussion Knight and De Wit (1995) have used the term 'strategies' to characterise those initiatives which are taken by an institution of higher learning to integrate an international dimension into research, teaching and service functions as well as management policies and systems. In recent years, several attempts have been made to structure organisational strategies into different models of the internationalisation process. This chapter provides an updated overview and critical analysis of strategies and organisational models for the internationalisation of higher education, based on Knight and de Wit, 1995.

1. Strategies

In the process approach, the many different activities identified as key components of internationalisation are divided into two major categories: programme strategies and organisational strategies. The programme strategies refer to those academic activities and services of an institution of higher education that integrate an international dimension into its main functions. Organisational strategies include those initiatives which help to ensure that an international dimension, or in other words the activities discussed above, are institutionalised through developing the appropriate policies and administrative systems.

Programme strategies

In their study of 1995, Knight and De Wit identify four categories of programme strategies: research-related activities; education-related activities; activities related to technical assistance and development co-operation; and extra-curricular activities and institutional services. Jane Knight (1997 and 1999) later changes them into academic programmes; research and scholarly collaboration; external relations and services; and extra-curricular activities. She (1999, 25) motivates the change of 'technical assistance and development co-operation' into 'external relations and services' by the change in orientation from 'aid' to 'trade'. Nonetheless, this category, of the four, is the least clear. If we look at the activities listed in this category (Ibid., 24) it is a mix of unrelated strategies, including transnational education strategies, development co-operation strategies, international alumni programmes and community services, intercultural projects and community–based partnerships. International students are placed under academic programmes although, as a trade, they could also be placed under external relations and services. Preference is given to distinguish between technical assistance strategies, export of knowledge (inward oriented) and transnational education (outward oriented) strategies; and include international alumni programmes and community–based programmes under extra-curricular activities. An overview of programme strategy categories and related examples is given below.
Internationalisation of Higher Education

**Figure 3**

### Programme Strategies

| Academic programmes | A. *Student-oriented programmes:*  
|                     | - Student mobility schemes  
|                     | - Student exchange programmes  
|                     | - International students  
|                     | - Work/internship/study abroad  
|                     | - Study visits  
|                     | B. *Staff-oriented programmes:*  
|                     | - Faculty/staff mobility programmes for teaching  
|                     | - Visiting lecturers/staff for teaching  
|                     | - Joint and double appointments for teaching  
|                     | C. *Curriculum development programmes:*  
|                     | - Internationalisation of the curriculum  
|                     | - Foreign language study  
|                     | - Local language and culture training  
|                     | - Area and international thematic studies  
|                     | - Teaching/learning process  
|                     | - Joint and double degree programmes  
|                     | - Summer programmes and universities  
| Research and scholarly collaboration | A. *PhD-student-oriented programmes:*  
|                     | - International PhD students  
|                     | - PhD student mobility  
|                     | B. *Staff-oriented programmes:*  
|                     | - Faculty/staff mobility programmes for research  
|                     | - Visiting lecturers/staff for research  
|                     | - Joint and double appointments for research  
|                     | C. *Research development programmes:*  
|                     | - International research projects  
|                     | - International research agreements  
|                     | - International conferences and seminars  
|                     | - International publishing and citation  
|                     | - Area and international theme centres  
|                     | - Joint research centres  
| Technical assistance | A. *Student-oriented programmes:*  
|                     | - Student scholarship programmes (South–North)  
|                     | - Student oriented training programmes (North–South)  
|                     | B. *Staff-oriented programmes:*  
|                     | - Staff training scholarship programmes (South–North)  
|                     | - Staff oriented training programmes (North–South)  
|                     | C. *Curriculum-oriented programmes:*  
|                     | - Institution–building programmes  
|                     | - Curriculum development programmes  
| Export of knowledge (inward) | - Recruitment of international students for economic reasons  
|                     | - Development of special profit–based courses and programmes for international students  
|                     | - Development of postgraduate training programmes for the international market  
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| Transnational education (outward) | - Offshore programmes and campuses
| - Distance education programmes
| - Twinning programmes
| - Branch campuses
| - Franchise arrangements
| - Articulation programmes
| - Virtual, electronic or web programmes and institutions

| Extra curricular activities | - Student clubs and associations
| - International and intercultural events
| - Community–based projects and activities, intercultural and international
| - International alumni programmes

Adapted from Knight, 1999, a.

