ABSTRACT This paper presents a case study of staff and student perceptions of internationalisation in a UK university and explores the implications of the findings for the operationalisation of a transformative internationalisation strategy. The paper replicates the methodology employed by Robson and Turner (2007) in a humanities faculty to elicit data in a science faculty. Data from staff and students reveals limited awareness of the university’s long-standing internationalisation strategy. Findings suggest that participating staff have a rather narrow perception of internationalisation as a market driven strategy which is mainly related to the recruitment of international students. Their comments focused largely on the impacts of this recruitment strategy on their preferred academic work (and research in particular). Data from focus groups and a small-scale survey suggest that students were not aware of the internationalisation strategy, nor of the potential benefits of receiving an internationalised education, but were moderately enthusiastic about the possibility of having an internationalised experience once it was explained to them. The paper reflects on these findings in relation to the concept of transformative internationalisation and offers recommendations to facilitate staff and student engagement with the internationalisation strategy as a means to achieve sustained institutional change.
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Introduction

This study was conducted in one, UK, Russell-Group [research-intensive] University that annually educates approximately 20,000 students in 460 degree programmes; approximately 22% of students are from overseas. The paper replicates the methodology employed by Robson and Turner (2007) in a humanities faculty in order to elicit the perceptions of staff and students in a science faculty about the University’s internationalisation strategy.

When Robson and Turner’s data was collected 2004-2006, the internationalisation strategy was perceived by participants to focus predominantly on increasing recruitment. The importance of developing a more holistic approach to internationalisation was recognised to enable more staff and students to commit to, and engage with, the internationalisation agenda. In the intervening years there has been a considerable emphasis on internationalisation through an Internationalisation Think Tank in 2009 and the formulation of an International Executive Group to review and monitor the internationalisation strategy. Significant developments include the publication of the University’s Vision 2021 (Newcastle University, 2012a) document which sets out a strategic framework for “a civic University with a global reputation for academic excellence” (p.3) with “a significant international ... profile” (p. 7). Key messages that have been communicated include a commitment to strengthen strategic partnerships by the planting of a small number of ‘large flags’ or key collaborations for the creation and dissemination of knowledge and the translation of this knowledge to benefit civic society. An example of this is the development of an international branch campus in a strategically important area of south-east Asia, building on the reputation of one of the University’s oldest and most respected disciplines. In terms of the internationalisation of research, the University has developed the concept of Societal Challenge Themes as part of its commitment to ‘Excellence with a purpose’ through research that responds to ‘some of the most pressing needs within society’ such as social renewal (Newcastle University, 2012b). A further strategic priority relates to diversity. While international student fees have become an increasingly important source of income, given the recent [deep] cuts to university funding, the University’s revised Internationalisation Strategy (Newcastle University, 2012c) recognises that international staff and students enrich the community and that the University is strengthened through cultural diversity.

This case study investigates whether the academic staff who design and deliver student learning experiences understand and commit to the internationalisation strategy (Shiel, 2009a). It also investigates students’ perceptions of the interna-
nationalisation strategy and whether they are cognisant of the benefits of receiving an internationalised learning experience at university.

Definitions and key concepts

"Internationalisation" is a complex term that is difficult to define (Grimshaw, 2011; Caruana and Spurling, 2007; Shiel, 2009a; Knight, 2004). Within the context of globalisation and the operation of free markets, internationalisation is a key institutional strategy for responding to the opening up of economic, cultural, educational and social opportunities across borders. Turner and Robson (2008, p.11-12) note that "at its broadest level, internationalisation acts as a metaphor which describes increasing international engagement" but this is highly dependent on the motivations and orientations of key groups and individuals.

A frequently adopted definition interprets internationalisation as “the process of integrating an international, intercultural or global dimension into the purpose, functions or delivery of post-secondary education” (Knight, 2003, p. 2). Some universities have sought to expand their global reach and reputations by prioritising the diversification of faculty and students through international recruitment and mobility programmes (Middlehurst and Woodfield, 2007; Altbach et al., 2009). In the UK, Rammell (2007), former Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, noted the "wide spread acceptance of the importance of 'internationalising' higher education and giving students the skills to enable them to operate effectively across boundaries."

Literature Review

An increasing number of publications aim to promote understanding of internationalisation in post-secondary educational institutions (Knight, 2004; Jones, 2007). Internationalisation has been interpreted in terms of international engagement, international recruitment and mobility, and internationalisation of curriculum content and delivery to promote intercultural skills development (Turner and Robson, 2008).

In a competitive recruitment environment, the importance of ensuring high quality and engaging learning experiences for both international and domestic students is highlighted, to instill the critical thinking and intercultural skills that underpin responsible citizenship at the local, national, and global level¹ and to prepare graduates with a cosmopolitan world view for life and work in the global economy. Hyland et al. (2008), Grimshaw (2011) and Leask (2009) highlight the relevance of the interactions between home and international students. Leask

¹ (www.unesco.org/iam/p_statements/index.html)
(2009, p.205) emphasises that “the development of intercultural competencies in students...requires a campus environment and culture that obviously motivates and rewards interaction between international and home students in and out of the classroom.” Hanson (2010, p.76) refers to the potential of social transformation models of internationalisation where radical curriculum reform fosters the values, skills, and dispositions associated with engaged global citizenship.

Montgomery (2009), Hyland et al. (2008) and Ippolito (2007) have found students to be generally enthusiastic about interacting with each other. Home students’ perceptions of international students may however be influenced by: their perceptions of the language competence of international students (Dunne, 2009; Hyland et al., 2008), cultural attitudes to academic work (Dunne, 2009; Turner, 2009), or homophylic tendencies (Dunne, 2009; Peacock and Harrison, 2009) that impact on home students’ experience and tendencies to study abroad (Parsons, 2009). The present research contributes to this under-studied area of the literature (Turner, 2009; Grimshaw, 2011).

This case study addresses the problematic issue of how to translate university policy into practical internationalisation initiatives (Warwick and Moogan, 2010; Luxon and Peelo, 2009). Maringe and Foskett (2010) note the prevalence of “a limited view of internationalisation,” a “lack of coherence in the nature of university products suited to a globalised world” and “a lack of strategies for measuring internationalisation performance”. Sanderson (2011, p.663) notes that much of the literature in Australia focuses on internationalisation at an organisational level, but is limited “in terms of dealing with the substance of how staff might engage with the concept to internationalise their work.” The internationalisation practices of teachers in higher education are an important indicator of the embeddedness of the internationalisation strategy (Sanderson, 2011).

Ippolito (2007) and Jiang (2008) note the criticisms that have been made of internationalisation, pointing to the remedialisation of curricula, loss of distinctiveness of a nation’s higher education practices, disparity between the support offered to home and international students (thus widening the gap between the two student groups) and the massification of higher education as a commodity. The tendency to prefix generic module or degree titles with the term ‘international’ in an effort to create the perception of a rejuvenated course content may lead to misperceptions that such courses are targeting international students and thereby discourage home students and have a narrowing effect on student diversity (Hyland et al. 2008).

There has been little written until relatively recently about precisely how the internationalisation of pedagogy and curriculum can be achieved. For transformative processes (Hanson, 2010) to take place, it is important that staff and students
are engaged with the internationalisation strategy to build a collective vision of how it can enhance teaching and learning (Warwick and Moogan, 2011; Black, 2004; Robson, 2011). Transformative approaches are internally-driven, partnership-focused and collaborative, aiming for academic and cultural, rather than financial benefits (Bartell, 2003; Turner and Robson, 2008). Tian and Lowe (2009) discuss the potential of a focus on personal engagement with the Cultural Other to promote inter-cultural understanding and lead to personally transformative internationalisation. Hyland et al. (2008) present encouraging data indicating increased awareness among UK higher education staff of the complex issues surrounding internationalisation related to recruitment strategies, entry requirements for non-native speakers, fees, the international status of a British degree and curriculum internationalisation. The Higher Education Academy (HEA) is currently focused on supporting the internationalisation of the learning experiences of both international and home students. The Teaching International Students Project, a joint initiative between the HEA and the United Kingdom Council for International Student Affairs (UKCISA) has collated extensive resources to support the development of internationalised course content and associated learning activities. A forthcoming book (Ryan, ed., 2012) resulting from this project moves beyond the rhetoric of internationalisation to map and address the challenges for teaching, learning and assessment.