As Knight and De Wit (1995, 20) have noted, all the activities described in the table can be part of a strategy for internationalisation. The activities do not exclude one another, but only in a few exceptional cases will an institution have an explicit strategy that covers all or even most of the activities mentioned above. It is essential to state that an institution should not be judged for its internationalisation strategy on the assumption that all or most of these activities are implicitly or even explicitly part of their policy plan. It is more important that institutions identify their priorities and how these can be integrated into a strategic plan for the institution.

Organisational strategies

The previous section illustrates the number and variety of activities and services which are part of integrating an international dimension into the teaching, research and service functions of higher education institutions. Knight and De Wit (Ibid., 20) state that, even if there is an increasing number of academic programmes and activities, if they are not underpinned by a permanent organisational commitment and structure they may die when supporters leave the institution, resources become scarcer or new priorities emerge. Internationalisation needs to be entrenched into the culture, policy, planning and organisation processes of the institution so that it is not marginalised or treated as a passing fad. Giving equal attention to both the programme and organisational strategy types as well as differentiating between the two types is essential.

Knight and De Wit (Ibid., 20-22) identify the following elements of organisational strategies: the commitment and support of the board of governors and senior administrators; the support and involvement of a critical mass of faculty/staff; the international office or position; adequate funding and support both internally and externally; policy; incentives and rewards for faculty and staff; the existence of formal communication channels; and an annual planning, budget and review process. Jane Knight (1999, 26) groups them together in four categories of organisational strategies: governance, operations, support services and human resource development.
### Figure 4

**Organisational Strategies**

| Governance | - Expressed commitment by senior leaders  
- Active involvement of faculty and staff  
- Articulated rationale and goals for internationalisation  
- Recognition of an international dimension in mission statement and other policy documents |
|---|---|
| Operations | - Integrated into institution-wide and department planning, budgeting and quality review systems  
- Appropriate organisational structures  
- Communication systems (formal and informal) for liaison and coordinator  
- Balance between centralised and decentralised promotion and management of internationalisation  
- Adequate financial support and resource allocation systems |
| Support services | - Support from institution-wide service units, *i.e.* student housing, registrariat, counselling, fund-raising, etc.  
- Involvement of academic support units, *i.e.* language training, curriculum development, library  
- Student support services for international students studying on campus and domestic students going abroad, *i.e.* orientation programmes, counselling, cross-cultural training, student advisers, etc. |
| Human resource development | - Recruitment and selection procedures which reorganise international and intercultural expertise  
- Reward and promotion policies to reinforce faculty and staff contribution to internationalisation  
- Faculty and staff professional development activities  
- Support for international assignments and sabbaticals |

*Source: Jane Knight, 1999 a, 26*

Different rationales and approaches will lead to different programme and organisational strategies. The same is true for the organisation models examined in the second part of this chapter.
2. Organisation Models for the Internationalisation of Higher Education

Six different organisation models for the internationalisation of higher education, as identified in the literature on the internationalisation of higher education, are reviewed here. The first model, by Neave (1992 b), presents a paradigmatic model for servicing and administering international co-operation. The second model, developed by Rudzki (1993), has a more programmatic approach to strategies, and tries to provide a framework for assessing levels of international activity within institutions. Davies’ model (1992) gives more emphasis to the organisational strategies as a starting point. The fourth model by Van Dijk and Meijer (Van Dijk, 1995) is an attempt to refine Davies’ model. These four models have been described by Knight and De Wit (1995), and an updated account is given below. The fifth model is by Van der Wende (1997, 8), and resulted from a model she designed for the NUFFIC, based on the process approach of internationalisation. The last model is by Knight (1994), also based on the process approach and stressing the internationalisation process as a continuous circle.