**Research design**

This research used exploratory research techniques (Zikmund, 2003) to elicit science-based staff and student perceptions of the University’s internationalisation agenda. The aim was to provide insights into the progress of the internationalisation agenda [of the university], the perceived challenges it presents for research, engagement, teaching, learning and assessment and to reflect on the findings in relation to the concept of a transformative approach to internationalisation.

The research design involved replicating Robson and Turner’s (2007) study (conducted in the humanities and social sciences) in science-based disciplines to ascertain whether there is evidence that deeper understandings of internationalisation within the University have been reached since Robson and Turner’s data were collected in 2004/05.

Figure 1 illustrates the overall research design and shows that the research had two, independent strands with a common goal. The first strand explores staff understandings of university policy, its impact on the practices and beliefs of those responsible for implementing internationalisation initiatives and ultimately on the
student experience. To obtain a more holistic perspective on the internationalisation of the Faculty the second strand investigated students’ awareness of the university’s internationalisation efforts and how they impact on their learning. Students’ views and understandings are a further important indicator of the embeddedness of an internationalisation strategy. Figure 1 shows the congruence of the two strands and how they were designed to reach this common goal. For both strands, the theoretical background of internationalisation and the empirical setting of the research were carefully considered and used to assist the design and development of the data collection instruments.

Gathering staff perceptions of internationalisation

To support the first strand of the research, data was collected from staff in schools of Science, Agriculture and Engineering at the case university. The Science Faculty is structured around ten academic Schools, two Research Institutes and a number of Research Centres and Networks. Several schools, such as those dedicated to engineering disciplines, have a long history of teaching international students; others have recently developed in-country delivery of programmes. Some Schools within the Faculty, such as the School of Biology and the School of Agriculture, Food and Rural Development have traditionally been populated by home students but are seeing a gradual influx of international students.

Focus groups were held over a four week period in June 2010 with the principal research objective being to determine staff understanding of internationalisation. The participants included academic and administrative staff all of whom, in their various roles, encountered the practical and strategic aspects of internationalisation. Focus groups were selected as the preferred data collection method to encourage discussion and debate (Berg, 2001). A purposive sample of 25 participants (16 male: 9 female) from six Schools and a central administration service were involved in the discussions. The focus groups were semi-structured and lasted approximately 90 minutes each. Following the focus groups, the data were transcribed, cross-referenced and manually coded to reveal common themes (Creswell, 2009). The interview guide used is available from the researchers on request.

The discussions with staff tapped perceptions of the university’s internationalisation agenda, its impact on the management of teaching, learning and assessment practices, the design and delivery of the curriculum and the quality of the student experience and research and engagement. More than half the staff involved in the focus groups had comparatively high teaching loads at both undergraduate and postgraduate level.
Gathering student perceptions of internationalisation

The second strand of this research aimed to identify students’ understanding of internationalisation. Hyland et al. (2008) and Grimshaw (2011) concluded that attention needs to be given to home students so that the whole student body can reap the benefits of an internationalised education in a culturally diverse environment. Three focus groups were conducted in mid-November 2009 with a total of 15 first-year students from the University’s Agribusiness Management (ABM), Rural Studies (RS), Countryside Management (CM) and Environmental Science (ES) degree programmes. The sample for these focus groups was purposively selected from these courses as they generally attract a narrow demographic of home students, largely white, middle-class males who have generally taken a gap year between finishing school and starting university.

As with the staff focus groups, a semi-structured interview guide with a series of open-ended questions (available upon request from the researchers) was used to facilitate discussions (Yin, 2003). At the beginning of each focus group, participants were provided with Post-it notes to write words or phrases which they associated with “internationalisation”. This was followed by a group discussion of what students perceived as internationalisation compared to the university’s strategy (which was then electronically projected onto the wall of the research venue). Further questions were asked about students’ experiences with internationalisation, their expectations of studying at an international university and what international aspects of learning were incorporated into their degrees. The data were treated in the same was as those from the focus groups with staff.

In a second phase of the research with students, we sought to understand how they thought the curriculum could best be internationalised. During this phase a questionnaire was administered to a stage-1 class of 65 students, of whom 14 were ABM students and five were RS students. While not all of the students were from the degrees represented in the focus groups, the quantitative approach to this phase required a sample size greater than the total cohort of the ABM, ES, RS and CM degrees. Therefore the opportunity was taken to survey students in a large class in which ABM and RS students participated.

The survey instrument contained 11 questions which combined nominal (yes/no) and ordinal (preferences and 4-point Likert) scales. The instrument and the theoretical sources of its development are presented in Appendix 1. To conduct the survey, TurningPoint technology (Turning Technologies, 2008) was used. The students were familiar with this technology, having previously used it in the class, and it was an inexpensive and fast method of collecting data.
Findings

At the beginning of both staff and student focus groups, participants were asked to write on Post-it notes either single words or sentences that indicate what internationalisation meant to them. Table 1 provides the themes and supporting data that emerged from this exercise. Staff responses to the Post-it note exercise was more detailed and complex than student responses. However, the point here was not to compare the views of the two groups but to ascertain individual understandings about internationalisation.

This exercise illustrated that staff and student understandings of internationalisation were enormously varied, as asserted by Caruana and Spurling (2007) and Shiel (2009a), and not always favourable, as discussed by Ippolito (2007), Robson and Turner (2007) and Jiang (2008). The majority of staff responses related internationalisation to the review of teaching and learning and the ways in which the curriculum is designed and delivered. While traditional teaching techniques can be used (such as case studies and examples), participants realised that it is no longer considered to be sufficient to ‘think small’ with regard to curriculum adaptation, as indicated by terms such as “broadening”, “global-centric” and “widening” the curriculum. Furthermore, staff understood internationalisation to require both staff and student mobility and experience of international environments as indicated by Jiang (2008) and Grimshaw (2011). Both staff and student participants considered that internationalisation was about creating diversity and promoting on-campus integration through “Engaging with other cultures”, and meeting “An interesting and varied group of people”. Students were enthusiastic about “Diversity” and “Mixing of cultures” to broaden their horizons and create a varied university population—and an inclusive educational culture as discussed by Robson (2011) and Grimshaw (2011). Staff appreciated opportunities for “Engaging [in] world-wide participation on an activity that has been domestic” and “Meeting diverse students’ needs,” indicating that internationalisation is perceived to be about appreciating different cultural perspectives and nurturing and facilitating diversity within the university population.

The University’s strategy statement for internationalisation refers to both internationalisation at home—to develop students as ‘global citizens’, with cross-cultural understanding and skills developed through curriculum experiences, exchanges, language training—and internationalisation abroad—developing strategic partnerships and networks, trans-national education initiatives and international recruitment. It was surprising when staff focus group participants were shown this statement that the majority did not know that it existed. However, some par-
participants shared their perceptions of what internationalisation means within the Faculty and the University:

An international university needs to be able to give people the preparation to be able to go and do it and then they’ve got to be able to go and do it and come back and have achieved well. That’s what I’d want to see. The rest is superficial. (male academic, focus group 1).

You can’t say that the university is internationalised sitting [in a focus group]. The judgement is made on whether the university is known elsewhere… “Have they heard of [this] university?” And that’s your measure of whether it is international or not. (male academic, focus group 1).

These comments suggest that internationalisation is perceived to be related to gaining an international experience and building the international reputation of the University. The overall results of the present study echo Robson and Turner’s (2007) findings that staff were generally supportive of the university’s internationalisation strategy although there were some concerns about the practicalities of implementation: staff participants thought that internationalisation was time-consuming and potentially damaging to individual research careers:

It has a negative impact on research I have to say…the quality of research…., we’re growing… our activities without having the resources to back it up…the quality and the quantity…I mean the real impact on that is that my School in the next Research Excellence Framework will almost certainly have a smaller number of people than we did last time (male academic, focus group 3).

The University’s definition of internationalisation was thought to be too focused on teaching rather than staff research efforts:

…the University is supposed to do teaching, research and engagement. And I think internationalisation is relevant to all of those three and I don’t see it [in the University’s definition] and I see absolutely no reference to research (male academic, focus group 1).

Responses revealed an awareness of the confusion brought about by the practical impacts of the University’s internationalisation strategy, and the need to address the predominant view that it is a revenue-generating scheme that leads to increasing recruitment of international students:

…and change…the focus of international students from a money basis to a one that would actually bring value to the university and to value them back in a way that they’re taught and
integration and so on and see them less as a parasite or whatever currency they bring.
(female academic, focus group 2).