Neave’s model

Neave (1992 b), using case studies at a global level written for UNESCO, developed two paradigmatic models, one ‘leadership driven’ and a second ‘base unit driven’. The first model has as its essential feature a lack of formal connection below the level of the central administration, while the second model sees such central administrative units mainly as service oriented to activities coming from below. Neave also casts them as ‘managerial rational’ versus ‘academic consensual’ models. He sees the two models “as opposite ends of a species of continuum”, in which “structures administering international co-operation which mould around one paradigm may in certain specific conditions, move towards the opposite end of the continuum.” Neave stresses that “the administrative structures of international co-operation (should be) continually provisional.” He combines the leadership and base unit model for administration in a diagram with ‘definitional’ and ‘elaborative’ scopes of institutional strategy. Instead of definitional and elaborative, alternative terms that might be appropriate are ‘pro-active’ and ‘reactive’ (see figure 5).

In Neave’s paradigmatic approach, the widely used simple distinction between ‘centralised’ and ‘decentralised’ models of internationalisation is implicit, although he adds the dimension of change to his matrix. Rudzki (1998, 184) criticises Neave’s model for its lack of practical application and self-evidence. The following three developmental models move away from this approach which is based on distinguishing between centralisation and decentralisation.
### Task analysis, strategic planning and administrative models

#### Scope of Institutional Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Orientation</th>
<th>Definitional</th>
<th>Elaborative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set institutional priorities.</td>
<td>Apply national guidelines to Institute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lay down procedures.</td>
<td>Ensure procedures set by government are adhered to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set down student numbers.</td>
<td>Screen and pass applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluate applications.</td>
<td>Implement agreements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiate agreements.</td>
<td>Distribute budget to dept. and ensure it is utilised according to government guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assign budget to dept.</td>
<td>Present agreements for government confirmation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Determine which staff go abroad.</td>
<td>Monitor inflow/outflow of student numbers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Determine whether period abroad is recognised for accreditation purposes.</td>
<td>Ensure disciplinary priorities are in keeping with government plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify disciplinary priorities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Unit</td>
<td>Coordinate departmental initiatives.</td>
<td>Stimulate co-operation activities in priority fields laid down by government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide guidance/advice.</td>
<td>Develop incentive scheme for departmental initiatives in co-operation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decide whether international co-operation is to be sustained.</td>
<td>Transmit government guidelines, give advice on formulating departmental response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And departmental commitment over time.</td>
<td>Make known whether additional governmental resources are available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Notify Centre of initiatives at departmental level.</td>
<td>Monitor and evaluate departmental responses in light of government priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Model</td>
<td>Determine part of dept. budget to set aside for co-operation.</td>
<td>Implement + evaluate co-operation agreements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operationalise priorities.</td>
<td>(Suggest ways of improvement to departments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiate co-operation agreements.</td>
<td>Set out and negotiate student number targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set maximum student numbers to be involved per year.</td>
<td>Set out and negotiate staff movements within framework of institutional strategy for institutional planning horizon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ascertains desirability of staff mobility and numbers per year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Neave, 1992 b, 168A
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**Rudzki’s model**

Another model is that of Rudzki (1998), who identifies four key dimensions of internationalisation: student mobility, staff development, curriculum innovation, and organisational change. Originally, Rudzki (1995, see also 1998, 216-218) outlined and contrasted ‘reactive’ and ‘pro-active’ models of internationalisation.

**Figure 6**

**Reacting and pro-active models of internationalisation**

**The reactive model of internationalisation**

*Stage 1: CONTACT:* Academic staff engage in making contacts with colleagues in other countries, curriculum development, limited mobility, links lack clear formulation of purpose and duration

*Stage 2: FORMALISATION:* Some links are formalised with institutional agreements being made. Resources may or may not be made available

*Stage 3: CENTRAL CONTROL:* Growth in activity and response by management who seek to gain control of activities

*Stage 4: CONFLICT:* Organisational conflict between staff and management leads to withdrawing of good will by staff. Possible decline in activity and disenchantedment

*Stage 5: MATURITY OR DECLINE:* Possible move to a more coherent, that is, pro-active, approach.