This view has since been addressed in the revised Internationalisation Strategy (Newcastle University, 2012c), which recognises that the University community is strengthened and enriched through cultural diversity.

Some staff responses indicated that they were adapting to the support needs of international students in the practical implementation of the strategy in relation to the student experience (Warwick and Moogan, 2010; Luxon and Peelo, 2009) for example by not being over-judgmental about students’ English language skills when assessing students’ work:

If the result is ok it’s good and then, although they might have some grammar mistakes or whatever, I still give [international students] reasonable marks
(male academic, focus group 4).

In the dialogue with students, an unexpected finding was the lack of awareness or expectations of gaining an international education at university, or of learning in an international environment:

No, I had no idea that I’d get an international education when I enrolled [in the degree]
(female student, focus group B)

I’ve never thought of [this university] as international
(male student, focus group C)

it doesn’t attract a lot of international students; I won’t say I’ve embraced the international community up at [this university]
(male student, focus group A).

With regard to student expectations, these comments indicate a lack of awareness of the potential for an internationalised curriculum to contribute to their learning, or of the fact that almost a quarter of the student population is international. The factors influencing students’ choice of university appear to have been the perception that the university is located in a party town where one can have a good time with similar types of people whilst working towards a tertiary qualification. With regard to the opportunities for intercultural experiences:

…international students…usually sort of group together and it doesn’t actually help to mix the cultures that much. But you could argue that English students don’t make the appropriate efforts towards international students to really make the effort
(male student, focus group A).
These findings concur with those of Dunne (2009) who suggested homophylic tendencies of home students in the UK. Nevertheless it was found that students were enthusiastic about internationalisation. Upon discussing the opportunities presented by international course content and learning activities, participants were enthusiastic about the prospect of learning about international business practices and the likelihood of pursuing careers in the international commercial environment. Many students openly expressed a desire to have international elements incorporated into their degree programmes so they were better prepared to operate in diverse environments as graduates, as suggested by Shiel (2009b). It is encouraging that once students were made aware of the internationalisation agenda they were mostly positive about the potential to enrich their learning experience.

The results of the survey of 65 stage-1 students, available upon request from the researchers, also indicate two encouraging findings. An overwhelming majority of participants (87.3%) strongly agree that internationalisation is the responsibility of the entire university. This finding concurs with the research results of Leask (2009) and Peacock and Harrison (2009), that students view internationalisation as an issue concerning students, lecturers, administration staff, the student union and indeed the university as a whole.

A further encouraging finding was that 77.8% of participants either strongly agreed or agreed that a valuable learning experience can be gained from working with international students. The findings concur with those of Montgomery (2009) and Wicaksono (2008), that the majority of students value the cross-cultural experience of working with international students through group work. The majority of respondents (61.3%) either strongly agreed or agreed that cross-cultural relationships can be developed through group work. Group work that incorporates reflective learning exercises can be beneficial and foster cross-cultural understanding (Ippolito, 2007; Robson and Turner, 2007).

A finding that contrasted with views in the literature is that events which celebrate multi-culturalism will aid in internationalising a university. We asked two questions about students’ attitudes towards events that celebrate cultural diversity. The first of the two questions asked students whether attending such events helped them to gain an international experience. The majority of respondents (64.5%) said no and similarly, 62.3% of students said that they had not attended such an event in the past 12 months. So while Parsons (2009) and Shiel (2009a) advocate multi-cultural activities, participants in the present research are unresponsive to institutionally organised multi-cultural events.
Conclusions

This small-scale case study provided an opportunity for participating staff and students from the science based disciplines to engage with the internationalisation agenda and to reflect on its implications for their work, learning and professional identities. It suggests that some tensions exist between individual and institutional priorities and that the process of engagement with transformational internationalisation has been slow.

The findings indicate that there is wide-spread acceptance among participating staff of the importance of ‘internationalising’ higher education. This is, however, rather narrowly interpreted in relation to incoming international students and international engagement, indicating that few participants have a deep and broad understanding of the internationalisation agenda, a result not dissimilar to the findings from social science disciplines (Robson and Turner, 2007) several years earlier. There is some way to go to achieve better understanding of the strategy for internationalisation of research, and internationalisation at home, in order that both home and international students are supported to develop the skills to operate effectively across cultural boundaries (Knight, 2003; Rammell, 2007; Shiel, 2009a). Only one academic participant indicated awareness of the concept of international mobility to develop students as global citizens (Caruana and Spurling 2007; Shiel, 2009a; Luxon and Peelo, 2009), to give people the preparation to be able to go and do it and then they’ve got to be able to go and do it and come back and have achieved well. That’s what I’d want to see. (male academic, focus group 1).

The data also indicate that efforts are required to communicate the integration of the University’s internationalisation strategy with its research strategy. Research has long been the key goal of many academic staff. The societal challenge themes adopted by the University provide a conceptual framework for the application of research to address key issues in local, national and global settings, such as social renewal. Hanson (2008, p.85), for example, suggests that “internationalization is or should be … centrally about pursuing those research and educational activities that increase knowledge and awareness of inequalities both within and between nations.” This approach integrates intercultural experiences and skills development with solution focused engagement, enabling “both inward (awareness and commitment) and outward (action) dimensions, reflecting both social and personal change” (Hanson, 2008, p.76).

The data suggests that staff and students’ engagement with transformative internationalisation is aspirational rather than actual. Improved communication about the international strategy and opportunities for staff and students to discuss
and negotiate internationalisation and how it is operationalised at the case university seem essential. This should encourage engagement with the strategy in its broadest sense and influence the values, skills, and dispositions associated with the internationalization of the academic self (Sanderson, 2008) or personally transformative internationalisation (Tian and Lowe, 2009). For the future, the case university could look to success stories, like those reported by Jones (2007), to promote the wider engagement with the internationalisation strategy that can lead to cultural change.

Social transformation models of internationalization suggest the need for radical reform to curricula (Hanson, 2008). Further development work is indicated to address inconsistent approaches to assessment of international students’ work, to support internationalisation at home and to promote the development of intercultural learning experiences for all students through group work and other practical curriculum innovation initiatives. These might include real or simulated instances of cross-cultural negotiation and communication, including specific reference to intercultural issues in professional practice (as suggested by the Oxford Brookes’ CICIN). Internationalisation of course content would be appropriate for classes in the disciplines of business, marketing, communications and international studies but could also be adapted for a range of other disciplines. Findings from the student data suggest that while students were surprisingly unaware of the concept of internationalisation, they respond favourably to opportunities for group work with international students and to the inclusion of case studies of international business issues and reflective learning activities into the curriculum.

Approaches to internationalisation in Anglophone universities range from symbolic to transformative (Bartell, 2003, cited in Robson, 2011). The findings from this case study indicate that the faculty in question is characterised by symbolic internationalisation “where stakeholders acknowledge the financial imperative for internationalization [sic] and strategies are driven by primarily economic and competitive motives.” However findings suggest an openness among both staff and students to the potential of a more transformative approach through the internationalisation of personal and professional outlooks (Sanderson, 2008); to the opportunities afforded by internationalisation; to the richness and opportunities for the University brought by the diversity of international staff and students (Ryan, 2011). This will require targeted efforts to communicate with and engage staff and students from the science-based disciplines with the internationalisation strategy in “… a two-way process of learning and adaptation” (Magyar and Robinson-Pant, 2011, p. 674). There is a need for international concerns to be “embedded into

3. See http://www.brookes.ac.uk/services/oecld/ioc/modules/course_content.html and http://www.brookes.ac.uk/services/oecld/ioc/modules/tl_activities.html
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[the faculty’s] routine ways of thinking and doing, in policy and management, staff and student recruitment, curriculum and programs” (Robson, 2011, p. 625). This seems to be an essential prerequisite to the achievement of the complex changes and ideological commitment required to ensure sustainable strategic success (Grimshaw, 2011) and to overcome the idea that international students are a source of problems (as alluded to in the first strand data in this study).

From the present research, it is suggested that greater attention needs to be paid to organisational theories of change that may help to overcome the deep-seated cultural obstacles to transformative internationalisation. Bartell (2003, p.43) notes the importance of achieving alignment of the international strategy and the organisational culture, since the ‘orientation and strength of the university culture and functioning structure’ can facilitate or inhibit the deployment of the strategy. Successful transformation alters the organisational culture in the direction of desired change (Keup et al., 2001).