**The pro-active model of internationalisation**

*Stage 1: ANALYSIS:* Awareness of what ‘internationalisation’ is and what it entails. Strategic analysis of short-, mid- and long-term organisational objectives – answering the question ‘Should we internationalise?’ ‘Why bother?’ Staff training and discussions – understanding of options – what types of international activities are available. International Audit of existing activities and Staff Audit. SWOT analysis. Cost-benefit analysis

*Stage 2: CHOICE:* Strategic plan and policy drawn up in conjunction with staff and explicit use made of mutual interest of staff and organisation. Performance measures defined. Resources allocated. Networking with internal and external organisations

*Stage 3: IMPLEMENTATION:* Measure performance

*Stage 4: REVIEW:* Assessment of performance against policy and plan

*Stage 5: REDEFINITION OF OBJECTIVES/PLAN/POLICY:* Process of continual improvement and the issues of quality this entails. Return to Stage 1 in cycle of growth and development.

Rudzki (1995, 25) has used these models in a study of the internationalisation of UK business schools, and comes to the conclusion “that the spectrum of activity ranges from those business schools who have positioned themselves on the global stage and are committed to internationalisation, to one institution which has taken a strategic decision not to engage in international activity.” He also concludes that “internationalisation is clearly being driven by financial imperatives and incentives, in the form of external UK and EC funding.”
He redefined his models in 1998 into what he calls the fractal process model of internationalisation (see also Rudzki, 2000).

**Figure 7**

**The Fractal Process Model of Internationalisation**

![Fractal Process Model Diagram](image)

Source: Rudzki, 1998, 220

Under ‘context’, Rudzki refers to the external environment; under ‘approach’ such internal factors as the history and culture of the institution; and under ‘rationale’ he refers to the political, economic, cultural and educational rationales as described by Jane Knight and myself (1995).

The model can be questioned for several reasons. In the first place one can query his use of context and approach, instead of internal and external context. One can wonder also why context and
approach are placed in a hierarchical order, which implies that the external environment is more important in strategic planning than the internal process. The four dimensions which together form the internationalisation process of an institution are also questionable. First, because of the combination of the more generic dimension ‘organisational change’ with three more concrete activities; second, because of his subjective choice of the three activities ‘curriculum development’, ‘staff development’ and ‘student mobility’, excluding other programme strategies or placing them under organisational change. Rudzki (1998, 240) defines organisational change as “the process by which an educational establishment reacts to factors in its environment in order to ensure its continued survival for the purposes of maintaining teaching, research and related activities.” As examples that show such change, he (Ibid., 223-224) mentions such diverse activities as policy statements, twinning arrangements, joint research, networks, franchising and joint degree programmes. The distinction between and combination of programme and organisational strategies as made by Knight and De Wit, explained above, is a more useful way of describing the internationalisation process of an institution.

Davies’ model

Davies (1995, 5) bases his model for internationalisation strategies on the need of universities to develop a framework for their international activities in response to changes in the external environment (regionalisation, globalisation, end of Cold War). Two sets of factors are identified, internal and external to the university, and six elements, three related to the internal and three related to the external factor (see figure 8).67

Keeping these two factors and six elements in mind, Davies has developed an organisational model with a strongly prescriptive aspect: a university espousing internationalism should have clear statements of where it stands in this respect, as its mission should influence planning processes and agendas and resource allocation criteria; serve as a rallying standard internally; and indicate to external constituencies a basic and stable set of beliefs and values.

---

67 Davies refers to G. Keller (1983), Academic Strategy, as the basis for his analysis.
According to Davies an institution can have:

**A**: a *central–systematic strategy*, which means: "There is a large volume of international work in many categories, which reinforce each other and have intellectual coherence. The international mission is explicit and followed through with specific policies and supporting procedures."

**B**: an *ad hoc–central strategy*, where a high level of activity may take place throughout the institution but it is not based on clear concepts and has an *ad hoc* character.

**C**: a *systematic–marginal strategy*, which implies that the activities are limited but well organised and based on clear decisions.

**D**: an *ad hoc–marginal strategy*, where little activity takes place and is not based on clear decisions.

Davies has put his model together in the following matrix.
Davies’ model has been used as the basis for further attempts to give structure to the organisational aspects of strategies for the internationalisation of higher education.