The findings may be helpful to policy makers, senior academic managers and staff developers in the case study university and in other institutions as they seek to support the operationalisation of the internationalisation agenda. The catalyst for the present research was the participation of the authors in a development initiative that encourages enquiry based approaches to enhancing the student experience. This enabled the research to be discussed and critiqued within a community of enquiry and linked to broader debates about key strategic initiatives (Robson et al. 2010). We suggest the active involvement of a wider range of academic and administrative staff and students in situated learning and development opportunities (Lave and Wenger, 1991) that promote enquiry and discourse around key strategic initiatives may help to foster engagement with the internationalisation strategy as a means to achieve sustained institutional change. Discourse in such communities can identify internal contradictions, design appropriate solutions and support the development of new values, understandings and commitment to internationalisation (De Vita and Case, 2003; Johnson and Inoue, 2003, cited in Robson and Turner, 2007), as a lived strategy for improvement in higher education.
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Appendix 1: Theoretical justification of survey questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integration of students who stick together</td>
<td>Peacock &amp; Harrison (2009), Montgomery (2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different cultural practices</td>
<td>Haigh (2002).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student perceptions of other nationalities</td>
<td>Turner (2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about international issues</td>
<td>Black (2004) (with ideas from Peacock &amp; Harrison (2009), Montgomery (2009), Turner (2009)).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group work between students</td>
<td>Peacock &amp; Harrison (2009), Montgomery (2009), Parsons (2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students attending international events</td>
<td>Parsons (2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual attendance of international events</td>
<td>Parsons (2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalisation is important</td>
<td>Montgomery (2009), Jordan (2008), Leask (2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swamped with international issues</td>
<td>Harrison and Peacock (2009).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: Research Framework

Research Strand 1: Staff Perceptions of Internationalisation (four focus groups with relevant staff)

Research Strand 2: Student Perceptions of Internationalisation (a. three focus groups and b. survey of relevant students)

Theoretical background of internationalisation

Possibilities for communicating and negotiating the internationalisation strategy with stakeholders

University Internationalisation Policy
### Table 1: Collective responses from Post-it note exercises

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Data from staffs' Post-it notes</th>
<th>Data from students Post-it notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and learning agenda</td>
<td>Different ways of learning; international context to degree programmes; global-centric curricula (case studies, examples, research, topic investigation); including people and perspectives from outside the UK; widening the scope of the curriculum; beyond ethnocentrism in teaching; broadening the curriculum to include international vs. national perspectives; cultural aspects in teaching.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate skills</td>
<td>Globally astute graduates (home and international); preparing students for employment; global, preparing graduates for work; widening horizons of students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff and student mobility</td>
<td>Taking degree in more than one country; staff/student mobility; exchange programmes; extending the scope beyond the UK experience; reaching out to other parts of the globe; gradual change of intake to reflect student mobility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative links</td>
<td>Mobility of information across countries; contact/involvement with other countries; collaborative provision; widening the aspirations of staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global expansion</td>
<td>Overseas campus; virtual admission days; [internationalisation] is not ‘globalisation’…that is us going abroad.</td>
<td>Global business, expansion; multinational; global business expansion; spread of something from or through many different countries globally; globalisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Exposure of the students to multicultural groups; cross culture, bringing in from other parts of the globe; engaging with other cultures; diversification; cohort of international students within the university; an interesting and varied group of people.</td>
<td>Foreign; diversity, international; mixing of cultures, expansion to international areas; immigrant; multiculturalism; foreigners into the UK; immigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Engaging world-wide participation on an activity that has been domestic; making appropriate provision for people of different cultures; meeting diverse students' needs.</td>
<td>Integration; integration with national residents and vice versa regarding students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International student recruitment</td>
<td>Student recruitment; bringing more overseas participants to the case university (as opposite to globalisation); internationalisation in recruitment; more foreign students; international students; increasing proportion of international students/staff in the university; attracting more international students; the university attracting staff, researchers and students (UG, PGT, PGR) to the campus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income generation</td>
<td>Fee income (no quota); ‘golden hills’; high fees; money making agenda of the university</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research-led work</td>
<td>Research networks; attracting students at research level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties</td>
<td>Visa difficulties; language difficulties</td>
<td>Brain-drain; unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>