**Van Dijk and Meijer’s model**

A fourth model, developed on the basis of an analysis of the internationalisation of Dutch higher education by Van Dijk and Meijer, extends Davies’ model by introducing three dimensions of internationalisation: policy (the importance attached to internationalisation aims); support (the type of support for internationalisation activities); and implementation (method of implementation). A policy can in their view be marginal or priority; the support can be *one-sided* or *interactive*; and the implementation can be *ad hoc* or *systematic*. The model that is formed in this way is a cube with eight cells (see figure 10).
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Figure 10

Internationalisation cube

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>marginal</td>
<td>one-sided</td>
<td>ad hoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>marginal</td>
<td>one-sided</td>
<td>systematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>marginal</td>
<td>interactive</td>
<td>ad hoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>priority</td>
<td>interactive</td>
<td>systematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>priority</td>
<td>one-sided</td>
<td>ad hoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>priority</td>
<td>one-sided</td>
<td>systematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>priority</td>
<td>interactive</td>
<td>ad hoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>priority</td>
<td>interactive</td>
<td>systematic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Van Dijk, 1995, 20

This developmental model is in their view (Van Dijk 1995, Van Dijk and Meijer, 1997) an extension of the Davies model and makes it possible to distinguish different processes of development within an institution. They mention three routes through which it is possible to achieve internationalisation as a real priority area in an institution:

- Route 1–2–6–8, indicating a thoughtful approach and a well-structured organisational culture, defined by them as ‘slow starters’
- Route 1–5–6–8, indicating a strong international commitment and an organised institutional culture, defined as ‘organised leaders’
- Route 1–5–7–8, indicating a quick response to external developments, a great variety of activities at different levels and much commitment which is only at a later stage organised in a more systematic way, defined as ‘entrepreneurial institutions’.

Van Dijk and Meijer (Van Dijk, 1995, and Van Dijk and Meijer, 1997) have developed their model in relation to a survey by a consortium of Dutch organisations on the implementation of internationalisation in Dutch higher education. They come to the conclusion that seven out of ten Dutch institutions can be placed in cells 7 or 8, which implies that they give high priority in their policy to internationalisation and that support in the institution is well distributed at all levels. In most cases (5.5 out of 10) the implementation is not yet systematic but still ad hoc. It is significant that this conclusion applies to both universities and the non-university sector, although the picture is more homogeneous for the first group. The non-university sector represents a very heterogeneous group, ranging from extremely high priority to extremely marginal examples of internationalisation.
The four approaches to the theoretical ‘modelling’ of internationalisation by institutions (Neave, Rudzki, Davies, Van Dijk and Meijer) complement one another in their prescriptive and descriptive aspects. They offer a means of measuring the formal, paper commitments of institutions against the practice to be found in concrete operating structures. Further, they offer a way to include in the theoretical frame the important fact that institutional strategies may be implicit as well as explicit. Knight and De Wit (1995) noted that one must be careful not to be too eager to strive for a model approach to the internationalisation of higher education. The organisational models presented above provide useful information and tools, but should not be considered to be the new paradigm for strategies of internationalisation. The models by Davies and Van Dijk and Meijer are more consistent with our framework than Neave’s and Rudzki’s. Davies’s model, although less refined, is particularly useful for a first rough assessment of the present organisational strategy of an institution and where it wants to move to. He himself observes (1995, 17) that “it is worth using a conceptual framework such as this to reflect on the dynamics of internationalisation, rather than merely go hell-bent on the creation of new policies and structures and in beating the bushes for business.”

The following two models by Van der Wende and Knight take the process approach as their basis. They are not focused on the organisation as such but on the process of internationalisation strategy as a whole. The organisational model of an institution is directly linked to the process as a whole.

**Van der Wende’s NUFFIC Model for the internationalisation of higher education**

In this model of internationalisation as a process taking place within a higher education institution, Van der Wende identifies three important factors: goals and strategies, as defined by the institution itself and by (inter)national policies; implementation of these goals and strategies, for which she identifies three categories: student mobility, staff mobility and curriculum development; and the effects of the implementation on the short term – for students, staff and education – and the long term – for the quality of education, output and position of the institution. An evaluation of the effects should have consequences for redefining goals and strategies.

Van der Wende (1996, 9), who originally developed the model for NUFFIC, notes that the model concentrates on educational aspects of internationalisation, excluding other aspects such as research, and technical assistance. She also (Ibid., 193) comments on her own model that the model is too narrow in its description of motives, using only definitions from formal policy documents; and that it suggests that institutional policies are mainly inspired by (supra) national governmental policies, ignoring other factors.
Figure 11

**NUFFIC model for internationalisation of higher education**

**INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION CONTACTS**

**GOALS AND STRATEGIES**

- EU Policy
- National Policy
- Institutional Policy

**IMPLEMENTATION**

- Student mobility
- Staff mobility
- Curriculum development

**EFFECTS**

- Short term: -student
  -staff
  -education
- Long term: -quality of education
  -output
  -position institution

*Source: Van der Wende, 1996, 8.*

**Knight’s model, internationalisation as a continuous cycle**

A second alternative approach to the development of organisational models is to consider the internationalisation process as a continuous cycle, not a linear or static process. The ‘Internationalisation Cycle: From Innovation to Institutionalisation’ developed by Jane Knight (1993) attempts to identify the steps or phases in the process of integrating the international dimension into the university/college culture and systems.
The cycle has six phases which an institution would move through at its own pace. While it is clear that there is a sequence to the six phases, it is also important to acknowledge the two-way flow that will occur between the different steps.

2. Concluding remarks

If one compares the two models of Van der Wende and Knight, we see a stronger emphasis by Van der Wende on the influence of the external and internal environment – comparable to Davies, according to whom (1998, 73) "internationalisation, almost more than any other domain of
university activity, does call for environmental analysis of the highest order" – and also on implementation, and on the long term effects. In the circle of Knight one notices a stronger emphasis on awareness and commitment and on planning, operationalisation and review. Both lack the central–departmental link, which is present in the organisational models of Davies and Van Dijk.

Combining the six elements of Knight with three elements from Van der Wende – analysis of context, implementation and long term effects – a modified version of the internationalisation circle of Jane Knight is presented.

In this model, the context analysis, the implementation phase and the effect of internationalisation on the overall functions of the institution have been incorporated. In all phases, both the institutional and the specific departmental aspects have to be addressed, as well as the link between the two. It is important to ensure that the specific circumstances of disciplines and departments get enough attention and are not forced into a general structure. The issue of differences among disciplines and academic fields in relation to internationalisation is underrepresented in research on internationalisation. Although there are many studies on the internationalisation of specific academic fields, a comparative study is lacking. Kerr (1990, 14) makes some interesting observations on this topic. He identifies three areas: areas of worldwide uniformity in the content of knowledge; areas of intracultural similarity of knowledge; and areas of intranational particularity. Further comparative study on this issue would be useful, as current studies assume too much homogeneity among the disciplines, where in reality there are big differences in approaches, rationales and strategies. An organisational model for the internationalisation of higher education has to take this issue into account.

The integration effect is – although placed in its heart – outside the circle, for the following reason. It is possible to see internationalisation as a strategy in itself, without a conscious and deliberate strategy to integrate it into the teaching, research and service functions of the institution. In most cases, internationalisation is assumed to have an integration effect, but is not primarily judged on that effect but on its own merits. However, in those cases where the main emphasis will be on the integrative factor of internationalisation, i.e. internationalisation as a strategy becomes a key factor in the overall strategy of an institution and/or department, the internationalisation circle becomes part of an overall planning circle of the institution, with the integration phase as the central link. In this way, internationalisation is no longer part of an external relations policy, but, as Van der Wende (1996, 195) also advocates, an integral element of educational development and innovation.
Internationalisation of Higher Education

**Figure 13**

**Internationalisation circle, modified version**

1. **Analysis of context**
   - Analyse the external and internal context in policy documents and statements

2. **Commitment**
   - by senior administration, board of governors, faculty and staff, students

3. **Planning**
   - Identify needs and resources; purpose and objectives; priorities; strategies

4. **Operationalise**
   - academic activities and services
   - organisational factors
   - use guiding principles

5. **Integration effect**
   - Impact on teaching, research and service function

6. **Implementation**
   - Implementation of programme and organisational strategies

7. **Review**
   - Assess and enhance quality and impact of initiatives and progress of strategy

8. **Reinforcement**
   - Develop incentives, recognition and rewards for faculty, staff and student participation

**Internationalisation circle**

*Note: In all phases address both the institutional- and department-specific aspects and the relation between the two*

Source: Based on Knight, 1994, 12.
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